



VIVA LIFE

JANUARY 2005
Vol. 23, No. 1

Visit Our Web Site At:
www.rtlnm.org

NEWSLETTER OF THE RIGHT TO LIFE COMMITTEE OF NEW MEXICO



MEDIA EVENT PRO-LIFE TELEVISION ADS

At long last The Right to Life Committee of New Mexico is going to do pro-life educational advertising. This is something we have wanted to do for a long time. We no longer can depend upon a newsletter, a speech here and there, a fair booth or a float to reach the people of New Mexico. We did start billboards two years ago and will continue those in the future, but now we are turning to television.

This is an expensive endeavor, and soon you will be asked to donate to this tax-deductible educational activity. We know what we will provide will change hearts and minds, the bottom line in all our endeavors.

Enclosed in this newsletter is a listing of time and date (beginning 1/17/04). Please watch and have others watch. Spread the word. Your friends and family can help. All that is needed is for anyone to send a check to RTLCNM-Media, 2800 San Mateo Blvd. NE, Suite 107, Albuquerque, NM 87110.

We will be updating you on future ads and when they come out as money is raised to cover the costs. Whether you receive a letter or not, please donate to this life-saving activity.

IMPORTANT EVENTS FOR 2005



JANUARY 22, 2005: Albuquerque RTL will have a Luminaria Memorial honoring the 5,000+ babies aborted in New Mexico each year. The event takes place at Calvary Cemetery's chapel at 5:15 p.m. Those wanting to help with set-up, please arrive at 4:15. Questions? Call Betty at 821-9101.

JANUARY 24, 2005: There will be a pro-life rally at the State Legislature from 11:30 am to 1:00 pm joining a pro-life coalition and organizations. For details call Sarah: 1-505-690-6856.

JANUARY 24, 2005: March for Life in Washington D.C. For more information, call 202-543-3377 or fax 202-543-8202.

APRIL 23, 2005: The Right to Life State Annual Convention in Albuquerque at the Wyndom Hotel at the Albuquerque Airport. Featured banquet speakers are Dr. Anthony Levatino and his wife Cecilia. He was a former abortionist who has turned pro-life, and she is a pro-life activist who was a nurse.

WORKSHOPS:

The workshops are being given by Burke Balch on *Roe v Wade*, What Is This Supreme Court Ruling and How Can We

Overtum It. Another workshop he will give is on Euthanasia, a subject that he is considered an expert on in the United States. He discusses what it is and how it is impacting us and what could happen in the future. This is a must for all. You may not have been aborted, but we are all vulnerable to health care rationing, etc. The third workshop will be on our media campaign presented by Jeff Van Brunt from Virtue Media. He will explain the need to move in this arena and what is available now and in the future. It is a new venture for our organization. We need solid, current information for our supporters so we can sustain this new movement.

Details will be coming at a later date. BUT TODAY, MARK YOUR CALENDAR.

JUNE 16-18: National RTL Convention in Minneapolis, Minnesota at the Sheraton Hotel. The events start on Thursday, June 16 through the 18th ending with a banquet.

For true knowledge and guidance, it is well worth attending this convention. Besides, you are surrounded by some of the nicest people.



HAPPY NEW YEAR TO YOU & YOURS

Editor Dauneen Dolce

It's hard to believe that 2004 has passed. It was a busy and a very productive year, and I am hoping that 2005 will offer even more

opportunities to advance the pro-life cause and to involve the people across the nation and in our own state of New Mexico. So much can be done when people are educated on what the issues are and how to go about seeking solutions. **WE THE PEOPLE** have so much power and ability to change the way people think and act. We underestimate our impact when the simple truth is provided and we take simple actions in our home, at work, at church, and in our social activities that people can see and hear. I have seen this for myself through the years when I have given a talk or had a discussion or was visibly doing activities that most people can do.

So in conjunction with this I offer you a list of activities you can be involved in that can make that difference.

