



Visit Our Web Site At:
www.rtlnm.org



AUGUST 2005
Vol. 23, No. 8

NEWSLETTER OF THE RIGHT TO LIFE COMMITTEE OF NEW MEXICO

THE BEGINNING OF THE END – A COMMENTARY

By Dauneen Dolce, Editor

Since 1973 there has been a concentrated effort by many pro-life people and organizations, including The Right to Life Committee of New Mexico, to overturn the unconstitutional ruling *Roe vs. Wade*. This happening is now on the righteous path.

This horrible law has been responsible for the killing of 45 million or more innocent lives and in a few years will be a bad memory.

However, as that law comes to an end, it will be the states that will have to step up to the plate. In New Mexico, it is the beginning of an intensive effort to prepare our New Mexico citizens to have their respective legislators in readiness to make sure that abortion is not a part of New Mexico's laws. This is not an easy task and will require chapters to exist in all counties to be the educators. It also requires people! That too seems to be difficult. Our existing chapters can't get volunteers, and the response to helping get new chapters in place went unnoticed.

THERE IS NO MAGIC WAND! WE ARE THE PRO-LIFE MOVEMENT, AND IT DEPENDS UPON US TO MAKE A WALL OF DEFENSE FOR INNOCENT LIFE.

Our forefathers had great foresight. We just celebrated the act of the Declaration of Independence, the philosophy that is the basis of RTLNCNM. They declared that all men are created equal with the unalienable right to life, liberty and to pursue happiness. But even these great men with high resolve and clear righteous purpose had a hard time getting their people to join in the fight against the English. Along with providence and unadulterated good luck, George Washington, after much abandonment of soldiers when battles were lost by the Americans, had only 3,000 true blue soldiers to fight the British at the end. This against 10,000 British troops seemed impossible. Fortune allowed this to be sufficient.

How much easier it could have been had everyone held their position and fought for the values and freedoms that we now take for granted. Unlike so many in those days, we must first not lose heart, but secondly we MUST increase the pace with the profilers in our ranks, and we must ADD to the ranks. Less than 100 people are working in counties across the state to defend against the culture of death. Many of them are tired, having been there for many years. Most have families and jobs that require them to work at this part time. In RTLNCNM, there are only two full-time and one part-time employees. So who is going to do the work? AGAIN, THERE IS NO MAGIC WAND! So role up your sleeves, stand up and VOLUNTEER TO WORK WHERE YOU LIVE. Just call 505-881-4563 and we will find activities you can work in your schedule that ward off the evil in our country and put in place those freedoms our forefathers and three thousand troops dedicated and gave their lives for. Can we not have that same fervor and commitment? If not us, WHO?

AT LONG LAST, A MOVE TO SANITY – A JUDICIAL COURT

John Roberts has been nominated by President George W. Bush to be the next associate justice on the U.S. Supreme Court.

In doing this, the President has kept his promise of picking someone who will uphold the Constitution rather than interpret it to make law. He will be Just, Fair and True to his role as Justice. If this had been the case of all the Justices in the course of history, and especially in the case of *Roe vs. Wade*, we would not have killed over 47 million babies. We wouldn't have demoralized our country through law. We would have been more protected by the Constitution that our forefathers created with faith and devotion to God and freedom.

How do I know that Judge John Roberts will be what he says he wants to be and the President has required of a nominee to the court? His record does a great deal of revealing this truth. First, he is exceptionally well-qualified according to pro-life attorneys around the country. This includes groups such as the Thomas More Law Center, The Right to Life Committee, and Life Institute. It also includes the Washington D.C. Bar Association, which gave unanimous support to him when he was nominated by President Bush to the Federal Court in 2001, a position he won after getting a favorable vote from the Senate Judiciary Committee 16-3. After graduating from Harvard Law School with honors in 1979, Judge Roberts worked as a law clerk for the very conservative Judge Henry S. Friendly of the U. S. Court of

(continued on page 2)

