

Gregg L. Cunningham, Executive Director

September 2009

Dear Pro-Life Friend,

On September 3, 2009, we received a note from a twenty-year-old woman from Long Beach, CA, who said: "I thank you guys for this website because now I have a beautiful ten-month baby girl." She added that she was directed to our abortion photos and video by "friends and family." Once again, someone close to a pregnant woman was able to get her to us before she got to Planned Parenthood. We thank God that our faithful donors have made it possible for us to be there when she and her baby needed us most. But there is an even broader need for pro-life education and it relates to President Obama's attempt to use "health care reform" to force the American people to pay for radically expanded abortion access. It won't be enough to merely communicate the facts. We must first rebut the diabolically clever lies with which liberals are attempting to cloud this life-and-death issue.

An example of the challenge which faces us can be found in the September 5, 2009 issue of the *Los Angeles Times*, which ran a column by Tim Rutten titled "Disturbing lessons in paranoia." The essay mocked those of us concerned about President Obama's suspicious speech to America's grammar school students. It turns out that our suspicions were justified. The speech was to have been followed by a requirement (CNN.com, September 4, 2009, "Many conservatives enraged over Obama school speech") that "students draft letters to themselves discussing 'what they can do to help the president.'"

If that weren't enough, their teachers, a high percentage of whom belong to a liberal labor union which supported Mr. Obama's presidential candidacy, were directed by the accompanying lesson plan to collect our children's letters and then hand them back "at an appropriate later date ... to make students accountable to their goals." Only a firestorm of parental protest beat back this intrusive requirement. Like many other parents, I don't want my children being asked to "help the president" whose goals include the government taking over banks, automakers, and health care. Nor do I want them asked to "help the president" open our borders and weaken our defenses and make elective abortion available everywhere, to everyone, at public expense. I want our born children to recognize that our infanticide-supporting president is the enemy of all children, preborn and born.

This brazen attempt to recruit impressionable students into the effort to advance the president's leftist agenda was only derailed because school districts across the country "were inundated with phone calls from parents" ("Obama speech to students draws conservative ire," AP, September 3, 2009). The AP story also reported that districts "... in states including Texas, Illinois, Minnesota, Missouri, Virginia [and] Wisconsin ..." decided "not to show the speech to students." The White House was eventually pressured into allowing the speech to be screened in advance of its delivery. After all the furor, the only overtly political rhetoric still in evidence was the line "I'm working hard to fix up your classrooms and get you the books, equipment and computers you need to learn." The implication, of course, is that Mr. Obama must overcome Republican opposition to books and computers. But the press mercilessly lampooned parents who expressed concerns about what this speech might have contained had there been no pushback. We may never know what else the White House had to remove before the public was shown the final edit but I am betting an unopposed speech would have been even more political.

And politics was how the White House chose Arlington, VA, the bluest of Democrat political bastions, as the location for Mr. Obama's lecture. Arlington is a bedroom community for government bureaucrats so, of course, he carried it by 72% of the vote. It has long been represented by a reliably liberal Democrat congressman and Arlington County is so far left that Democrat school board candidates run unopposed ([arlingtondemocrats.org](http://arlingtondemocrats.org)). The president knew he would get no tough questions from these breathless enthusiasts.

But still, he was taking no chances. Mr. Obama has a reputation for rigging his Q&A events with planted questions ([WashingtonPost.com](http://WashingtonPost.com), June 24, 2009, "Stay Tuned for More of 'The Obama Show'") so it should come as no surprise that one of the students just happened to ask him "why the U.S. lacks universal health care when thirty-six other countries have such a system" ([LATimes.com](http://LATimes.com), September 8, 2009, "Obama tries to motivate students with speech"). In this case, Mr. Obama didn't merely plant the question, he planted the entire audience. It is unlikely that this boy knew Mr. Obama's version of "universal health care" would include universal access to publicly funded baby-killing. This is exactly the sort of school around whose campus we drive our billboard trucks with huge abortion photos. We aren't going to give parents and teachers a chance to lie to these kids about what abortion is and does.

Mr. Rutten patronizes parents for their "paranoid fantasies" but some autocratic school administrators refused to allow parents to opt their children out of this "Yes, We Can" rally ([Foxnews.com](http://Foxnews.com), September 3, 2009, "Some Parents Choose Not to Allow Their Kids to Hear Obama's National Address"). But, then again, contempt for parental prerogatives has long been epidemic in public education. Also on September 3, 2009, Fox reported an even more disturbing story headlined "Angry Parents Suing California Schools Over Mandatory Gay-Friendly Classes":

Parents in the Alameda Unified School District were refused the right to excuse their kids from classes that would teach all kids in the district's elementary schools about gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender alternative families. The parents say they are concerned about 'indoctrination' in the schools but administrators say the course is needed to protect against sexual discrimination – and that the lessons are protected by laws in California and ten other states.

