

# *Word in Life Ministries*

*Biblical, Historical, and Philosophical Studies Institute*

## *You Will Know Them By Their Fruits*

In Matthew 7:15-23, Jesus gave a very important warning and grid to His followers about discerning true and false prophets, which can also apply to everyone who calls himself or herself a believer in Jesus Christ:

Beware of the false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravenous wolves. <sup>16</sup> "You will know them by their fruits. Grapes are not gathered from thorn *bushes*, nor figs from thistles, are they? <sup>17</sup> "Even so, every good tree bears good fruit; but the bad tree bears bad fruit. <sup>18</sup> "A good tree cannot produce bad fruit, nor can a bad tree produce good fruit. <sup>19</sup> "Every tree that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire. <sup>20</sup> "So then, you will know them by their fruits. <sup>21</sup> ¶ "Not everyone who says to Me, 'Lord, Lord,' will enter the kingdom of heaven; but he who does the will of My Father who is in heaven. <sup>22</sup> "Many will say to Me on that day, 'Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in Your name, and in Your name cast out demons, and in Your name perform many miracles?' <sup>23</sup> "And then I will declare to them, 'I never knew you; depart from Me, you who practice lawlessness.' (Matthew 7:15-23)

During this and every election cycle, we have politicians saying and promising many things, and we have politicians who overtly lie and attempt to deceive and manipulate the electorate in order to get elected. Unfortunately, far too many of the American electorate vote emotionally, versus knowledgably, and politicians are very well aware of that. Thus, those who have things to hide that would very likely diminish, or even perhaps invalidate their candidacy, do everything they can to avoid their past coming to the light. Whenever an opponent challenges them on such matters, their usual response is to try and deflect such questions and charges by saying their challenger is avoiding the real issues in an attempt to 'smear' them by bringing up such 'non-essential' issues, or they resort to charges of 'racism', 'sexism', and other forms of politically incorrect views in order to taint the legitimate questions about their candidacy.

On the other hand, those who have things in their past that might be a negative on their candidacy, but who are also men and women of integrity, are willing for those things to come to the light and discuss them in an informative manner. In our current election cycle (Presidential & Congressional Election of 2008), we see just such a scenario. Barack Obama, the Democratic candidate, has done everything to hide and mislead people about his involvement, support, and agreement with the principles taught at the United Church of Christ where he was a parishioner for twenty years. His pastor, Jeremiah Wright, subscribes to a theological belief system that is called Liberation Theology, which is nothing less than religious Marxism. Senator Obama has asserted that he did not know that Pastor Wright held such racist and hate-filled views about our country, etc., let alone did he ever hear him when he preached those messages. Ladies and gentlemen, with all due respect to Senator Obama, I do not believe him at all – thus, I believe he is unequivocally lying. In his book, *The Audacity of Hope*, he affirms that Pastor Wright has been his mentor for twenty years, and thus, for Senator Obama not to know what he believes and teaches stretches far beyond the pale of believability.

In addition, Senator Obama worked very closely with Bill Ayers, the self-proclaimed domestic terrorist who bombed government buildings in the early 70's. However, Senator Obama has said he was not aware of these events since he was only eight years old at the time. However, Senator Obama is also a graduate of Harvard, and I don't believe that anyone who graduates from Harvard is an ignorant person. Thus, for him to say he, as an adult and graduate of Harvard, was not aware of what Ayers believed and advocated is absolutely ludicrous. The following is taken from the website, [DISCOVERTHENETWORKS.ORG](http://DISCOVERTHENETWORKS.ORG), and it is an excellent purview of the political left in our country. The article below, therefore, is a summation of Bill Ayers' biographical data, as well as Barack Obama's involvement with him:

### **Bill Ayers**

- Leader of the 1960s and 70s domestic terrorist group Weatherman
- "Kill all the rich people. ... Bring the revolution home. Kill your parents."
- Participated in the bombings of New York City Police Headquarters in 1970, of the Capitol building in 1971, and the Pentagon in 1972
- Currently a professor of education at the University of Illinois

Born in 1944, Bill Ayers, along with his wife **Bernardine Dohrn**, was a 1960s leader of the homegrown terrorist group **Weatherman**, a Communist-driven splinter faction of **Students for a Democratic Society**. Characterizing Weatherman as "an American Red Army," Ayers summed up the organization's ideology as follows: "Kill all the rich people. Break up their cars and apartments. Bring the revolution home, Kill your parents."

Today Ayers is a professor of education and a Senior University Scholar at the University of Illinois. He has also authored a series of books about parenting and educating children, including: *A Kind and Just Parent*; *To Become a Teacher*; *City Kids*; *City Teachers*; *To Teach*; *The Good Preschool Teacher*; *Zero Tolerance: Resisting the Drive for Punishment in Our Schools*; and *Teaching Towards Freedom: Moral Commitment and Ethical Action in the Classroom*.

In his 2001 screed, *Fugitive Days*, Ayers recounts his life as a Sixties radical, his tenure as a Weatherman lieutenant, his terrorist campaign across America, and his enduring hatred for the United States. "What a country," Ayers **said** in 2001. "It makes me want to puke."

Ayers was an active participant in Weatherman's 1969 "Days of Rage" riots in Chicago, where nearly 300 members of the organization employed guerrilla-style tactics to viciously attack police officers and civilians alike, and to destroy massive amounts of property via vandalism and arson; their objective was to further spread their anti-war, anti-American message. Reminiscing on those riots, Ayers says proudly: "We'd ... proven that it was possible -- we didn't all die, we were still there."

A substantial portion of Ayers' book *Fugitive Days* discusses the author's penchant for building and deploying explosives. Ayers boasts that he "participated in the bombings of New York City Police Headquarters in 1970, of the Capitol building in 1971, and the Pentagon in 1972." Of the day he bombed the Pentagon, Ayers says, "Everything was absolutely ideal. ... The sky was blue. The birds were singing. And the bastards were finally going to get what was coming to them."