Coming Events

→ **BORN TO RUN – THE EVENT THAT HELPS SAVE LIVES – Sept. 24, 2005 – Kit Carson Park – Albuquerque, NM.** Whether young or old, runner or walker, you can participate in an event that will raise money for the RTLNCNM Educational Trust Fund to educate people of New Mexico on the issues of abortion, infanticide and euthanasia. We have much to do and need many supplies such as pamphlets, videos, DVD's, fair booths, money to travel the state to give talks, media ads, etc., and yes, to write this newsletter. So come have fun with many other pro-life supporters, raise much needed money, and help save lives and our nation. It all happens in just a few hours on one day. On the brochure you will notice that you can also help RTL by getting pledges whether you walk or run. After you fill out the enclosed brochure, return it to the address given ASAP. Thank you for your support of this great activity!

→ **STATE FAIR: Sept. 9-25 – Albuquerque, NM**

→ **BORN TO RUN: Sept. 24, 2005 - Kit Carson Park – Albuquerque, NM (see article)**

→ **PRO-LIFE DINNER: Oct. 8, 2005 – Wyndam Hotel, Albuquerque, NM “Roe v. Wade and You!” (info/reservation form coming in September Viva Lif.)**

→ **PRO-LIFE DINNER: JAN. 14, 2006 – Wyndam Hotel – Albuquerque, NM**

Commentary by the Editor...

(continued from pg. 1)

Appeals for the Second Circuit. Then Judge Roberts became the law clerk under Supreme Court Justice William Rehnquist. Following the last clerkship experience, John Roberts served as Special Assistant to the U.S. Attorney General William French Smith.

In 1982, President Reagan appointed Judge Roberts to the White House Staff of Associate Council to the President, a position in which he served until joining the DC firm of Hogan and Hartson in 1986. In 1989 he left the firm to accept an appointment as Principal Deputy Solicitor General of the United States, a position he served until returning to the firm in 1993. He was appointed to a seat on the Court of Appeals in May 2003.

Now many are attacking statements he either said or statements he refused to say. John Roberts has never made a personal remark about Roe vs. Wade. He did make a statement in a brief he helped write working for the Bush Administration that reiterated the Administration's opposition to Roe vs. Wade which said "We continue to believe that Roe was wrongly decided and should be overruled." He did help write the brief.

In his confirmation hearings in 2003, John Roberts made the following comment when asked his views on Roe vs. Wade. "Roe v. Wade is the settle law of the land." And he added, "There's nothing in my personal views that would prevent me from fully and faithfully applying the precedent." This is an accurate answer. As a Federal Court Judge, he cannot change a law that is "settled," and he must uphold U.S. Supreme Court rulings. The Supreme Court can "unsettle" Roe vs. Wade. Overruling Roe vs. Wade would then let the legislative process take place, which the Court had no business being involved in except to rule whether a law was Constitutional or not.

The appointment of John Roberts will not immediately give the numbers to overturn Roe vs. Wade. That will take a court that is 5-4 in favor of this decision. Currently the Court is 6-3, and with the appointment of John Roberts it would be 5-4 - still lacking one to make it 6-3. We do have the votes, should John Roberts get appointed and follow his approach of constitutional constructionist, to uphold the Partial Birth abortion ban, which has Judge Kennedy joining the three we have to be a 5-4 vote in favor. We can also uphold parental involvement laws. In the long run, it will be the people through their state legislatures who will be making the decision when we have the numbers on the Supreme Court to overrule Roe vs. Wade, which would not mean to outlaw abortion but to send it back to the states.

Probably the most "proof" on why John Roberts is a good choice is what the opposition is doing. Pro-abortion Democrats are making their threats and already have made disparaging remarks. NARAL and other pro-abortion organizations are gearing up for an all out battle to oppose Judge Roberts's nomination.

Much will be said and heard in the next few weeks. The hearings will take place in September after the August congressional break. We can only hope and pray for a fair hearing and the placement of an honorable man dedicated to truth and justice.