1. Continue believing that abortion, infanticide, and euthanasia are wrong, and reinforce this with solid information that can be used to persuade others to be pro-life. This means additional reading. Aside from some great books that are available in the RTLCNM office, consider getting the *National RTL News*. It only costs \$5.00 when you sign up with a membership with RTLCNM.

2. Reach out to people, and in a loving manner, share your views. The saying "Never talk politics and religion" sounds so safe, but how safe are we. Those that are ignorant on the issues, including those in churches, synagogues, and mosques,

(continued on page 2)

(continued from pg. 1)

are voting our future. California votes support embryonic stem cell research. I am sure most do not know the facts. People who vote for candidates on subjects such as abortion, euthanasia, cloning, and stem cell research can vote for death, maybe their own, by picking the wrong people to represent them. I find people “shocked” to find out that Senator Kerry was a supporter of abortion, stem cell research, and euthanasia. So playing it “safe” is not changing minds or saving lives. Be a braveheart and share the truth.

3. Children can be guided at a very young age. They must be taught to respect life from the unborn to the elderly. Don't assume they just know this. It must be brought home to them. In our country where the elderly or those with disabilities are treated as “problems” and not needed, we must make a concerted effort to help our children realize the value of these people and how any of us can and will be in this category.

4. Support the organizations that are “doing” the work to aid people in need. There are the “on hand” groups such, as crisis pregnancy centers and groups that work with the disabled and the elderly. Of course, I include The Right to Life Committee of New Mexico. Even if we are not a “hands on” organization,” we do work, even “fight” for the innocent unborn, the struggling newborn with disabilities, and those later in life who are infirm, physically and mentally, and those who are elderly with little protection from those who would try to eliminate them before dying from natural causes. Under this classification of help come the following needs:

1. BE A MEMBER
2. Be a volunteer; there are many activities where you can help.
3. Start or join a chapter board or one of its committees, or start one.
4. Join a state committee or be a director on a board.
5. Find speaking engagements in your area on the subjects of abortion, euthanasia, stem cell research and cloning.
6. Join the Five Alive Program to give sustaining planned support to RTLCSNM.
7. Communicate with you legislator and ask him/her to sponsor bills RTLCSNM-PAC is sponsoring.
8. Come to the educational events, especially the RTLCSNM Educational Conference on April 23, 2005.
9. Help monetarily whenever it is possible. The only money we receive is from good people like you through membership or other requested donations. We do, when you do.
10. For those spiritual supporters, please pray for the success of our movement and for the salvation of our country.

Do I ask too much? I don't think so. No matter what age you are or what talents you may possess, if you are truly pro-life, there is something on this list you can do. Will you be the question. If you don't, who will? Let's make this a great 2005.

THE SCOTT PETERSON EFFECT

By Joe Mariani

The verdict is in. Scott Peterson, a fertilizer salesman and part-time philanderer from California, killed his wife who was eight months pregnant. He tied her body to an anchor made of concrete and dumped her into the San Francisco Bay, covering his actions with a story about a fishing trip for which he didn't even have the proper equipment. Despite the twisting and turning of attorney Mark Geragos (who first gained media attention with his defense of Susan McDougal during the

Clinton Whitewater scandal), the jury convicted Peterson of murder.

Why is this significant? Murders happen every day. Peterson was convicted not of one crime but two. He was convicted of murder in the first degree (premeditated) of his wife, Laci. He was also convicted of murder in the second degree (intentional) of his son, Conner. It turns out that this may be very significant after all.

Conner was not yet born.

You can only murder a human being.

Conner was murdered; therefore, he was a human being.

A human being has rights.

Therefore, an unborn child is a human being with rights that should be protected.

I don't look at abortion from a religious standpoint. I've never seen a soul, and — chances are — neither have you. I have, however, seen the faces of the unborn as they smile, cry and play, thanks to the “miracle” of modern technology. The main Liberal argument seems to be that it's just a lump of “fetal tissue” right up until that magical moment when it breathes air and is transformed into a child. Not even the most fanatical Liberal will claim that it's not *alive* before that, just that it's not *human* life. Well, I was once a lump of tissue just like that. So were you. The DNA of an unborn child is fully human DNA. No one has yet documented any important changes that take place exactly at birth, except that suddenly the child's lungs are filled with air. And that's a pretty poor definition of humanity.