On another occasion, Ayers stated: "There's something about a good bomb ... Night after night, day after day, each majestic scene I witnessed was so terrible and so unexpected that no city would ever again stand innocently fixed in my mind. Big buildings and wide streets, cement and steel were no longer permanent. They, too, were fragile and destructible. A torch, a bomb, a strong enough wind, and they, too, would come undone or get knocked down."

All told, Ayers and Weatherman were responsible for 30 bombings aimed at destroying the defense and security infrastructures of the U.S. "I don't regret setting bombs, **said Ayers in 2001**, "I feel we didn't do enough."

In 1970, Ayers' then-girlfriend Diana Oughton, along with Weatherman members Terry Robbins and Ted Gold, were killed when a bomb they were constructing exploded unexpectedly. That bomb had been intended for detonation at a dance that was to be attended by army soldiers at Fort Dix, New Jersey. Hundreds of lives could have been lost had the plan been successfully executed. Ayers attested that the bomb would have done serious damage, "tearing through windows and walls and, yes, people too."

After the death of his girlfriend, Ayers and his current wife, Bernardine Dohrn, spent the 1970s as fugitives running from the FBI. In 1980 the two surrendered, but all charges against them were dropped due to an "improper surveillance" technicality. Ayers' comment on his life, as reported

by Peter Collier and David Horowitz in their authoritative chapter on Weatherman in *Destructive Generation*, is this: "Guilty as sin, free as a bird, America is a great country."

Notwithstanding his violent past, Ayers today does not describe himself as a terrorist. "Terrorists destroy randomly," he reasons, "while our actions bore ... the precise stamp of a cut diamond. Terrorists intimidate, while we aimed only to educate."

In *Fugitive Days*, Ayers reflects on whether or not he might use bombs against the U.S. in the future. "I can't imagine entirely dismissing the possibility," he writes.

In the mid-1990s, Ayers and his wife Bernardine Dohrn hosted **meetings** at their Chicago home to introduce **Barack Obama** to their neighbors during his first run for the Illinois Senate.

In 1995 Ayers -- whose stated educational objective is to "teach against oppression" as embodied in "America's history of evil and racism, thereby forcing social transformation" -- founded a "school reform organization" called the Chicago Annenberg Challenge (CAC). He **appointed** Obama as the group's first chairman.

When *National Review Online* writer Stanley Kurtz in 2008 **reviewed** the CAC archives at the Richard J. Daley Library at the University of Illinois, he found that Ayers had been one of five members of a working group that assembled the initial CAC board which hired Obama.

"Ayers founded CAC and was its guiding spirit," Kurtz **wrote**. "No one would have been appointed the CAC chairman without his approval." **According to Kurtz**, the CAC archives show that Obama and Ayers worked as a team to advance the foundation's agenda -- with Obama responsible for fiscal matters while Ayers focused on shaping educational policy. The archived documents further reveal that Ayers served as an ex-officio member of the board that Obama chaired through CAC's first year; that Ayers served with Obama on the CAC governance committee; and that Ayers worked with Obama to write CAC's bylaws.

A September 2008 *WorldNetDaily* report **offers still more details**: "Ayers made presentations to board meetings chaired by Obama. Ayers also spoke for the Chicago School Reform Collaborative before Obama's board, while Obama periodically spoke for the board at meetings of the collaborative ... According to the documents, the CAC granted money to far-leftist causes, such as the radical **Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now**, or ACORN, which ...has done work on behalf of Obama's presidential campaign."

*WorldNetDaily* **reports further** that "while Obama chaired the board of the CAC, more than \$600,000 was granted to an organization founded by Ayers and run by Mike Klonsky, a former top communist activist. Klonsky was leader of the Marxist-Leninist Communist Party, which was effectively recognized by China as the all-but-official U.S. Maoist party."

In 1999 Ayers joined the **Woods Fund of Chicago**, where he served as a director alongside Barack Obama until the latter left the Woods board in December 2002. Ayers went on to become Woods' Chairman of the Board. In 2002 the Woods Fund made a grant to Northwestern University Law School's Children and Family Justice Center, where Ayers' wife, **Bernardine Dohrn**, was employed.

At a 2007 **reunion** of former members of the **Weather Underground** and **Students for a Democratic Society**, Ayers painted a **verbal portrait** of life in the United States which included the following passages:

- "This is a time not only of great stress and oppression and authoritarianism, and a kind of rising incipient American form of fascism, and what the government counts on, what the powerful count on, is that we will stay quiet. It's the idea that we can tolerate these intolerable things without screaming, without somehow coming out, joining up and coming out and saying something. It's what they count on in terms of keeping things under control."
- "Empire resurrected and unapologetic, war without end, an undefined enemy that's supposed to be a rallying point for a new kind of energized jingoistic patriotism, unprecedented and unapologetic military expansion, white supremacy changing its form, but essentially intact, attacks on women and girls, violent attacks, growing surveillance in every sphere of our lives, on and on and on, the targeting of gay and lesbian people as a kind of a scapegoating gesture to keep our minds off of what's really happening."

And here is how Ayers **characterized himself and the longtime radical comrades** to whom he was speaking:

"Even though we think of ourselves as political, we weren't politicians. We were people who had a moral vision of what was possible. And when we talk, for example, about health care, about peace, we're talking a language of ethics, not a language of instrumentalism or opportunism, or what we might get. So we have to speak in a language that's large and generous and encompassing. And then we have to act." (<http://www.discoverthenetworks.org/individualProfile.asp?indid=2169>)

Is it any wonder, therefore, that Senator Obama has tried to distance himself from his close association with Ayers? But the real concern here is that once again, as with his involvement with Pastor Wright (from whom he ultimately distanced himself after Wright's hate-filled racist beliefs became known), Barack Obama doesn't appear to be telling the truth. What also is of great concern is that ACORN is an organization whose efforts to get voters registered has proven on more than one occasion to be fraudulent, and it is this organization that Barack Obama not only supported, but also wants to be a part of helping set the social agenda for his administration.

