



PO Box 219
Lake Forest, CA 92609-0219
949-206-0600

www.AbortionNO.org / info@cbrinfo.org

Gregg L. Cunningham, Executive Director

June 2017

Dear Pro-Life Supporter,

Last month we introduced a pro-life picketing project which confronts the pro-abortion campaign that calls itself Black Lives Matter (BLM) at the Smithsonian's National African American Museum of History and Culture. BLM attempts to disrupt pro-life activism on college campuses all across America and its campaigners have intimidated and silenced pro-life students again and again. We are fighting back on behalf of pro-life student groups and part of that effort centers on this museum, which uses tax money to promote the BLM propaganda which makes objective discussions of race and abortion so difficult.

We have partnered in this endeavor with the inspiring African American pro-life group called the Life Education And Resource Network (LEARN). CBR and LEARN are non-partisan, non-profit organizations, and we do not, therefore, participate in electoral political activity. We do, however, exercise our right to conduct voter education campaigns. No issue cries out for improved public understanding more forcefully than abortion -- and there is no more important venue for such education than outside this museum.

Would African American museum-goers, especially students, be so reflexively committed to pro-abortion candidates if they were shown the horror of the abortions which are devastating African American communities? As noted above, the change in the black vote would not have to be huge to be decisive. Historically, "Fourteen presidential contests (30 percent) have been determined by fewer than 5 percentage points" (CenterForPolitics.org). Races for the U.S. Senate were decided in 1990 and 1991 by only 3 points in New Jersey; in 2002 by 1.1 point in Missouri; in 2008 by less than 1 point in Minnesota; in 2010 by 2 points in Pennsylvania; in 2010 by 1.7 points in Colorado; and in 2014, by 1.6 points in North Carolina (editions.lib.umn.edu). U.S. Senators vote to confirm or reject appointees to the federal courts.

A relatively modest influence on black voter attitudes could produce significantly different election outcomes in pivotal states.

We propose to exhibit sign panels (5'X5') on public property along the approaches to the museum's two entrances. Visitors will have to pass them to enter. Many signs will also display QR codes which visitors can scan to watch pro-life videos on their trip home. The signs appropriate themes and slogans from the Black Lives Matter campaign as a means of engaging black students with justice concepts familiar to them.

CBR staff member Jacqueline Hawkins is an African American woman who, along with Rev. Clenard Childress (a CBR and LEARN board member who pastors a black church in the Newark, NJ area), will direct this project. We hope to staff the project with African American volunteers recruited from black churches in the D.C. area.

Our outdoor exhibit will be conducted in tandem with a congressional education campaign to make Congress aware of the need to condition museum funding on an agreement by museum officials to not obstruct lawful pickets on public sidewalks near the museum.

On February 1, 2017, Rev. Childress and Jacqueline Hawkins were threatened with arrest by National Museum of African American History and Culture security personnel, and ordered to remove their picket signs from the public sidewalk outside the front of the museum. CBR is consequently preparing to file a First Amendment complaint in federal court.

Throughout both Obama Administrations, federal officials encouraged the filing of lawsuits by liberal activist organizations which opposed arguably conservative statutes and regulations. The Department of Justice (DOJ) then routinely settled those suits rather than defending them -- and also paid the legal fees of the far-left plaintiffs. We expect that DOJ, under the Trump Administration, would likewise decline to oppose a lawsuit seeking to bar this museum from violating the expressive rights of pro-life activists. We will insist on a settlement which protects the speech rights of all Americans.

We hope to benefit from news coverage which might help attract funding and staffing for this project. We are also seeking federal funding of the sort the Obama Administration relentlessly provided to pro-abortion organizations.

Black abortion and the black vote intersect profoundly at this museum, and we are unlikely to ever again be presented with such an opportunity to save so many lives and influence so many elections at so little expense. Our display content should be exhibited inside this publicly funded facility, but at a minimum, African American activists shouldn't be threatened with arrest for displaying it on the public sidewalks in front of this museum.