URGENT CONGRESSIONAL ALERT

The Senate may soon vote on bills that would mandate federal funding of research that requires the killing of human embryos. Such legislation has *already passed* the U.S. House of Representatives. In addition, the Senate might vote soon on legislation to either encourage or ban the practices of human cloning for research.

YOUR HELP IS NEEDED! Please communicate with both Sen. Jeff Bingaman and Sen. Pete Domenici urging them to oppose legislation that would mandate federal funding of

research that requires killing human embryos (H.R. 810S.471).

Also, urge them to support legislation that would prohibit the creation of human embryos by cloning (the Brownback-Landrieu bill, S. 658).

To e-mail your letter, use the NRLC Legislative Action Center at <http://www.capwiz.com/nrlc/home/>. This is the fastest way to communicate with your U.S. senators and representatives.

To mail your letter, use the following addresses: Senator___U.S. Senate, Washington D.C. 20510 or The Honorable___U.S. House of Representatives, Washington D.C. 20515.

To call: Capitol Switchboard is 202-225-3121 or 202-224-3121. PLEASE SHARE ANY RESPONSES YOU RECEIVE WITH THE STATE RTLCNM OFFICE: RTLCNM, 2800 San Mateo Blvd. NE, Ste. 107 Albq. NM 87110 -505-881-4563 or e-mail info@rtlncm.org.

A RIGHT TO LIFE CHAPTER AT WORK!



The Estancia Valley RTL chapter was busy on July 4th. They had a float in the county's parade in Moriarty, and then they had a booth at the festivities that took place later. With their baby models and educational pamphlets, along with getting petition signatures, this chapter spent a day helping our cause and the people in their district.

ARE YOU REGISTERED TO VOTE?

by Dauneen Dolce – PAC Chairman

In getting ready for elections in 2006, I have been trying to ascertain how the people on our files are registered (for primaries purpose) and what senate and representative districts they are in for both primary and general elections. I am astounded at how many people are either not registered at all or are not registered at the address they provided RTLCNM.

FIRST AND FOREMOST REGISTER TO VOTE! This act alone can change the pro-life issues by making sure pro-life legislators are elected in our state and at the federal level.

SECOND, register where you live. You are probably in another state senate and house district, and for you to have an impact where you live you must register accordingly. Further more, the law says you should make this change.

NOW, BEFORE WE HAVE AN ELECTION, GET REGISTERED. If you need help with this, e-mail me at info@rtlncm.org or call: 505-881-4563. We can get people to help you, but you must first help yourself and anyone else in your household who needs to register or make a change. The time it takes is little; the effect from it is great!

Give none of yourself to others, and eventually very little will be worth having.

ARE YOU SUPPORTING ORGANIZATIONS THAT SUPPORT ABORTION?

We can't mention all the groups but have chosen some that are either having fundraising in coming months or because of the subject they embrace are popular with people who wish to give help. We hope those who are generous with their donations will also be conscientious donors.

MARCH OF DIMES: The March of Dimes (MOD) uses the advertising slogan "Saving Babies Together." However; they are selective about which babies they wish to save. The MOD supports and promotes prenatal testing (such as amniocentesis) in order to detect "defective children." Studies show that between 95% and 100% of "defective" children are aborted after being found to have some genetic abnormality, while another 1% of the children are miscarried as a result of the test. Is this "saving children together?" The MOD also promotes pre-implantation genetic diagnosis (PGD), a process that screens embryos fertilized *in vitro* for various genes and/or diseases. The embryos that contain undesirable genes would then be destroyed instead of implanted into the mother's womb. The MOD 2002 annual clinical genetics meeting featured a session where attendees could learn how to expand the use of PGD to detect more genetic diseases. They have also recently funded experiments involving human fetal tissue and embryonic stem cells. The MOD seems to work to ensure that "all babies will be born healthy" by destroying those who are not or cannot be healthy.