"Paranoia" is unreasonable fear. There is nothing unreasonable in fearing that homosexual activists are going to lie to your children. Yet Mr. Rutten wasn't content to merely question the mental health of anyone expressing skepticism concerning the president's "educational" goals. He also called us "unhinged" for perceiving Mr. Obama as "an illegitimate usurper of the presidency." He associated the president's education critics with the "birther movement" (consisting of voters who dispute Mr. Obama's claim to have been born in America) and further compared us to those who fear the president is a "*secret Muslim*" or a "*secret Marxist*."

Mr. Rutten's sneering column may have been condescending but it did make me ask myself why so many Americans consider Mr. Obama so alien, so "other"? Surveys indicate that it isn't his racial background. Yet the September 7, 2009 *Los Angeles Times* carried a front-page story headlined "Obama is fast losing white voters' support." These defections are coming from the very Democrats and Independents who helped elect him.

Why then, despite significant evidence that Mr. Obama was born in Hawaii, do only 47% of Southerners and 42% Republicans believe that he is an American citizen? ([USNews.com](http://USNews.com), September 3, 2009, "Poll on Birthers: Most Southerners and Republicans Question Obama Citizenship.") Why do so many Americans see him as a socialist and assume that every word he speaks is a lie? Why do they suspect that every goal he pursues is an assault on the very essence of what makes America American?

Some of the more obvious reasons should be evident even to so strident an ideologue as Mr. Rutten. The columnist scoffs at the widespread “secret Muslim” doubts but according to Fox.com, September 1, 2009 (“Obama Praises Islam as ‘Great Religion’”) Mr. Obama recently paid tribute to Islam as “a great religion and its commitment to justice and progress.” Yet the Council on Foreign Relations, at cfr.org, says that although the “vast majority” of Muslim states “no longer prescribe death for apostates [those who leave Islam],” they do “mete out some lesser form of punishment.” Cato.org’s Doug Bandow (June 1, 2009, “Obama’s Interfaith Dialogue: Let’s Talk Persecution”) reports that “most Islamic governments routinely persecute minority faiths.” This may be why an Ohio teenager named Rifqa Bary has fled to Florida, claiming her Islamic parents have threatened to kill her for converting to Christianity (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uPG7vU9PQUM>). Bigotry is neither “just” nor “progressive” and it makes people nervous about who Mr. Obama really is when they hear him lie about Islamic intolerance.

As regards Mr. Rutten’s ridicule of suspicions that Mr. Obama is a “secret Marxist,” it is instructive to note an article at Bloomberg.com, August 7, 2009, headlined “Obama Lauds Putin’s ‘Extraordinary Work’ in visit to Mend Ties.” It quotes the president telling Russia’s latest defacto dictator, Vladimir Putin, that “I am aware of ... the extraordinary work you have done on behalf of the Russian people ....” Could Mr. Obama be referring to Mr. Putin’s facilitation of the executions of reporters whom the Committee to Protect Journalists describes as the “sixteen journalists [who] have been killed in Russia because of their work since 2000”? Or could he have been referring to Mr. Putin’s recent and brutal military attack on his neighbors in the former Soviet nation of Georgia?

The patronizing Mr. Rutten may ridicule Americans who question Mr. Obama’s tendency to trivialize the excesses of Marxism, but what about his long-standing political association with Bill Ayers, who in his blog at BillAyers.wordpress.com, November, 2006, describes the “World Education Forum,” in Caracas, Venezuela, where he praised the “profound educational reforms” being implemented by Marxist dictator Hugo Chavez. Was Mr. Ayers lauding Mr. Chavez’s ruthless, physical attacks on uncooperative journalists or his orders to close down news organizations which refuse to support his adaptation of Cuban Communism (uk.reuters.com, September 5, 2009, “Chavez minister vows more Venezuela radio closings”).

