

Gregg L. Cunningham, Executive Director

March 2010

Dear Pro-Life Supporter,

On March 11, 2010 we received a message from a nineteen-year-old from Tacoma, WA. She said: "I came to your website looking for answers. I'm seven weeks' pregnant and I have been looking in to my so-called 'options.' Thank you for shedding light on the subject. The more I think about it, I will never be able to kill my baby." Praise God! Thank you for making possible another save! She was intellectually honest enough to care about the facts and had the integrity to make the right decision once we had given her those facts. If only the congressional debate over ObamaCare's abortion funding provisions would have been characterized by the same levels of intellectual honesty and integrity, countless lives might have been saved.

ObamaCare is the most horrific abortion funding legislation in American history and to fight it, CBR put billboard trucks and our tow planes pulling aerial billboards into the congressional districts of sixteen Blue Dog Democrat House Members who were nominally pro-life but were wavering over the phony abortion funding restrictions Rep. Bart Stupak claimed to be fighting to replace with a real funding ban. By God's grace, we helped keep six of those Members committed to opposing any version of health care which didn't contain a genuine ban. But at the eleventh hour, Rep. Stupak folded under pressure and dissolved that coalition. We had it won. But he threw away our victory and, with it, his own political career.

Mr. Stupak, in the *Washington Post*, March 27, 2010, wrote a column titled "Why I wrote the 'Stupak Amendment' and then voted for health-care reform." The essence of his attempt to rationalize his surrender of our victory is summed up in the following assertion: "Once it was clear that the House leadership would eventually obtain the 216 votes necessary to pass health-care reform, I was left with a choice: Vote against the bill and watch it become law with no further protections for life or reach an agreement that prevents federal funding for abortions." The two most obvious problems with his lame apologia are, first of all, that the Democrat leadership did not have the 216 votes required for passage and they weren't going to get it without Bart Stupak's "pro-life" Blue Dog coalition. And secondly, Mr. Stupak's meaningless "compromise agreements" with Messrs. Obama and Reid and Mrs. Pelosi won't block even one dime of the flood of tax dollars which will now be used to kill babies.

Concerning Mr. Stupak's bogus argument that the Democrats could have passed ObamaCare without the votes he controlled (with our help), Michael Barone, a Fox News political analyst and columnist at *WashingtonExaminer.com*, March 21, 2010, drawing on an analysis at *FireDogLake.com*, concluded that "The Democratic leadership had to make a deal with Stupak in order to avoid defeat." His assessment was confirmed by Fox News White House correspondent Major Garrett, who revealed on the Dennis Miller radio show, March 26, 2010, that he had been told by House Democratic leadership that until Rep. Bart Stupak handed over the votes we had worked so hard to hold back, ObamaCare lacked the support to pass. CBR had won. We had done exactly what we had set out to do: Use our billboard trucks and airplanes in the districts of sixteen Blue Dog Democrats to hold together the six Members Bart Stupak needed to force abortion funding out of the bill.

As regards Mr. Stupak's absurd claim that his pact with the devil will stop ObamaCare from funding abortion, Sen. Barbara Boxer told *McClatchy Newspapers* on December 23, 2009, in a story headlined

“California senators back health care bill despite abortion limits,” that the requirement for people with federally subsidized abortion coverage to write two checks, one for abortion and one for other services, is “only an ‘accounting procedure’ that will do nothing to restrict abortion coverage.” Mrs. Boxer has a 100% pro-abortion rating from abortion industry groups such as Planned Parenthood and NARAL, and she helped draft the treacherous Nelson Senate abortion funding “compromise.”

Then the HuffingtonPost.com, March 19, 2010, reported an even more embarrassing story titled “Health Care Whip Count Live Updates ...” with the sub-headline “Rep. DeGette open to executive order compromise on abortion.” The article said, “The lead pro-choice negotiator in the House said Saturday that she would accept an executive order related to abortion, the latest compromise to be floated to win over pro-life Democrats. ‘If there was an executive order saying that they weren't going to use federal funds in the bill to pay for abortions that would be fine with me’” She finished that sentence, and Mr. Stupak’s political career, when she told Yahoo.com, in a story titled “Abortion compromise doesn’t satisfy critics,” March 21, 2010, that the executive order “ ... doesn’t change anything.”