Justice Thurgood Marshall, the first African American to serve on the U.S. Supreme Court, was inhumanely pro-abortion, demanding even public funding for the abortions which savage the African American community with black genocide. His tenure is nonetheless celebrated by this museum.

Justice Clarence Thomas, the African American currently serving on the Court, is humanely pro-life. His tenure, however, is defiantly denied the slightest mention in any exhibit appearing in this hyper-politicized institution. This sort of discrimination heaps shame on the magnificent legacy of the civil rights movement. All Americans are paying for this travesty, and they deserve better.

As explained above, we emphasize the importance of calling abortion by its proper name because misidentifying your enemy can confuse the process of choosing strategies and tactics with which to fight it. Our friends at some pro-life groups CBR actually helped start have recently fallen into this trap. They have decided to surrender to the pro-aborts and conceal from the public abortion's true identity. In place of genocide references, they now misleadingly characterize abortion as a mere "human rights" violation. It should be borne in mind that human rights violations can vary greatly in their depravity -- or lack thereof.

Consider, for instance, Reference.com "human rights" defined under The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which was promulgated by the United Nations in 1945: The right to move, travel; the right to an adequate living standard; the right to own property; the right to equal pay; the right to join a union; protection from intellectual property theft; protection from discrimination based on status or social standing; the right to get married, etc., etc. Are any of these "rights" as compelling as the right to not be butchered in mass murder? Of course not, and that is why calling abortion a "human rights" violation instead of genocide helps trivialize this crime against humanity. When pro-lifers call abortion a "human rights" violation, they beg the question, "What human right is being violated?" Using the term "genocide" answers that question accurately and instantly.

From a sectarian perspective, it is as important to identify abortion as "child sacrifice" in the church as it is to identify abortion as "genocide" in the secular culture. Child sacrifice is not just another form of sin. It is an especially egregious form of sin which demands an especially vigorous response from people of faith.

Genocide is not just another form of homicide. It is an especially inhumane form of homicide which demands an especially robust response from people of conscience.

The terms “child sacrifice” and “genocide” are deeply stigmatizing, anathematizing words which more accurately describe the magnitude of the evil each represents. Calling your enemy by its proper name is vital to accurately understanding and effectively responding to the threat posed by that adversary. Pastors and politicians and pro-aborts often resist the use of these terms because their adoption imposes obligations they wish to avoid.

Deciding to hide the truth because proclaiming it is “hard” or “unpopular” or “difficult to argue and understand” is not a compelling ethical argument for propagating in the public mind the confused notion that torturing a baby to death is the moral equivalent of plagiarizing a speech. If our goal is to mobilize a serious societal defense of unborn life, we shouldn’t expect to achieve that objective by equating the right to life with the right to join a union.

This dispute is not some inconsequential debate over semantics. An argument over whether abortion is genocide doesn’t change the subject; it IS the subject. It is the perfect vehicle to explain why abortion isn’t some nominal evil best left to individual discretion. It is an evil of such enormity that governments should ban it (as genocide is internationally banned) with prohibitions which impose severe civil and criminal punishment on abortionists who violate its strictures. This process requires skill and determination.

CBR feels very strongly about truth-telling. We insist that the pro-life movement tell the truth -- even when it’s hard. One factor which contributes to the difficulty of arguing that abortion is genocide and child sacrifice is the simple fact that such contentions are extremely controversial. But conflict can be a powerful tool through which to create a forum, force a debate, and attract attention to the discussion.

Liberal activists instinctively understand the power of controversy, and they create conflict everywhere they go. Unlike conservatives, who fear criticism because they perceive it to be a form of persecution (particularly Millennials, who so internalize their beliefs that they consider criticism of their position as an attack on their person), liberals don’t care what you think of them and they thrive on disagreement and even condemnation. This attitude allows liberals to dictate the agenda and control the narrative. Think of how easily conservatives are silenced by absurd accusations that white disapproval of race-based preferences for black people makes the disapproving white people racist (never mind that in a sane world, it is the race-based preferences which would be seen as racist).