SUSAN G. KOMEN BREAST CANCER FOUNDATION: Over 75% of the studies conducted regarding abortion and breast cancer have shown that having an abortion is a risk factor for breast cancer. Despite the commendable efforts of The Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation to promote breast cancer screening and awareness, the foundation refuses to acknowledge a connection between abortion and breast cancer. When a woman becomes pregnant, her body undergoes a miraculous transformation in preparation for forty weeks of pregnancy and birth. A pregnant woman's hormone levels increase rapidly during this time by producing very high levels of estrogen and progesterone. This surge in hormones induces the breast cells to divide and start a maturing process (differentiation) whereby they are changed into mammary (milk-producing) glands. Once a woman has completed her pregnancy and given birth to her child, her breast cells finish the maturation process and become stable again. When a woman undergoes an induced abortion, however, she disrupts this natural process of differentiation, leaving the breast cells in a state of transition and thus more vulnerable to carcinogens. Girls and women who have an induced abortion before their first full-term pregnancy are at much higher risk for breast cancer; the risk is even greater for young girls. If the foundation was really concerned about curing breast cancer, they would acknowledge the vast scientific data supporting the connection between induced abortion and breast cancer. The foundation would also support, rather than discredit, efforts to inform women considering abortion about the increased risk of developing breast cancer after an induced abortion.

JUVENILE DIABETES RESEARCH FOUNDATION: Scientists and politicians have been asserting that embryonic stem cells are the easiest and most productive form of stem cells to use in research. Yet even aside from the moral concerns, may problems with embryonic stem cells have surfaced, one being that the results from current research have been moderate at best and non-existent at worst. The leading corporation that funds embryonic stem cell research, The Geron Corporation, reports that embryonic cells might not be easy to manipulate and that these cells may actually produce tumors or other harmful growths when transplanted into patients, as has happened in animal trials using

embryonic stem cells. Despite these scientific facts and moral problems, the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation (JDRF) aggressively supports embryonic stem cell research (ESCR). Adult stem cells have already shown much more promise than embryonic stem cells; therefore, scientists can save lives without compromising their moral integrity. ("Adult" refers to the age of the cell, not the age of the patient from whom the cell was taken.) Unfortunately, the JDRF vehemently insists on the potential of ESCR instead of focusing on the real results manifested with adult stem cell therapies and islet cell transplantation techniques. JDRF is cruelly misleading diabetes sufferers by giving them false hope in ESCR.

As pro-lifers, we must always remain compassionate to the pain and suffering of those with disease and serious illness. In doing so, we must insist on choosing methods of research that do not rely on the destruction of human lives. By funding organizations and patronizing companies that do not support destructive research and other assaults on innocent human life, we further restore a Culture of Life in our Society.

**This information was supplied by
Texas Right to Life Educational Fund**

UNICEF: A recent essay in the British medical journal *Lancet* exposed the aggressive pro-abortion policies of UNICEF. It noted that of the world's ten million children who died last year of preventable diseases and starvation, two-thirds could have been saved by effective international intervention through UNICEF. It stated that "child survival must be put back on the agenda." This organization has gone from bad to worse. The turnaround occurred when the Clinton Administration demanded the appointment of Carol Bellamy as UNICEF director. She decided its job was not to save sick and hungry children but to join the great march toward universal sex freedom advocating for minor's access to condoms, requiring that refugee camps provide abortion services, and handing out sex education manuals to grade school children in the Third World...All of this to achieve the ability of any woman, in any place, at any price, for any reason, to have an abortion.

SOME POLITICAL NOTES

The editor will try to keep its readers informed on the activities/statements of others in the political arena that could have an impact on the abortion issue. This month we will address Sen. Hilary Clinton and Governor Mitt Romney.

