

Gregg L. Cunningham, Executive Director

June 2011

Dear Pro-Life Friend,

On June 11, 2011, we received a message from a Pennsylvania schoolgirl. She had just seen our abortion videos and wrote to say: “... I am only eighteen and I just found out I was pregnant. I was excited when I found out, but my boyfriend is completely against me having this baby and is pressuring me to get an abortion.” So my wife Lois, who is a public health nurse and former crisis pregnancy medical clinic director, immediately began a dialogue with this young mother. Our goal is to equip her to resist her boyfriend’s attempt to coerce the killing of their child. If possible, we also want to draw him away from the culture of death. He does not want to debate his demand that she make this “problem” go away; he simply wants her to shut up and get it over with.

He is not alone. The entire abortion industry is trying to suppress all debate over abortion. Some clinics are even willing to sue their critics to shut them up. Northland Family Planning Centers, a corporation which operates a chain of Michigan abortion clinics, has just filed a lawsuit against CBR because we criticized them with a mocking, consumer protection video we recently produced. Titled *Angel of Light*, our video embarrassed Northland by mixing CBR abortion footage with portions of one of the deceptive marketing videos Northland uses to sell abortions.

In recently filed court documents, Northland says the clinical “environment” they offer provides “health care” that is “filled with compassion.” The CBR abortion footage we inserted into their sales pitch video proves that killing babies is neither “health care” nor “filled with compassion.” Naturally, they’re angry. They say their video is intended for use in the “counseling of potential or actual Northland patients.” Poorly informed women and girls are being lied to by the abortion industry and Northland is furious at us because our abortion footage proves that their video is more about misleading sales tactics than therapeutic support.

Northland says that as a consequence of CBR’s video exposé, their abortion clinics were “inundated with threatening phone calls from anti-abortion activists.” We are delighted to have stirred the public up against these abortion profiteers, but how is Northland defining the word “threatening”? They never say. Their vague allegations are suspiciously reminiscent of the old abortion industry trick of inflating anti-abortion crime statistics by defining the peaceful display of abortion photo signs as “violence” against women. We think Northland has an obligation to turn over their phone logs to document the relevant caller-ID numbers. That way these “threatening” callers can be investigated. If they can’t prove these scurrilous accusations, they should stop making them.

Our legal opponents also say that “due to the volume and nature of the threatening phone calls and comments ... Northland temporarily removed the *Good Women* video from both YouTube and its own website.” Again, we demand that Northland back up this claim by showing us the contemporaneous police reports their clinics would surely have filed if the “nature” of those calls was truly criminal. In point of fact, Northland admits that it only took down their sales video long enough to disable its ability to be downloaded. Then they immediately reposted it. It would seem, therefore, that the video’s brief removal was motivated more by fear that it might be used to further deride them than that it might inspire criminality.

But either way, blaming CBR for the behavior of people whose identities we don't even know is as cynical as Chicago Mayor Richard Daley blaming Martin Luther King's peaceful civil rights protests for the race riots which later ensued. Dr. King condemned violence -- and we do too. But he also refused to be silenced -- and so do we.

Even more laughable, however, is Northland's related claim that "The safety and security of Northland's clinics have been compromised" by CBR's *Angel of Light* video. Amid torrents of crocodile tears, they add that "Northland's employees fear that the inflammatory nature" of CBR's *Angel of Light* video "will incite violent acts and hate crimes against Northland's clinics, employees, and/or patients."

"Inflammatory"? What is it about our video which has the power to inspire mayhem? We took portions of the Northland sales video and rearranged them with an introduction consisting of one brief paragraph quoting writer George Orwell. The on-screen text reads: "In our time, political speech and writing are largely the defense of the indefensible. Political language ... is designed to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable, and to give an appearance of solidity to pure wind." Is that incendiary enough to make you want to throw a firebomb?

This material is followed by one brief scripture citation to 2 Corinthians 11:13-14, which, if viewers take the time to look up, will warn them that Satan masquerades as "an angel of light." Does that make you want to attack an abortionist?