On the other hand, Sara Palin's husband recently went back to Alaska to testify in what the national media refers to as 'Trooper-Gate', and the committee found that Palin may have overstepped her authority as governor in having an official dismissed, but no charges of illegal impropriety were brought against her. Would she have preferred all that notoriety to not have been front and center? Of course, but her husband chose to go up and testify on his own recognizance in order to clear the air of the allegations against her. Each of us must come to our own determination of how we evaluate these two people and their handling of these situations in their lives. But one of the things to keep

in mind is that if there is no acknowledgement at this point in these candidates' lives about these matters, then you can rest assured that when one of them is in office (Obama as President & Palin as Vice President), they will continue to do the same based on the unrepentant pattern they have already begun to set. Only later, when in office, the stakes will be far greater and the consequences immeasurably higher and far more devastating to our nation as a whole.

One other matter has occurred with Senator Obama that is of great concern is the attempt by his campaign to silence his opponents. This has occurred three times: (1) attempting to silence a TV ad this summer by a wealthy Texas businessman exposing his relationship with Bill Ayers; (2) attempting to silence a negative ad in the St. Louis, MO area; (3) attempting to silence TV ads by the NRA. Below are the web-sites with their respective links concerning the three named instances:

**(1) <http://brain-terminal.com/posts/2008/08/27/obama-free-speech>**

**Barack Obama vs. Free Speech**

**27 August 2008 @ 7:52AM**

If Senator Barack Obama becomes president, will he use the power of government to stifle speech he doesn't like?

The answer clearly seems to be yes, considering he is now asking the Justice Department to investigate a political ad—one that I **cited on Monday**—that highlights his multi-year connection with unapologetic domestic terrorist Bill Ayers.

*The Politico* **reports** (emphasis mine):

Sen. Barack Obama has launched an all-out effort to block a Republican billionaire's efforts to tie him to domestic and foreign terrorists in a wave of negative television ads.

**Obama's campaign has written the Department of Justice demanding a criminal investigation** of the "American Issues Project," the vehicle through which Dallas investor Harold Simmons is financing the advertisements. **The Obama campaign—and tens of thousands of supporters—also is pressuring television networks and affiliates to reject the ads.** The effort has met with some success: CNN and Fox News are not airing the attacks.

**The Obama campaign plans to punish the stations that air the ad financially, an Obama aide said,** organizing his supporters to target the stations that air it and their advertisers.

Obama's campaign has written a **pair of letters** to station managers carrying the ads.

“Obama supporters have now sent more than 93,000 e-mails to the Sinclair stations that have decided to run the ad,” said Obama’s spokesman Tommy Vietor. “**Other stations that follow Sinclair’s lead should expect a similar response** from people who don’t want the political discourse cheapened with these false, negative attacks.”

“Why would Barack Obama be friends with someone who bombed the Capitol and is proud of it?” asks the ad’s narrator.

“With all our problems, why is John McCain talking about the ’60s, trying to link Barack Obama to radical Bill Ayers?” says Obama’s ad. “McCain knows Obama denounced Ayers’ crimes, committed when Obama was just 8 years old.”

The problem for Obama isn’t that the revolutionary organization run by Ayers and his wife bombed U.S. targets when Obama was a kid, the problem is that *even today* the only regret Ayers has is that *he wasn’t successful* in overthrowing the government.

As with Reverend Wright, this is someone Obama *chose* to embrace.

For four years, **Barack Obama chaired an organization just after it was set up by Bill Ayers** to advance his education agenda in Chicago. Ayers is clearly more than just “a guy who lives in my neighborhood,” as Obama disingenuously characterized him in a debate.

Does Obama not see why his refusal to explain his relationship with former Weather Underground leaders would concern people? If so, that fact alone should disqualify him from the presidency.

Americans do not want their president to be chummy with Marxist revolutionaries who tried to overthrow *the very government he would be leading*. To a presidential candidate with any judgment, this would be obvious.

But not only doesn’t Obama think he owes America an explanation, *his campaign is actually trying to use the Justice Department to intimidate private citizens* who believe that this is an important topic to address.

It’s interesting that the Obama campaign has not yet contested any of the facts in the ad. If the ad is “an appalling lie, a disgraceful smear of the lowest kind” as the Obama campaign maintains, then demonstrate what statements are false. And then maybe sue for defamation.

Why Barack Obama would choose to work for a Marxist bomber of American government buildings is a legitimate question, but in order to prevent any questions from being asked, Obama’s resorting to totalitarian tactics.

The Messiah says it’s time to shut up.

**(2) <http://www.rightsidenews.com/200809292079/editorial/obama-goes-to-war-against-freedom-of-speech.html>**

By now a gazillion sites have posted [this](#) from the State of Missouri's site, "Gov. Blunt Statement on Obama Campaign's Abusive Use of Missouri Law Enforcement." What interests me most about it is the eerie parallel between the Obama camp's activity here and the [Organization of the Islamic Conference's efforts to stifle all criticism of Islam and destroy the freedom of speech](#) -- also by means of legal intimidation, at the UN and elsewhere

No, I am *not* saying that Obama is a closet Muslim Manchurian candidate. I am saying that if he values free speech so lightly, as this episode suggests, it is not at all beyond the realm of possibility that once he becomes President he will acquiesce to the OIC attempts to criminalize criticism of Islam, and pressure the Supreme Court (to which he will probably appoint several key members) to declare a "hate speech" exemption to First Amendment protections. Then it will effectively become illegal to discuss the motives and goals of the jihadists, and to strategize about ways to resist them -- because the OIC and American Islamic groups assail all attempts to do that as "hate speech." "Hate speech" is in the eye of the beholder, and "hate speech" laws are tools by which the powerful can silence criticism from the powerless. In this case, the Islamic groups have already made themselves abundantly clear that any examination of the jihadists' use of Islamic texts and teachings to justify their actions is what they consider "hate speech." Thus if what is labeled "hate speech" about Islam becomes a criminal offense, so will resistance to Islamic supremacism.