HILLARY CLINTON: After giving a prominent speech in which she called for common ground on the abortion debate, Sen. Hilary Clinton refused to meet with a coalition of pro-life groups that sought to dialogue with her. Rev. Patrick J. Mahoney, Director of the Christian Defense Coalition and one of the leaders in attempting to secure a meeting, said he was "profoundly disappointed" Clinton refused to meet. "It now seems that the statements Sen. Clinton made concerning finding common ground on abortion were politically motivated and not sincere," he said. A spokesman from Clinton's Senate office had not returned a phone message by press time. Mahoney said Clinton's comments should be viewed as an attempt to moderate her public perception in advance of a potential 2008 presidential bid. "These comments should now be viewed as an attempt to reinvent herself and appear less radical on the issue of abortion in light of the 2008 race for the White House," he said. "I think it is critical that the American public focus more on what Sen. Clinton does concerning abortion, rather than her rhetoric, as we move closer to the presidential campaign season." During her January speech to abortion activists, Clinton said there is "an opportunity for people of good faith to find common ground in this debate."

(continued on page 4)

Some Political Notes ...

(continued from pg. 3)

Editor's Note: In 2004, it was Sen. Clinton who screamed to a large crowd in D.C. that we women must be able to control our bodies and must always have abortion available. Could it be the 2004 elections that made her "change" her position?

MITT ROMNEY: Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney is considering a possible candidacy for the presidency in 2008. However, one obstacle stands in his way of capturing the Republican nomination – his stance in favor of abortion. But Romney says that could be changing. In an interview with *USA Today*, Romney said he "is in a different place" on abortion now than when he ran for the U.S. Senate in 1994 and indicated he supported legal abortion. "Understand, over time one's perspective changes somewhat," Romney said. "I'm in a different place than I was probably in 1994, when I ran against Ted Kennedy, in my own views on that." Romney would not elaborate on whether he has come full circle to adopt a pro-life position on abortion. Yet the governor, an anomaly in a state mostly controlled by Democrats, has won praise from the pro-life community for his strong stance against embryonic stem cell research. Though the state legislature is ramming through legislation that would promote embryonic stem cell research, Romney has been forceful and active in his opposition to it and pledged to veto the bill. However, Romney's "personally opposed" position has never won lawmakers support from pro-life groups. They say a candidate is not pro-life unless he supports changing laws to put those beliefs into policy. Carol Tobias of the National Right to Life Committee told the *Boston Herald* at the time, "John Kerry said that he was personally opposed to abortion but wouldn't do anything to stop it. Mitt Romney's position doesn't seem any different."

Editor's note: Just as I have criticized "Catholic" legislators who do not follow their faith to be able to hold office, I will also criticize this "Mormon" politician for doing exactly the same. It is good he is right on stem cell research; however, his position on abortion must be defined and supported, and we must know his views on euthanasia.

POPULATION – THE FACTS PART II

by Austin Ruse

At the time that the debates raged during the 1990s and the discussions about UNFPA continued, the population controllers once more began to change their terms. They determined, quite correctly, that population control was getting bad press. It was viewed as too "top down," in the words of population control advocates. In addition to the bad press, population control advocates also began receiving reports from their own demographers, which presented startling information: the drive to slow population growth by discouraging fertility was becoming more successful than anyone could imagine.

Though not revealed to the general public until the late 1990s, it was becoming obvious to demographic experts by the time of the Cairo Conference on Population and Development in 1994 that fertility rates were plummeting rapidly all over the world. I will address the facts in a minute but first will point out the switch in terminology, which exists to the present day.

First, they determined that the top down approach and the phrase "population control" were no longer tenable. Second, they already knew or suspected that fertility rates were plummeting, and they feared that policy makers would conclude that population control was no longer necessary. Third, they wanted fertility rates and, therefore, population control to continue to decline. Their solution to these sticky problems was to cloak the

old theory of overpopulation in the language of human rights, the political argument *par excellence* of the late 20th century. Enter the phrase "reproductive rights." The thinking went that if everyone demanded and received their "reproductive rights" as defined by the UN, then fertility rates would continue to decline. So, under the guidance and support of UNFPA, the United Nations began the international call for reproductive rights at the Cairo Conference on Population and Development in 1994.

Here we have entered the latest but certainly not the last phase of the war against the concept of people. It started in Malthusianism, continued in eugenics, switched to the population explosion, and has ended up, at least for now, in the fight for reproductive rights. And here we enter briefly the dichotomy in their movement, that between the feminists and the population controllers.