Finally, Planned Parenthood’s president gleefully issued a March 21, 2010 press release which dismissed Mr. Stupak’s meaningless executive order as a merely “symbolic gesture.” She went on to praise the abortion funding bill, whose passage he made possible, chortling that it will “significantly increase access to reproductive health care,” by which she, of course, means abortion. On their paction.org website, Planned Parenthood claimed a “huge victory” because they “were able to keep the Stupak abortion ban out of the final legislation and President Obama did not include the Stupak language in his Executive Order.”

How badly did Mr. Obama roll Mr. Stupak? Slate.com carried a story headlined “The Stupak Mystery, Why did he hold out for a meaningless executive order,” March 21, 2010, which speculates that Rep. Stupak’s initial objective was to get the White House to agree to extend Hyde Amendment funding restrictions to the new insurance exchanges and make them permanent, but “surprise!” Mr. Obama pulled a bait and switch on him: “As of ... [Saturday], the White House was willing to promise Stupak an open-ended ban [not requiring annual renewal] on abortion funding in the exchanges. But today, either because of blowback from pro-choicers in Congress or because Stupak lost some leverage as the health reform bill acquired more votes, it was not. So a basically meaningless executive order was issued to help Stupak save face.”

All the executive order did was repeat Mr. Obama’s lie that the Senate version of ObamaCare (which Mr. Stupak was brow-beaten into finally accepting) never did provide abortion funding. This is the same false claim which Mr. Stupak had spent months condemning before deciding to accept it as the truth. For instance, TheNation.com, in an article headlined “The World According to Stupak,” March 2, 2010, had earlier reported Mr. Stupak’s criticism that the Senate ... [version of ObamaCare] “still allows public funding of abortion.” An April 9, 2010 *New York Times* story headlined “Under Fire for Abortion Deal, Stupak to Retire” said of the ObamaCare bill passed by the Senate, “**Mr. Stupak insisted that the Senate language was not good enough**”

“Not good enough” to protect babies but apparently good enough to accept in trade for \$726,409 in pork barrel funding for airports in his district. At least that was the accusation leveled by “Deal Watch,” a blog of the National Republican Congressional Campaign Committee, as reported by TheHill.com, “Stupak pushes back against claims airport grant bought his vote,” March 23, 2010.

Kathleen Parker says in her March 24, 2010 column, titled “Stupak’s fall from pro-life grace,” that it’s “No wonder Stupak locked his doors and turned off his phones on Sunday, according to several pro-life lobbyists who camped outside his office.” Parker ends her March 28, 2010 column titled “Federally funded abortions are in our future” with this chilling conclusion: “Prediction: [Publically funded abortions] ... *will* be performed at community health centers.”

There were signs that Mr. Stupak's knees were buckling days earlier. I was troubled by a story run by TheHill.com, March 19, 2010, headlined "Pro-Choice Caucus livid at talk of deal with Stupak on abortion." The article quotes Rep. Stupak, saying "Stupak said unequivocally that he could live with the Senate bill becoming law at the end of the day. 'You know, maybe for me that's the best: I stay true to my principles and beliefs,' he said, and 'vote no on this bill and then it passes anyways. Maybe for me it's the best thing to do.'" Maybe it's "the best" for you, Rep. Stupak, but what about the babies? And as it turned out, betraying us all didn't work out so well even for him.

Politico.com, April 9, 2010, in an article titled "Stupak won't seek reelection," said "Stupak had never faced difficulty winning reelection" but added that "This year was shaping up to be a different story" A *New York Times* headline, April 9, also suggested that Mr. Stupak quit because he saw the handwriting on the wall, "Under Fire for Abortion Deal, Stupak to Retire."

John Fund at *The Wall Street Journal* removes all doubt that Mr. Stupak was driven from office in his wsj.com column, April 9, 2010, "Casualty of ObamaCare." Mr. Fund notes that "Just last night, buses from the Tea Party Express movement rolled into Mr. Stupak's district for the first of four rallies -- presumably they will now be taking something akin to a victory lap." Mr. Stupak had also watched CBR's abortion billboard trucks and planes roll and fly into the districts of his Blue Dog colleagues and knew we would be bringing those same abortion photos to his district this fall. The *Journal* article also reported that "Mr. Stupak is known to have taken a private poll of his district since his health care vote, and his retirement announcement is a likely indication that he feared he might lose to a Republican challenger this fall."