But if this were to become an actual live possibility, Americans would rise up and fight for their freedoms, right? I hope so. Yet all too many Americans don't seem to understand or care about the importance of free speech nowadays, and of course no one supports "hate speech" in the first place -- so once the OIC frames the analysis of the jihad threat in terms of "hate," as American Muslim groups do endlessly, the ability to discuss, analyze, understand, and defend ourselves against the jihadist threat will be severely damaged if not utterly destroyed.

Will it happen? I hope not. I pray not. But can it happen? After reading this story out of Missouri, I am beginning to wonder if just maybe it can -- although just days ago I was discussing all this with an attorney, who assured me that precedents protecting free speech in American law are very thick on the ground, and will be hard to overturn. In fact, he maintained that they would be impossible to overturn.

Still -- is this speculation, and that is certainly all that it is, really that far beyond the realm of reasonable possibility? Already those who discuss the jihad threat in its full dimensions honestly and openly are ostracized, marginalized and vilified. If Candidate Obama is willing to have people arrested when they say things about him that he doesn't like, will President Obama have the vision or courage or understanding to stand up against the OIC when it demands restrictions on freedom of speech at precisely the same time that he wants to build bridges to the Islamic world and demonstrate his power to restore hope and bring change to old stalemated conflicts? So maybe a few greasy Islamophobes get silenced, fined, arrested, imprisoned, whatever. What's the big deal? Peace, and the expansionist and supremacist agenda of the Religion of Peace, will then march on unimpeded.

JEFFERSON CITY - Gov. Matt Blunt today issued the following statement on news reports that have exposed plans by U.S. Senator Barack Obama to use Missouri law enforcement to threaten and intimidate his critics.

"St. Louis County Circuit Attorney Bob McCulloch, St. Louis City Circuit Attorney Jennifer Joyce, Jefferson County Sheriff Glenn Boyer, and Obama and the leader of his Missouri

campaign Senator Claire McCaskill have attached the stench of police state tactics to the Obama-Biden campaign.

"What Senator Obama and his helpers are doing is scandalous beyond words, the party that claims to be the party of Thomas Jefferson is abusing the justice system and offices of public trust to silence political criticism with threats of prosecution and criminal punishment.

"This abuse of the law for intimidation insults the most sacred principles and ideals of Jefferson. I can think of nothing more offensive to Jefferson's thinking than using the power of the state to deprive Americans of their civil rights. The only conceivable purpose of Messrs. McCulloch, Obama and the others is to frighten people away from expressing themselves, to chill free and open debate, to suppress support and donations to conservative organizations targeted by this anti-civil rights, to strangle criticism of Mr. Obama, to suppress ads about his support of higher taxes, and to choke out criticism on television, radio, the Internet, blogs, e-mail and daily conversation about the election.

"Barack Obama needs to grow up. Leftist blogs and others in the press constantly say false things about me and my family. Usually, we ignore false and scurrilous accusations because the purveyors have no credibility. When necessary, we refute them. Enlisting Missouri law enforcement to intimidate people and kill free debate is reminiscent of the Sedition Acts - not a free society."

**(3) <http://www.gunbanobama.com/Default.aspx?NavGuid=c3d25dd2-7abd4f24-8efd-d62bd977d7c2&ID=11588&Type=1>**

9/25/2008 -

Fairfax, VA-Sen. Barack Obama's presidential campaign has sent threatening letters to news agencies in Pennsylvania and Ohio to stop airing ads exposing his anti-gun record sponsored by the National Rifle Association Political Victory Fund (NRA-PVF).

The kicker? NRA-PVF's Ohio's ads have not yet begun running.

"Barack Obama and his campaign are terrified of the truth," declared Chris W. Cox, Chairman of NRA-PVF. "Sen. Obama's statements and support for restricting access to firearms, raising taxes on guns and ammunition and voting against the use of firearms for self-defense in the home are a matter of public record. NRA-PVF will make sure that everyone knows of Obama's abysmal record on guns and hunting."

The Obama campaign sent cease and desist letters to news outlets in Pennsylvania and Ohio, denouncing the ads and demanding their removal from the airwaves. All stations where NRA-PVF has purchased or plans to purchase ads have been provided with documented evidence of Sen. Obama's anti-gun record.

**Obama Campaign Cease and Desist Letter**

**NRA-PVF Response Memo**

**NRA-PVF Response to Washington Post "fact check"**

"Barack Obama would be the most anti-gun president in our nation's history. That's the truth," concluded Cox. "NRA-PVF has the facts on our side. No amount of running from or lying about his record and then intimidating news outlets in the hope of deceiving American gun owners and hunters is going to work. Those strong arm tactics may work in Chicago, but not in Pennsylvania and Ohio, and not as long as NRA-PVF has anything to say about it."

I am sixty-one years old, and I have never seen in all the years I have been a registered voter an attempt by any politician and his campaign cohorts to actually silence his opposition from presenting their political ads to the populace (Richard Nixon attempted to steal campaign secrets, but he didn't attempt to shut up by legal force his opposition)! I personally believe this is only a taste of what can be expected from Obama and his ilk if they take control of our government, and I certainly do not, in any form, want the full meal!

The next item that is of great concern is Obama's attempt to reformulate his vote in the Illinois Senate where he voted against a bill that would provide life-saving treatment for a baby that has survived an attempted abortion. Below is the web-site and the article discussing this matter:

### **Obama Blocked Born Alive Infant Protection Act**

by Jill Stanek, guest reporter

He often stood alone as an Illinois lawmaker in opposition to protections for babies who survived abortion.

*Note: This report first appeared in the April issue of [Citizen magazine](#).*

On Jan. 10, 2005, newly elected U.S. Sen. Barack Obama visited former colleagues and staffers at the Illinois state Capitol, where he had served seven years as state senator. I happened to be at the Capitol that day, too, and a friend and I took the opportunity to speak to Obama, who had not yet achieved rock-star status and was still approachable.