Mr. Obama need not close down news organizations here in the U.S. because he has already taken them over. That is why it is so important that CBR do its job of exposing evil which the government is perpetrating and the press is covering up. But of greater concern than the bloviating Bill Ayres is Mr. Obama’s recently hired Green Jobs czar, named Van Jones. Mr. Jones was tasked with distributing \$80 billion in green grants, despite the fact that he has openly embraced Maoist principles. *The Los Angeles Examiner* reports (“Green Jobs Czar Van Jones Resigns,” September 6, 2009) that “In 1992, Van Jones was arrested during the Rodney King riots, an experience he recounted with joy in an article he wrote for the *Huffington Post* where he spoke with pride about ‘angry mobs,’ looting, and committing acts of violence. He saw the riots as the first step in a ‘Revolutionary Movement.’” The article quotes Mr. Jones as saying, “By August, I was a communist.”

Jack Kelley (Realclearpolitics.com, September 13, 2009, in a story titled “How Could Obama Have Hired Van Jones?”) quotes Comrade Jones’ remarks to a Bay Area paper in 2005. “I met all these radical young people of color, I mean really radical, communists and anarchists,” he told the East Bay Express. “It was like ‘this is what I need to be part of.’ I spent the next 10 years of my life working with a lot of those people I met in jail, trying to be a revolutionary.”

According to the *Examiner*, in 1994 he helped form an organization whose literature “admits to a ‘commitment to the fundamental ideas of Marxism-Leninism’ as well as the ‘revolutionary strategies’ of ‘Mao Tse-tung.’” The article says this group “stated their purposes as trying to ‘replace the falsely-democratic capitalist state’ and ‘defeat capitalism’ and described the United States as a country of ‘white supremacy.’” Does Mr. Rutten really wonder how these Marxist associations, on top of his socialist agenda,

might lead fair-minded voters to question his devotion to capitalism and his opposition to communism? Mr. Obama knew who Van Jones was. The FBI had vetted him. He came highly recommended by Valerie Jarrett, someone the *Examiner* describes as “Mr. Obama’s most trusted advisor.” She reportedly introduced him at a Netroots Convention as a man of “great ideas.” Even as calls for his firing mounted, *The Hill* newspaper (“White House stands by ‘truther’ Van Jones,” September 4, 2009) said the White House described Jones as “still a part of the administration.”

The opposition of CBR and like-minded conservatives forced a retreat on Mr. Obama’s speech to students and it took similar opposition to finally force Mr. Jones’ firing. He was a dangerous man. As with most communists, he is no friend of the unborn. On August 29, 2008, he wrote a pro-abortion article for *The Huffington Post* (“Palin: You’re no Hillary Clinton”) in which he said that when his “pro-Hillary female friends” discover that “Sarah Palin opposes rape and incest exceptions for women seeking abortion, they completely write her off.” He accuses John McCain of choosing the female Gov. Palin to “out-Democrat the Democrats” and adds a dismissive “... it ain’t working.”

How will this all end? CNN.com reported a story September 4, 2009, headlined “White House ready to draft own health care bill, sources say,” which claimed that “... the administration is leaning toward dropping the public option...” But that isn’t true because in the next sentence the article added “... the bill ... would leave out the public option but include a trigger provision that could lead to the introduction of a new government-run insurance plan under certain circumstances.” The problem is that those “circumstances” will be defined as the failure of private insurers to meet “reform” targets which will be impossible to meet and still stay in business.

The idea will be to dupe conservative Democrats and liberal Republicans into signing on because the “public option” is being “dropped” but placate Mr. Obama’s liberal Democrat base by quietly assuring them, with a wink and a nod, that the “trigger” provisions will make a public take-over of health insurance unavoidable as private insurers struggle to meet impossible and/or self-destructive goals which the bill will force upon insurers. The story says that Mr. Obama “took an initial step in that direction Friday afternoon, holding a conference call with some of the most liberal members of the House ...” Then the truth slips out. Quoting Rep. Lynn Woolsey, D-California, a virtual Socialist, we learn that she thinks “... he would like to convince us that there is something ... that could lead to a public option that would satisfy us.” This battle will never end, but with your help, CBR will deny Mr. Obama even an inch of slack in his anti-life agenda.

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

P.S. On August 30, we received a message from a thirty-one-year-old woman from Poulsbo, WA, (Seattle) who said, “I was driving by the Kitsap Mall intersection in Silverdale, WA. and saw people holding big signs showing the handprints and footprints of a 10-week-old aborted fetus. I applaud you for taking a stand for life and for not being afraid to show such ‘in your face’ images.” Those were CBR signs. She added, “Thank you for all that you do to promote awareness of how gruesome abortion is, and hopefully change the culture's thinking.” Her thanks should also be extended to you, our faithful donors!