Actually the split is not all that great. Some feminists, though not many, have considered population control as an assault against women. Some of them, though very few, spoke out against the Chinese one-child policy. And none of them spoke out against coercion in Peru. But at least theoretically there is a dichotomy between those who believe that women's rights lie in the advancement of abortion, yet who still criticize coercion in family planning and those who believe so strongly in the necessity of population control that women's rights may be trampled as a consequence. This final phase of the anti-people movement uses the language of women's rights in the service of population control.

Let me finish with how I began. The theory that the world is so awash in people that it will eventually die is false and it always has been. We will not run out of food, natural resources, or room. The theory is completely and dangerously false. The world now produces more food on less land than ever before. The world is awash in food. The problem is getting it to the hungry. Starvation occurs in the world today not from lack of food but generally as a result of bad policies or the use of starvation as a tool of war. Also, the cost of natural resources is now lower than forty years ago. Price is always a marker for availability; lower prices mean greater availability. Why are natural resources more plentiful? Simply because of our ingenuity. Mankind is better at getting natural resources out of the ground, wherever they are, and we are more efficient in their use.

Still, the population continues to grow. How can that be? For a very good reason. According to Harvard's Nicholas Eberstadt, it is not that people "reproduce like bunnies" rather that they "no longer die like flies." The most startling revolution in the most revolutionary 20th century was one of health. Where a century ago almost any disease could kill someone in a matter of days, these diseases are now routinely cured. Where once someone could hope to live into their 60s, they now routinely live well into their 70s, 80s and even 90s.

The fact is that the much feared fertility rate began declining in the West more than 150 years ago, long before the advent of UN-style family planning and population control. In fact, France reached what is called the demographic transition in the 19th century. The fact of nature is that fertility rates decline naturally when populations move from the farm to the city and from agricultural subsistence to the industrial age. They decline also as women move toward education and postpone marriage, also aspects of modernization.

It turns out the war on fertility was not necessary, and what we have achieved in artificially lowering it is a problem the world has never seen. At this point more than 80 countries have achieved what is known as below replacement fertility, the point at which women are having so few children, generally thought to be below 2.1 children per woman, that countries are no longer

(continued on page 5)

Population: The Facts...

(continued from pg. 4)

replacing themselves. The UN predicts that every nation on earth, with the exceptions of a few African nations, will reach below replacement fertility within the next twenty years. And this is a very serious problem. What this means is a rapidly aging population that turns the demographic pyramid on its head. Societies are meant to have lots of young people supporting an ever-shrinking number of old people. Below replacement fertility has meant in many countries there are more old people than young people. Fifteen years ago Japan reached a global first; it reached the point where it had more people over 65 than those under 15. This is a recipe for economic disaster and intergenerational warfare over levels of government taxation and spending for social services for the elderly. The UN now acknowledges this.

In recent years, the UN Population Division (official UN statistical analysis) has sounded the alarm about below replacement fertility. A year ago, it hosted an expert meeting at which demographers from all over the world concluded they did not know how low fertility can go. The UN now believes the world population will top out at roughly 8 billion people in 2050 and then begin to decline.

The population controllers continue to make their case, however. They still say the world will soon starve and that we will soon run out of natural resources and that the planet is running out of room. Anyone can test the theory, however. Next time you are in an airplane flying virtually anywhere in the world, even in the very populous United States, look down from on high and what you will see is a remarkably empty planet straining to be made a garden by more of us.

Austin Ruse is President of the Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute, a New York based non-governmental organization that monitors UN activity.

Editor's Note: With up to 15% or more of women who have an abortion on their first pregnancy becoming sterile according to the Center For Disease Control and Prevention, even less human beings will come into this world. Abortion makes matters worse beyond the killing of each individual child.