We were in Springfield to lobby for passage of the state Born Alive Infant Protection Act, legislation that would require hospitals to care for infants who survive an abortion. Obama spoke against the legislation in 2001 and 2002 and single-handedly defeated it in committee in 2003.

My friend stood in Obama's path and said, "Senator, we are going to pass Born Alive here in Illinois this year."

Obama smiled smoothly and agreed, "I think you will," adding, "I would have voted for the Born Alive Infant Protection Act in Illinois had it been worded the same as the federal bill. I think that's the position the Democrats should take."

There's just one thing he forgot to mention: Obama had stopped his committee from adding the federal wording.

With Obama no longer in the state Senate, the Born Alive legislation passed in 2005.

## **First encounter**

An Illinois lawmaker offered the first draft of the state's Born Alive Infant Protection Act in 2001 after I revealed publicly that Christ Hospital left babies who survived abortion — viable babies whose delivery was induced, and whom the abortionist intended to kill but somehow survived — in a utility room to die.

The bill, sponsored by state Sen. Patrick O'Malley of Oak Lawn defined "born alive" using language identical to that of federal legislation introduced in 2000 by Rep. Charles Canady, R-Fla., who in turn drafted wording developed by the World Health Organization in 1950 and adopted by the United Nations in 1955:

The term "born alive," with respect to a member of the species homo sapiens, means the complete expulsion or extraction from its mother of that member, at any stage of development, who after such expulsion or extraction breathes or has a beating heart, pulsation of the umbilical cord, or definite movement of voluntary muscles, regardless of whether the umbilical cord has been cut, and regardless of whether the expulsion or extraction occurs as a result of natural or induced labor, cesarean section, or induced abortion.

I first encountered Barack Obama on March 27, 2001, when I testified before the Illinois Senate Judiciary Committee, of which he was a member. My testimony included my description of holding a premature aborted baby until he died:

One night, a nursing co-worker was taking an aborted Down's syndrome baby who was born alive to our Soiled Utility Room because his parents did not want to hold him, and she did not have time to hold him. I could not bear the thought of this suffering child dying alone in a Soiled Utility Room, so I cradled and rocked him for the 45 minutes that he lived. He was 21 to 22 weeks old, weighed about ½ pound, and was about 10 inches long. He was too weak to move very much, expending any energy he had trying to breathe. Toward the end, he was so quiet that I couldn't tell if he was still alive unless I held him up to the light to see if his heart was still beating through his chest wall. After he was pronounced dead, we folded his little arms across his chest, wrapped him in a tiny shroud, and carried him to the hospital morgue where all of our dead patients are taken.

Obama questioned whether the born alive legislation would impede the right to abort and doctor/patient decision-making. He and an American Civil Liberties Union attorney speculated Born Alive would force doctors to resuscitate nonviable aborted babies.

Obama opposed Born Alive in committee, but voted "present" — neither "yes" nor "no," but merely "present" — on the state Senate floor, one of many "present" votes that Hillary Clinton has cited as evidence that Obama lacks leadership skills. Clinton voted for the federal Born Alive bill, putting her on record as more pro-life than Obama.

## **Constitutional blindness**

A graduate of Harvard Law School, Obama taught constitutional law at the University of Chicago for 10 years. Both schools are listed in the top 10 law schools in the country.

But Obama revealed his constitutional blind spot in his book *The Audacity of Hope*:

“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created [emphasis added] equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among those are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.”

... (T)he essential idea behind the Declaration — that we are *born* [emphasis added] into this world free, all of us; that each of us arrives with a bundle of rights that can't be taken away by any person or any state without just cause; that through our own agency we can, and must, make of our lives what we will — is one that every American understands.

Note Obama's choice of the word “born” over the word “created.” Perhaps that helps explain his support for unrestricted abortion. Also note that our “bundle of rights” can be “taken away” with “just cause.”

Obama clearly considers abortion a “just cause.” Here is how he argued against Born Alive during Illinois Senate debate in 2001:

... I just want to suggest ... that this (legislation) is probably not going to survive constitutional scrutiny.

Number one, whenever we define a pre-viable fetus as a person that is protected by the equal protection clause or the other elements in the Constitution, what we're really saying is, in fact, that they are persons that are entitled to the kinds of protections that would be provided to a — child, a 9-month-old — child that was delivered to term. That determination then, essentially, if it was accepted by a court, would forbid abortions to take place.

I mean, it — it would essentially bar abortions, because the equal protection clause does not allow somebody to kill a child, and if this is a child, then this would be an antiabortion statute. For that purpose, I think it would probably be found unconstitutional.

The legislation passed the Senate but did not survive in the House. When Rep. O'Malley reintroduced Born Alive and its companion bills in 2002, they headed again to the same committee, where Obama rewrote history:

"Ms. Stanek, your initial testimony last year showed your dismay at the lack of regard for human life. I agreed with you last year, and we suggested that there be a Comfort Room or something of that nature be done. The hospital acknowledged that and changes were made and you are still unimpressed. It sounds to me like you are really not interested in how these fetuses are treated, but rather not providing absolutely any medical care or life to them."

Of course, Obama had not agreed with me the year before, and I was the one who had told him about the Comfort Room, which the hospital created in response to my testimony: "We now have this prettily wallpapered room. ... There is even a nice wooden rocker in the room to rock live aborted babies to death."

The hospital made live birth abortions look nicer, but the end result was still dead babies.

“What we are doing here is to create one more burden on women, and I can't support that,” Obama concluded, and voted “no” in committee again.

The bill went again to the Senate floor, where Obama was the sole speaker against it, claiming that it would impose a “burden” on physicians:

[T]his [legislation] puts the burden on the attending physician who has determined, since they are performing this procedure, that in fact, this is a nonviable fetus.