We follow that content with video clips of Northland's saleswoman telling lie after lie, which lies we in turn rebut by inserting brief abortion video clips at appropriate intervals in her narrative. Does that fill your heart with uncontrollable rage? Is Northland saying that their physical security can only be preserved so long as the public is never allowed to see video of babies being tortured to death?

From here, Northland's complaint descends from confusion into incoherence. They whine that because CBR has publicly exposed the deceptive marketing practices on which they rely to manipulate and exploit vulnerable women, "Northland has been injured ..." and their "reputation harmed ..." But isn't that what's supposed to happen when you get caught lying to people you are trying to victimize? The public has a right to know the truth about Northland's savagery and we have an obligation to give it to them.

Northland also concedes that when CBR rebutted their false claims, "The value of the Good Women Video as an educational and counseling tool is diminished ...." If they mean that consumers can now see through their lies, we heartily concur! That was our whole purpose!

More illogically, however, they argue that CBR's video exposé "is misleading and create[s] the impression that the images represent abortions performed at Northland's clinics." Huh? If our *Angel of Light* video "injured" Northland and "harmed" their "reputation" and "diminished the value" of their marketing video, who in their right mind would be "misled" to conclude that Northland invited CBR into their clinics to film their abortions? Does Northland need to be drug tested? Are they implying that the abortions they perform are actually less ghastly than the abortions we depict? Are they claiming that their abortions are less violent and therefore less inflammatory than the abortions we use to refute their lies? If so, then let's see Northland's abortions for comparative purposes! CBR will demand that right in discovery at trial!

And if all that weren't enough, Northland then notes that our CBR video critique "... received so many complaints that YouTube removed it after less than two hours. An embedded link to the video now reads: 'This video has been removed as a violation of YouTube's policy on shocking and disgusting content.'" All this means is that both Northland and the very pro-abortion management at YouTube are equally anxious to prevent the public from seeing the "shocking and disgusting" atrocities by which Northland brutalizes babies. YouTube censors us and Northland sues us -- all to cover up the horror of abortion.

But as noted above, Northland is far from alone in using the courts to silence critics and hide the horror of abortion. LifeSiteNews.com, June 15, 2011, reported a similar story, headlined, “Carleton University Tries to Dismiss Pro-Life Student Lawsuit.”

CBR’s Canadian affiliate helped pro-life students take CBR abortion photo signs onto the campus of this university and the students were immediately arrested -- for trespass -- on their own campus! Our Canadian Centre For Bio-Ethical Reform then helped our students sue the university and the university petitioned the court to throw out our lawsuit without even hearing the case! “Carleton University responded to Lifeline’s Statement of Claim with a Motion to Strike it on the grounds that it discloses no reasonable cause of action, is scandalous, frivolous, vexatious and an abuse of the court process.” Get it? Aborting babies isn’t “scandalous” but suing for the right to show aborted babies is! Perhaps Carleton needs to be drug tested too!

The article explains that “On October 4, 2010, Carleton University had members of Lifeline handcuffed, arrested, charged and fined with trespassing for attempting to display an exhibit that the University administration deemed disturbing and offensive due to the graphic nature of the display.” Here we go again. Killing babies isn’t “disturbing and offensive,” but showing them is! The story then reports that “In November 2010, Carleton University’s administration provided Lifeline with an ultimatum regarding the expression of their opinions and threatened further arrests.”

But it gets even worse: “The student government took issue with the group’s constitution, which says: ‘Carleton Lifeline believes in the equal rights of the unborn and firmly believes that abortion is a moral and legal wrong, not a constitutional right. Therefore, Carleton Lifeline shall work to promote the legal protection of the unborn and their basic human rights to life.’” And then worse yet: “The student government claims the [Lifeline organization’s] constitution violates the campus discrimination policies that call for students to ‘respect and affirm a woman’s right to choose her options in case of pregnancy.’” How is it disrespectful to show women what one of those “options” looks like -- unless that option itself is offensive? We believe that nothing communicates greater disrespect for women than Carleton’s effort to trick them into the worst mistake they could ever make.