ONE VERY GOOD BIRTH DECLINE! CDC ANNOUNCES A SHARP FALL IN BIRTH RATE AMONG YOUNG GIRLS

The U.S. government reported the birth rate among American girls ages 10 to 14 fell to its lowest level since 1946. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) announced that the birth rate declined 38% from 1994 to 2002 despite a 16% increase in the number of girls in that age group during the same period. In 1994 12,901 babies were born to 10- to-14 year-old mothers; in 2002 that number fell to 7,315. The rate stands at 0.7 births per 1,000 females. Maine has the lowest birth rate between 2000 and 2002; Washington D.C. had the highest rate.

Source:

Milwaukee Journal Sentinel

BAD STATISTICS PERPETUATE A LIE

Sen. Hillary Clinton and John Dean, Democratic National Committee Chairman, are perpetuating the lie that there have been more abortions done under President Bush's presidency than was done under President Clinton's Administration.

On NBC's Meet the Press, John Dean said, "You know that abortions have gone up 25% since Bush was President." Following this

claim, as well as other questionable claims made recently by Dean, The Annenberg Center's factcheck.org website at (<http://www.factcheck.org/article330.html>) published a report that proves that Dean's numbers are erroneous, and that in reality abortions have decreased under the Bush Administration.

The author of the Annenberg Center's report, "Biography of a Bad Statistic," notes the Democratic National Committee did not respond to several inquiries for the source of the 25 percent claim. (Read the entire critique, "Biography of a Bad Statistic.")

Since before the 2004 election, Democrats have been pushing the myth that abortions have increased under President George W. Bush. A publicized audit of those numbers by NRLC pointed out several serious statistical flaws in the data used by the Democrats (<http://www.nrlc.org/rko/index.html>), but party stalwarts like Howard Dean continued to trumpet the false data.

Despite the wide distribution of the factcheck.org report, Dean has more recently continued to falsely accuse Republican policies of causing an increase in the rate of abortions. Just last week (June 3, 2005) on CNN's Wolf Blitzer Reports, Dean stated, "The abortion rate was lower than Democrat – when Democrats were in charge, than they are when the Republicans are in charge."

These are just two of the latest examples of false but widely reported claim made earlier by, among others, Senators John Kerry and Hilary Clinton. But according to the newly published analysis by the Annenberg Center's factcheck.org, "*This claim is false. It's based on an opinion piece that used data from only 16 states. A study by the Alan Guttmacher Institute of 43 states found that abortions have actually decreased...The author of the original claim now concedes that the Guttmacher study is 'significantly better' than his own.*"

Information from National RTL – June 10, 2005

FLORIDA TEENAGER ABORTS BABY WITH COURT APPROVAL

Despite intervention by the Florida Department of Children & Families (DCF), a 13 year-old foster child aborted her 14-week-old unborn baby on May 8, 2005, the *Miami Herald* reported. Earlier that day a judge lifted a temporary stay that had prevented the girl, known only as "L. G.," from having an abortion.

"It's a tragedy that a 13-year-old child would be in a vulnerable position where she could be made pregnant, and it's a tragedy that her baby will be lost," said Gov. Jeb Bush, according to *Reuters*. "There's no good news in this at all."

L.G. ran away from a Palm Beach County group home in January and came back a month later. She soon discovered she was pregnant and told caseworkers that she wanted an abortion, which was then scheduled for April 26.

DCF officials filed a suit to stop the abortion, since Florida law states that "in no case shall the department consent to a sterilization, abortion, or termination of life support," according to the *Herald*. L.G. is officially a ward of the state.

"The Department of Children & Families is acting in accordance with what we believe is in the best interest of the child," Zoraya Suarez, a spokeswoman for DCF Secretary Lucy Hadi, told the *Herald*. "If a child in our care requires any procedure that is prohibited by Florida statute, we cannot consent to the procedure."

Judge Ronald Alvarez issued a temporary stay of the abortion ordering a psychological and medical evaluation of the teenager, the *Palm Beach Post* reported. After receiving the evaluation, Alvarez ruled May 2 that L.G. is competent to make the abortion decision and that she "would not be physically or emotionally harmed by the procedure."

After this ruling, DCF officials dropped their case. "There will be no further appeals, and we will respectfully comply with