What defines us as human, if not our genetic code? At the moment of conception, a totally unique human genetic identity is created, one that has never existed before and will never exist again. There is no sudden, magical change detectable in the DNA between the moment of conception and the moment of birth. Therefore, a baby is a human life from the moment it's conceived until the moment it dies. And if it's human, it has to have some rights. One of those rights ought to be “not dying for someone else's convenience.”

According to the Alan Guttmacher Institute, “49% of the 6.3 million pregnancies that occur each year are unplanned; 47% of these occur among the 7% of women at risk of unintended pregnancy who do not practice contraception.” The three main reasons for choosing an abortion are that having a baby would interfere with work, school, or other responsibilities (75%); the women cannot afford a child (66%); and they do not want to be a single parent or are having problems with their husband or partner(50%). Overlapping reasons aside, three-quarters of abortions are performed for reasons of *convenience*. The introduction of post-coital drugs like Preven (no longer manufactured) and Plan B caused a 43% drop in abortion rates between 1994 and 2000. I'd say that's a good start and a lot more convenient. Plan B, which prevents fertilization altogether, is unlike the French “morning after” pill RU 486, which prevents a fertilized egg — a life — from implantation. Besides, RU 486 seems to come with its own side effects, some which involve death.

Of course, there is only one absolutely certain contraception method, but few words cause Liberals to roll their eyes and groan as much as “abstinence.” God forbid — to make a weak joke — that people should have self-control. The idea that people should consider the implications before voluntarily having sex is generally met with scorn by Liberals and characterized as “medieval” by the media. It's easier to pretend that there are no consequences to one's actions.

Sometimes those consequences have faces and names, however. And sometimes they never get the chance to have them. We can hope that the conviction of Scott Peterson, along with the Unborn Victims of Violence Act (Laci and Conner's

(continued on page 3)

Law, signed in April 2004), will go a long way towards ensuring some real protection for the youngest and most vulnerable members of the human race.

Post note: RU-486 is not a morning after pill. It is an abortifacient taken between the fifth and seventh week of pregnancy.

Joe Mariani is a computer consultant born and raised in New Jersey. He lives in Pennsylvania where the gun laws are less restrictive and taxes are lower. Joe always thought he was politically neutral until he saw how far left the left had really gone after 9/11. His essays and links to articles are available at <http://guardian.blogdrive.com>

LEGISLATION: SHOULD WE GO ALL OUT?

Recently, I have read articles saying that states should make an all-out effort to pass laws that will prohibit abortion. The argument has been that the American people have shown that the abortion issue is important and that with the election of George W. Bush we must make our move now with the new attitudes. I agree with the positions taken by the three men listed next. We must be energetic but always realistic. You must have in place all that makes it possible to pass pro-life legislation that will last.

James Bopp, legal council for National RTL, sent this article to me, and he sights the critique by Clarke Forsythe, a fine pro-life lawyer who is with Americans United For Life and another pro-life lawyer, Paul Linton (originally from New Mexico).

PAUL LINTON: This is part of a letter to Harold Cassidy, Esq. in Holmdel, New Jersey who proposes a strategy of passing laws in all the states to make abortion illegal.

MEANS AND ENDS: Everyone in the pro-life movement would like to see legal protection extended to unborn children at all stages of their biological development. The question is not the *end*; it is the *means*. And debate over the *means* cannot be avoided by focusing on the *end* or by appeals for 'unity' in the pro-life movement. Unity should never be sought at the expense of truth or used as a means to stifle robust debate over fairly disputable matters. You believe that the end can be achieved through litigation. I believe that it can be achieved only through a constitutional amendment. Therein lies our disagreement. Regardless of the theory advanced-the rights of unborn children — the Supreme Court is not going to interpret the Constitution to *forbid* abortion in the absence of a constitutional amendment. The most that can be expected of the Court is a decision to overrule *Roe* and return the matter to the States and the political process. Not one of the four Justices who have voted to overrule *Roe* (Chief Justice Rehnquist, Justice Scalia, Justice Thomas, and the late Justice White) has ever said otherwise. In the last twelve years you have asked the Court to review at least six cases in which one or more of the aforementioned theories were presented, and each petition for *certiorari* was denied without a single dissenting vote.