The Washington Monthly reported Mr. Stupak's retirement April 9, in a story titled "Stupak Heads for the Exit." The article cited sources who described Mr. Stupak as "burned out from the long fight over health care" but acknowledged that "right-wing interest groups this week started to go after Stupak with a vengeance, and their attacks appear to have rattled the lawmaker badly." We were one of those "interest groups" and our abortion photo trucks and planes will be taking "voter education" to the districts of the Blue Dogs who defected along with Mr. Stupak but are still trying to hang onto their seats.

In fairness to the "pro-life Democrats" who are now seen as having vanished, it should be borne in mind that 34 Democrats voted against ObamaCare on final passage and that some, such as Rep. Dan Lipinski (D-IL), did so explicitly because they are pro-life. At ChicagoTribune.com, in a story headlined "Lipinski lonely but proud to be pro-life Democrat," March 28, 2010, the Illinois Democrat said "... I could not vote for a bill that would change the status quo on funding for abortion." And there were a few more faithful pro-life Blue Dogs, such as Rep. Dan Boren (D-OK) and Rep. Gene Taylor (D-MS). But it must also be noted that all of them bowed to caucus pressure and voted to give Mrs. Pelosi the power she needed to ram health care through the Congress by making her the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The largely untold back-story in this Greek tragedy, however, is the most awful expansion of access to baby-killing since *Roe v. Wade*. On March 28, 2010, *The Huffington Post* posted a story titled "Fox News Anchor: 'Low-Income Babies' Will Increase Without Federal Abortion Funding," noting that Fox News anchor Alisyn Camerota said, "If there is no federal money used to subsidize abortions for low-income women, doesn't that mean there will be more low-income babies ...?" *The Baptist Press*, on March 19, 2010, posted a story headlined "'No question' health care bill would increase abortion rate." The article quoted Richard Land, of the Southern Baptist Convention, as saying, "This legislation ... will be the largest expansion of abortion since ...1973."

Family Research Council president Tony Perkins agreed, saying "...you will see an expansion of the abortion rate in America" Then Richard Doerflinger of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops explained that "...the public policy that has the biggest impact on abortion rates is simply whether the government funds abortion." Finally, Doug Johnson, of the National Right to Life Committee, offered

conclusive proof that increased abortion funding ups the abortion rate when he cited a Guttmacher Institute study "...which reported last year that about 25 percent of the women who would have had Medicaid-funded abortions chose instead to give birth when they were barred from using public money."

As Kathryn Jean Lopez notes at NationalReview.com, March 22, 2010, in an article titled "Michigan's Cheap Date," Congressman Bart Stupak (D-MI) was once a great man:

He stood against his party, and by doing so got life-protective language added into the House health-care legislation in November. He challenged supposed pro-lifers Ben Nelson and Bob Casey to a higher standard than they were willing to fight for in the Senate. He pressed on even while the president and the speaker of the House pretended that abortion funding wasn't an issue — they claimed it wasn't in their legislation and called those who said otherwise liars. Well, it *was* an issue. And it's in the bill that passed last night. If it hadn't been, the Democratic leadership and the White House wouldn't have been forced to go through the motions of negotiating with Stupak.

Isaiah 39:5-8 contains some of the most painful words in Scripture: *"Then Isaiah said to Hezekiah, 'Hear the word of the LORD Almighty: The time will surely come when everything in your palace, and all that your fathers have stored up until this day, will be carried off to Babylon. Nothing will be left, says the LORD. And some of your descendants, your own flesh and blood who will be born to you, will be taken away, and they will become eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon.' 'The word of the LORD you have spoken is good,' Hezekiah replied. For he thought, 'There will be peace and security in my lifetime.'"*

Mr. Stupak, like King Hezekiah, is a man to whom God gave great power. But he surrendered it because he wanted "peace and security in his lifetime." Both proved willing to betray their children to get it.

On January 13, 2010, the HuffingtonPost.com ran a story titled "Bart Stupak Eyeing Run for Governor of Michigan." He told the press that his "independent streak could make him the strongest Democratic candidate in a difficult election environment this year." He started out the year as the big Blue Dog but by late March he had shrunk himself down to become Pelosi's poodle. Now he couldn't be elected dog catcher. [Please help us educate voters](#) on the need to elect a Congress which will defund the implementation of ObamaCare till we have the numbers to repeal and replace it with real health care reform!

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 March 16, 2010, we received a message from a twelve-year-old girl from Indiana. She said that she had never seen abortion photos or video before but those on our website had convinced her that abortion "should not be an option." She said her mother had taken her to our website. Thank you for helping us equip that mother to greatly reduce the odds that her daughter will ever kill her baby.