### **Troubled conscience?**

Democrats won control of the state Senate in November 2002, and when Born Alive was reintroduced for the third time in 2003, it was directed to the Obama-chaired, infamously liberal Health and Human Services Committee, where he simply refused to call it for a vote.

By this time Obama was running for U.S. Senate. He won his primary in March 2004, and Republicans recruited former U.N. Ambassador Alan Keyes, who lived in Maryland, to oppose him. It was Obama’s position against Born Alive that persuaded Keyes to run, as he stated in his announcement speech:

"When I was first approached about this possibility... I have to say that my reaction was negative.... What finally caught my eye, however... what finally arrested my attention and forced me to consider whether I not only had the opportunity to oppose him, but the obligation... was when I learned that (Obama) had actually, in April 2002, apparently cast a vote that would continue to allow live birth abortions in the state of Illinois ... .

"We are talking about a situation in which, in the course of an abortion procedure, a child has been born alive — is out of the womb, breathing and living on its own — and he cast a vote against the idea that we should not stand by and let that child die!"

This was why Keyes alleged during their campaign that Jesus Christ would not vote for Barack Obama, as he explained in an interview with an NBC affiliate:

Christ would not stand idly by while an infant child in that situation died. ... Christ would not vote for Barack Obama, because Barack Obama has voted to behave in a way that it is inconceivable for Christ to have behaved.

Obama later admitted Keyes’ comment “nagged” him and has written or spoke about it several times, although he always misrepresents Keyes’ rationale as being about abortion support when it was specifically about infanticide support. In a July 2006 opinion piece in USA Today, restated later in *The Audacity of Hope*, Obama wrote:

If I am opposed to abortion for religious reasons but seek to pass a law banning the practice, I cannot simply point to the teachings of my church. I have to explain why abortion violates some principle that is accessible to people of all faiths, including those with no faith at all.

Obama’s faith has come into question on the campaign trail. Accused of being a Muslim, he’s insisted that he’s “rooted in the Christian tradition” and has a “personal relationship with Jesus Christ.” In fact, Obama has attended the largest church in one of America’s most stridently pro-abortion denominations — the United Church of Christ — for 20 years. His church, Trinity, is located just five miles from Christ Hospital. Obama’s pastor, the Rev. Dr. Jeremiah Wright, served on the board of Christ Hospital’s health care system.

It's ironic in the extreme that the most determined opponents of preborn life — and even those who are born — embrace the name of the One who caused John the Baptist to leap in his mother's womb.

(<http://www.citizenlink.org/content/A000007034.cfm>)

One of the most recent admissions of Senator Obama with regard to his view of redistributing wealth came just this past weekend in a conversation with a plumber. Below is the transcript, as well as the web site, and when you go to the web site, it will in turn point you to another website that will have the actual footage of the conversation: (<http://elections.foxnews.com/2008/10/13/obama-plumber-plan-spread-wealth/>)

Barack Obama told a tax-burdened plumber over the weekend that his economic philosophy is to "spread the wealth around" -- a comment that may only draw fire from riled-up John McCain supporters who have taken to calling Obama a "socialist" at the Republican's rallies.

Obama made the remark, caught on camera, after fielding some tough questions from the plumber Sunday in Ohio, where the Democratic candidate canvassed neighborhoods and encouraged residents to vote early.

"Your new tax plan is going to tax me more, isn't it?" the plumber asked, complaining that he was being taxed "more and more for fulfilling the American dream."

"It's not that I want to punish your success. I just want to make sure that everybody who is behind you, that they've got a chance for success too," Obama responded. "My attitude is that if the economy's good for folks from the bottom up, it's gonna be good for everybody ... I think when you spread the wealth around, it's good for everybody."

Obama's remarks drew fresh criticism on the blogosphere that the Illinois senator favors a breed of wealth redistribution -- as well as a rebuke from the McCain campaign.

"If Barack Obama's goal as President is to 'spread the wealth around,' perhaps his unconditional meetings with Hugo Chavez, Raul Castro, and Kim Jong-Il aren't so crazy -- if nothing else they can advise an Obama administration on economic policy," McCain spokesman Michael Goldfarb said in a written statement to FOXNews.com. "In contrast, John McCain's goal as president will be to let the American people prosper unburdened by government and ever higher taxes."

Obama frequently rails against what he calls a Republican concept that tax breaks for the wealthy will somehow "trickle down" to middle-class Americans.

Obama says he will not raise taxes on anyone making less than \$250,000 a year.

However, McCain's aides and supporters argue that Obama wrongly wants to raise taxes on businesses in a time of economic distress.

Both candidates spent Monday discussing how they would resurrect the ailing economy. McCain again pointed to his plan to buy up cumbersome mortgages from homeowners and renegotiate them. Obama unveiled what he called an economic rescue plan for the middle class, which included a 90-day moratorium on foreclosures.

The following is the web site where you can see the actual video of this conversation:

(<http://www.breitbart.tv/?p=195153>)

All you need to do is click on the arrow on the picture of the FOX News anchors, and the video will play.

With regard to Obama's statement, it unequivocally reveals the foundational core of his belief structure, in which Liberation Theology has unquestionably played a major part. I do not have the time in this short piece to dissect LT, but let me say once again that in its essence, it is religious Marxism. Quite honestly, I think this debate is very healthy because it will force many Americans to find out what Marxism is actually all about. For those of you who do not settle for 'second-hand' information, but you want to go the original source as much as possible, let me suggest the following material for you to read:

- (1) *The Communist Manifesto* – This can be found almost everywhere, and you can even find it on the Internet. It was a pamphlet written in 1848 by Marx and Engels, and it clearly outlines the purpose and intent of communism.
- (2) *Das Kapital* – This is a three volume work by Marx. He published the first volume in 1867, and he had the drafts for the remaining two volumes, but he died (1883) before they were ultimately published. His colleague, Friederich Engels, edited and published volumes II & III in 1885 and 1894 respectively. I must tell you, however, that these are major works that will take you some time to read through. However, the good news here is that these too can be found on the Internet.
- (3) *The Gulag Archipelago*, vols. I & II – These two books were written by Aleksandr Solznenitsyn, and I must say that they gave me an appreciation for the Judeo/Christian foundation of our country and the freedoms we have as much or more than anything I have ever read. Solznenitsyn chronicles his time as a political prisoner in the Soviet Union, and this is a must read if you want the 'real world' perspective of communism as it is actually lived out and practiced.
- (4) *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, 4 vols. – This is a very important resource to once again see communism in its real world actualization, versus the pseudo-utopian concepts foisted off on sincere, but incredibly naïve people (especially the young and

very impressionable). There is one quote from Mao in volume one that gives the true picture of socialistic/communistic implementation:

Every communist must grasp the truth, "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun." Our principle is that the Party commands the gun, and the gun must never be allowed to command the Party. Yet, having guns, we can create Party organizations, as witness the powerful Party organizations which the Eighth Route Army has created in northern China. We can also create cadres, create schools, create culture, create mass movements. Everything in Yen-an has been created by having guns. All things grow out of the barrel of a gun. (Mao Tse-tung, *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, vol. 2 [Peking: Foreign Languages Press, 1975], 224-225)

Concerning the above quote from Mao's *Selected Writings*, you may legitimately ask, what does this have to do with Obama's socialistic scheme of "spreading the wealth"? The answer is this, it is a forced, economic policy that the government will enact on all Americans, versus the free economic flow that has helped to make this country what it is today. That is, you will have no say about the government taking your money and giving it to others who don't have as much as you do. Thus, what we have is a 'redistributed welfare system' under the guise of economic equality, and you can look back in the twentieth century to see how well this works (e.g., the former Soviet Union, North Korea, Cuba, & Red China [their economic growth is not a result of Marxist economic policies, but rather of capitalistic policies under the control of communist dictators, and even though there has been growth, the vast majority of Chinese live in great poverty]). Only in the West where freedom born from a Judeo/Christian foundation has there been economic success for the vast majority of the people who are willing to work hard and sacrifice. Rather than spurring people to go beyond where they are economically, socialism retards ambition and motivation to improve one's lot, and thus, we return to a 'welfare state'. I am certainly no fan of Bill Clinton's, but I must say, that Clinton did much to decrease the 'welfare state' we had in America, and Obama makes Clinton look like a right-wing conservative with his economic policies.

(5) *The Critique of the Gotha Program* – This too can be found on the Internet, and I have given a website at the end of the following quote where you can read it in its

entirety. This is the work in which Marx made his famous statement about communism, "From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs" (<http://marx.eserver.org/1875-gotha.critique.txt>). Below is an excellent and accurate assessment about the *Critique of the Gotha Program*:

The *Critique of the Gotha Program* is a document based on a letter by **Karl Marx** written in early May 1875 to the *Eisenach* faction of the German **social democratic** movement, with whom Marx and **Friedrich Engels** were in close association. Offering perhaps Marx's most detailed pronouncement on programmatic matters of revolutionary strategy, the document discusses the "**dictatorship of the proletariat**," the period of transition from **capitalism** to **communism**, **proletarian internationalism**, and the party of the **working class**.

The *Critique* is also notable for elucidating the principle of "**From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs**" as the basis for a communist society. He also mentions that in socialism "the individual receives from society exactly what he gives to it." Indicating that while communism would be a state where payment is based on needs, socialism being immature and incomplete would **have its wages based on deeds**. The *Critique of the Gotha Program*, published after his death, was one of Marx's last major writings. ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Critique\\_of\\_the\\_Gotha\\_Program](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Critique_of_the_Gotha_Program), & <http://marx.eserver.org/1875-gotha.critique.txt>)

I must tell you that in the same way that Castro and Chavez moved into their respective countries with the promise of "change," so too do I see the very same approach with Barack Obama, and the above exchange he had with the plumber in Ohio is of great concern. Politicians always talk of "change," but it is within a free-enterprise, capitalistic, and First Ten Amendments, or Bill of Rights context. That is, the promise is to return to that premise of our founding as a nation. However, with Obama, the first two amendments appear to be in some jeopardy (wanting to silence his opposition and his anti-gun positions with regard to Concealed Carry licenses, home and self-defense automatic and assault weapons, etc.), not to mention his socialistic mindset that is a rephrasing of Marx' statement about the essence of communism:

It's not that I want to punish your success. I just want to make sure that everybody who is behind you, that they've got a chance for success too," Obama responded. "My attitude is that if the economy's good for folks from the bottom up, it's gonna be good for everybody ... I think when you spread the wealth around, it's good for everybody. (Obama above with plumber)

From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs. (Marx form *Critique of the Gotha Program*)

Late this afternoon (10/14/08), I heard on FOX News a report about a statement Jesse Jackson made in Evian France concerning Obama's approach toward Israel, which appears to be at odds from what we have heard Obama say. This story was taken from the New York Post by columnist Amir Taheri, and below is the full article with the website where you may go yourself:

PREPARE for a new America: That's the message that the Rev. Jesse Jackson conveyed to participants in the first World Policy Forum, held at this French lakeside resort last week.

He promised "fundamental changes" in US foreign policy - saying America must "heal wounds" it has caused to other nations, revive its alliances and apologize for the "arrogance of the Bush administration."

The most important change would occur in the Middle East, where "decades of putting Israel's interests first" would end.

Jackson believes that, although "Zionists who have controlled American policy for decades" remain strong, they'll lose a great deal of their clout when **Barack Obama** enters the White House. "Obama is about change," Jackson told me in a wide-ranging conversation. "And the change that Obama promises is not limited to what we do in America itself. It is a change of the way America looks at the world and its place in it."

Jackson warns that he isn't an Obama confidant or adviser, "just a supporter." But he adds that Obama has been "a neighbor or, better still, a member of the family." Jackson's son has been a close friend of Obama for years, and Jackson's daughter went to school with Obama's wife Michelle.