Liberals get up each morning spoiling for a fight. If you won’t bake a gay wedding cake, they attack the bakers with economic boycotts. If you won’t allow grown men to pee in the little girl’s bathroom, they attack the state with economic boycotts. If a talk radio host annoys feminists, they attack the advertisers with economic boycotts. Meanwhile, some sixty prominent corporate donors support Planned Parenthood with financial contributions, but conservatives, out of ignorance and indifference, relentlessly patronize these corporations. How many pastors even know that Starbucks, Nike, Bank of America and a host of other businesses give the abortion industry’s largest killers a portion of the revenue from every purchase made by clueless Christians? How many members of their congregations would refrain from frequenting offending businesses even if their church led the boycott? Pro-lifers don’t see these battles as any of their business. They just want to get through the day with a minimum of risk and sacrifice. This sort of self-absorption ensures that innocent babies will be sacrificed with impunity.

Pro-lifers often tell me that they don’t want to call abortion “genocide” or “child sacrifice” because doing so “changes the subject.” But nothing could be further from the truth. A debate about what constitutes genocide and child sacrifice IS the subject. Such an argument creates the perfect opportunity to explain how and why butchering babies comports with any reasonable definition of genocide and child sacrifice. And the conflict

concentrates people's minds. Our campus use of abortion photos next to concentration camp photos frequently attracts shrieking Jewish pro-aborts who help us draw a crowd of students, many of whom would have mindlessly shuffled past our display were it not for all the commotion generated that abortion merits comparison with the Holocaust.

If you don't believe that abortion is genocide and child sacrifice, you are not pro-life. If you do believe that abortion is genocide and child sacrifice, you are honor-bound to declare those facts.

Timidity doesn't merely kill babies, it invites the suppression of anti-abortion activism (most pro-lifers won't even acknowledge that they are "anti-abortion" because doing so sounds less positive than the largely meaningless but less risky term "pro-life). France, which has one of the most anemic pro-life establishments in the world (God bless them, however, for at least doing ineffectual projects), is actually criminalizing explicit expressions of disapproval for abortion. These government thugs would be unlikely to attack activists who fight back. The activists don't, so the government does.

The Daily Wire, November 24, 2016, posted a story headlined "France Bans Ad Featuring Kids with Down Syndrome Because It Might Make Women Who Aborted Their Disabled Kids Uncomfortable." *National Review*, December 8, 2016, ran a story headlined "France Prepares to Criminalize Pro-Life Advocacy." The article reported that "It is already illegal for activists to 'obstruct' the operation of an abortion clinic by exerting 'moral and psychological pressures' on women who might be considering abortion." That means even praying on the sidewalk outside an abortion clinic could get you locked up. The report adds that "They do not want the pro-life movement to have the *chance* to argue." *The Washington Free Beacon*, December 6, 2016, published a story headlined "France Passes Crackdown on Pro-Life Websites." Think that can't happen here? America just experienced a near-death experience for many of the rights which would have vanished with the election of Hillary Clinton.

Her cabinet and courts would have been stuffed with despots as preposterous as the professor who posted in *The New York Times*, April 24, 2017, a column titled "What 'Snowflakes' Get Right About Free Speech." "The idea of freedom of speech does not mean a blanket permission to say anything anybody thinks. It means balancing the inherent value of a given view with the obligation to ensure that other members of a given community can participate in discourse as fully recognized members of that community." That tyrannical tirade categorically rejects the First Amendment, which does, in fact, guarantee the right to "say anything anybody thinks." Who gets to decide "the inherent value of a given view"? Why, the government, of course. And pro-life speech would automatically be assumed valueless, and eventually criminal -- as pro-life expression now is in France. These are the autocrats we fight every day on college campuses. Thanks for helping us roll back the rights-robbers. This is a tough fight and we can't win it alone. We thank God and we thank you.

Lord bless,

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

Gregg Cunningham
Executive Director