The article concludes with the fact that “The decision is so egregious that the pro-abortion Canadian Civil Liberties Association and Nathalie Des Rosiers, general counsel of the group, are supporting Carleton Lifeline. Des Rosiers told the CBC the decision to revoke the status disrupts the group’s free speech rights.”

That same day, June 15, 2011, we received a remarkably similar message from Andrew Stephenson, who directs our CBR operations in the United Kingdom. Andrew and his staff had just returned from a thwarted attempt to display abortion photos outside a busy abortion clinic. He told me, “We were shut down by the police today. They wouldn’t arrest us but confiscated our banner and our camcorder. When we asked them afterwards to clarify what had happened, they refused to tell us. We have reported them for theft.” Do you see a pattern here? They won’t arrest us because they fear we will win in criminal court. But they won’t stop harassing us because the public harasses them with endless complaints when we expose the horror of abortion. We have retained counsel in London and we will now sue the Bobbies in a civil action to force the return of our signs and video gear!

But Trevor and Robyn Grace, our associates Down Under in South Australia, are being persecuted at least as severely as Andrew Stephenson. We have sent them CBR abortion photos but they report that if they displayed them, “councils (local municipalities) and then police would come in and close ... [us] down quickly.” They have had more than 2,500 posters stolen and another 200-plus vandalized -- and the posters depict only a *born* baby with the caption “Save The Unborn”! Even an image and message as mild as that has provoked death threats and websites with URLs consisting of the words “The We Hate Trevor Grace Page,” “Abort Trevor Grace” and “Tear Down Trevor Grace’s Save The Unborn Campaign Posters.” It should come as no surprise that Trevor was physically assaulted as he posted one of his signs.

LifeSiteNews.com covered Trevor's campaign and reported that "Leading Democrat candidate Jeanie Walker told ABC she thinks the pro-life posters are offensive and said she wasn't surprised that they elicited the violent attack." She added that "... it doesn't surprise me and that's why I've been calling for the posters to be taken down right from the first day they were put up ...." Sounding very much like Northland Family Planning Centers, "Walker told ABC earlier in the campaign that abortion should be kept out of public debate for fear of stigmatizing women who have aborted their children and doctors who perform abortions." There it is again: No debate! If these very evil people go ballistic by a polite request to "Save The Unborn," imagine what an aborted baby photo would do to them! Their empty heads would explode!

I have advised our international associates to consider displaying only our picture of a seven-week living embryo and doing it in a location in which it is most likely to generate complaints. If the police threaten to arrest them in response to those complaints, they can be embarrassingly mocked for banning an objective, scientific image of a living baby. This would place the censors in the historical company of those who suppressed the inconvenient astronomical discoveries of Copernicus and Galileo. If they don't threaten to arrest us, then add our photo of a seven-week aborted embryo. When the second photo provokes arrest threats, ask the authorities to explain the logic of permitting photos which show what a baby looks like going into an abortion clinic, but banning photos which show what that same baby looks like coming out of an abortion clinic.

We also advised our international associates to consider holding a sign which merely displays the textual, declarative statement "Abortion is an act of violence which kills a baby." If they are not threatened with arrest, they can ask the authorities to explain the logic of being permitted to assert that abortion is homicide but being denied the right to prove that abortion is homicide. The government (and nearly everyone else) is obviously trying to cover up the evidence that abortion is, in fact, homicide.

But with your continued help, we aren't going to let them get away with it -- at home or abroad! That is why we will soon be using aborted baby photo signs to picket the stores of Planned Parenthood's corporate donors! Customers will be shocked, businesses will be intimidated, abortionists will be defunded, babies will be saved and mothers will be protected! And all this because you cared enough to stand behind us!

Lord bless,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gregg Cunningham", followed by a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Gregg Cunningham  
Executive Director

P.S. Northland admits that our video critique of their inhumanity has become an internet sensation that is approaching viral status. Their court filings say that "Since January 7, 2011 ... [copies of CBR's *Angel of Light* video] have been linked to, re-posted, and/or embedded in a number of blogs and websites. On information and belief ... [*Angel of Light* has] been viewed ... thousands if not tens of thousands of times since they were posted." And now Northland's very stupid lawsuit will generate the publicity to turn hundreds of thousands of views into millions!