"We helped him start his career," says Jackson. "And then we were always there to help him move ahead. He is the continuation of our struggle for justice not only for the black people but also for all those who have been wronged."

Will Obama's election close the chapter of black grievances linked to memories of slavery? The reverend takes a deep breath and waits a long time before responding.

"No, that chapter won't be closed," he says. "However, Obama's victory will be a huge step in the direction we have wanted America to take for decades."

Jackson rejects any suggestion that Obama was influenced by Marxist ideas in his youth. "I see no evidence of that," he says. "Obama's thirst for justice and equality is rooted in his black culture."

But is Obama - who's not a descendant of slaves - truly a typical American black?

Jackson emphatically answers yes: "You don't need to be a descendant of slaves to experience the oppression, the suffocating injustice and the ugly racism that exists in our society," he says.

"Obama experienced the same environment as all American blacks did. It was nonsense to suggest that he was somehow not black enough to feel the pain."

Is Jackson worried about the "Bradley effect" - that people may be telling pollsters they favor the black candidate, but won't end up voting for him?

"I don't think this is how things will turn out," he says. "We have a collapsing economy and a war that we have lost in Iraq. In Afghanistan, we face a resurgent Taliban. New threats are looming in Pakistan. Our liberties have been trampled under feet . . . Today, most Americans want change, and know that only Barack can deliver what they want. Young Americans are especially determined to make sure that Obama wins."

He sees a broad public loss of confidence in the nation's institutions: "We have lost confidence in our president, our Congress, our banking system, our Wall Street and our legal system to protect our individual freedoms. . . I don't see how we could regain confidence in all those institutions without a radical change of direction."

Jackson declines to be more concrete about possible policy changes. After all, he insists, he isn't part of Obama's policy team. Yet he clearly hopes that his views, reflecting the position of many Democrats, would be reflected in the policies of an Obama administration.

On the economic front, he hopes for "major changes in our trading policy."

"We cannot continue with the open-door policy," he says. "We need to protect our manufacturing industry against unfair competition that destroys American jobs and creates ill-paid jobs abroad."

Would that mean an abrogation of the NAFTA treaty with Canada and Mexico?

Jackson dismisses the question as "premature": "We could do a great deal without such dramatic action."

His most surprising position concerns Iraq. He passionately denounces the toppling of Saddam Hussein as "an illegal and unjust act." But he's now sure that the United States "will have to remain in Iraq for a very long time."

What of Obama's promise to withdraw by 2010? Jackson believes that position will have to evolve, reflecting "realities on the ground."

"We should work with our allies in Iraq to consolidate democratic institutions there," he says. "We must help the people of Iraq decide and shape their future in accordance with their own culture and faith."

On Iran, he strongly supports Obama's idea of opening a direct dialogue with the leadership in Tehran. "We've got to talk to them what we want and hear what they want," Jackson says. "Nothing is gained by not talking to others."

Would that mean ignoring the four UN Security Council resolutions that demand an end to Iran's uranium-enrichment program? Jackson says direct talks wouldn't start without preparations.

"Barack wants an aggressive and dynamic diplomacy," he says. "He also wants adequate preparatory work. We must enter the talks after the ground has been prepared," he says.

Jackson is especially critical of President Bush's approach to the Israel-Palestine conflict.

"Bush was so afraid of a snafu and of upsetting Israel that he gave the whole thing a miss," Jackson says. "Barack will change that," because, as long as the Palestinians haven't seen justice, the Middle East will "remain a source of danger to us all."

"Barack is determined to repair our relations with the world of Islam and Muslims," Jackson says. "Thanks to his background and ecumenical approach, he knows how Muslims feel while remaining committed to his own faith."

([http://www.nypost.com/seven/10142008/postopinion/opedcolumnists/the\\_o\\_jesse\\_knows\\_133450.htm?page=0](http://www.nypost.com/seven/10142008/postopinion/opedcolumnists/the_o_jesse_knows_133450.htm?page=0))

This is an incredibly revealing article, but of course you will hear the spin from the Obama camp that Jackson is not their spokesman, and very likely Jackson will say that he was simply speaking from his own perspective, not as a spokesman of Obama's campaign. However, it is most interesting that Jackson said what he did, and quite honestly, I believe that what he said is indeed representative of Obama's position. The truth is we don't have ANY IDEA AT ALL what Obama will do because he has NO TRACK RECORD on these matters. On the other hand, we know exactly what John McCain will do because his track record is open for all to see!

In summation of all that I have presented to you, the most important thing that we can do is to once again realize that this is a spiritual battle of worldviews, and Paul certainly pictured it correctly in Ephesians 6:10-12: "Finally, be strong in the Lord, and in the strength of His might. Put on the full armor of God, that you may be able to stand firm against the schemes of the devil. For our struggle is not against flesh and blood, but against the rulers, against the powers, against the world forces of this darkness, against the spiritual *forces* of wickedness in the heavenly *places*." It is not Bill Ayers, ACORN, Jeremiah Wright, Planned Parenthood, Moveon.org, George Soros, the ACLU, congressional & Wall Street corruption, Jesse Jackson, or even Barack Obama and his campaign cohorts that we are in a great struggle against, but rather it is the "spiritual *forces* of wickedness in the heavenly *places*" that we are in an intense spiritual, mental, and emotional battle with. With the most humble, but strongest admonition that I can speak to you, I call on you to seriously consider spending time in prayer and fasting for the final debate tomorrow night, as well as before the election. I was told yesterday that Pastor Mike MacIntosh has issued an invitation across the country to join him and hundreds of thousands of other believers in a week-long time of prayer and fasting before the election. Thus, beginning on Wednesday morning, October 29, up through Tuesday night, November 4, we spend that time in prayer and fasting for this most crucial and all-

important election. There is great power in corporate prayer, and there is even greater power when that prayer is accompanied with fasting.

May the Lord continue to bless, keep, and guide you as we earnestly seek the Lord in prayer, fasting, and sharing the information above with others.

God bless you,

Justin T. Alfred