CLARKE FORSYTHE: A PRO-LIFE MISTAKE — NATIONAL REVIEW ONLINE

Someone's overdosing on President George W. Bush's reelection. There are, reportedly, plans afoot in some states to introduce bills prohibiting abortion in 2005. The old proverb "Zeal without knowledge is folly" counsels some rethinking.

Such plans, however sincerely intentional, are premature. They are a product of wishful thinking that disregards the reality in the Supreme Court today. Such bills will divide friendly forces, waste precious resources, and undermine the credibility and political survival of pro-life legislators in the states that consider them. And there are alternative policies, better calculated to make a positive difference in 2005.

The hostility of the current justices to strong pro-life legislation is plainly expressed in the Supreme Court's most recent statement on abortion — the *Carhart* case in June, 2000. There, five justices — Connor, Souter, Ginsberg, Breyer, and Stevens — made it clear that they strongly supported *Roe v. Wade* and fiercely rejected the Nebraska prohibition on partial-birth abortion, in the belief that even restrictions on partial-birth abortion threatened *Roe*. Those same five are still on the Court today. And a sixth, Justice Anthony Kennedy, made clear that he supported *Roe*, even though he would have upheld Nebraska's prohibition on partial-birth abortion.

But the rest of the story has not been widely told. When the Supreme Court struck down Nebraska's law, it also struck down partial-birth-abortion bans in 29 other states. Those 30 states were forced to pay the fees of the abortion attorneys — reportedly totaling \$6,000,000. Federal law requires that attorney's fees be paid by the states to the attorneys for abortion clinics when they "prevail" in abortion cases.

So, *Roe* is still strongly supported by six justices and still controls lower federal courts. Just look at the current status of the federal partial-birth-abortion law. In October 2003 - immediately after President Bush signed the bill - the American Civil Liberties Union, Planned Parenthood, and an army of pro-abortion attorneys filed legal challenges to the bill in federal courts in three states. Hostile federal judges immediately slapped an injunction on the President's bill preventing its enforcement. It has *never* gone into effect, and, if the Court applies its decision in *Carhart*, it *never* will (unless, per chance, the makeup of the Court changes before the cases get to the Court).

The *Carhart* case also emboldened federal judges to adopt a cynical attitude toward partial-birth-abortion bills and the government attorneys who defend them. Instead of viewing the bills as expressions of popular will reflected in numerous public-opinion polls since 1995, federal judges dismiss them as political ploys. When a Justice Department attorney sought to defend the federal partial-birth law in the U.S. Court of Appeals in Chicago, one judge snidely asked, "And on this the fate of the Republic hinges?" Hostile federal judges will dismiss abortion bans with a laugh - and an attorney's fees bill of, say, a half a million dollars per case.

Given the Supreme Court and the experience with the federal partial-birth-abortion law, the outcome of abortion prohibition bills in 2005 is certain. Federal courts will immediately apply injunctions against the enforcement of such laws, federal appeals courts will agree, the Supreme Court will deny review, the laws will never go into effect, and the state legislature will get an expensive bill from ACLU. Prohibitions on abortion are not carefully calculated, in light of current obstacles, but clearly dead on arrival in 2005.

And, contrary to myth, there's no way to "force" the Supreme Court to hear any case. It has often refused to hear appeals in abortion cases, and this Court will never hear a case involving an abortion ban. Unless, of course, the six pro-abortion justices just want to reaffirm *Roe* again.

That's the "law of unintended consequences," which hovers over abortion litigation. And it could impact abortion-prohibition legislation in at least two ways.

Legislation: Should We Go All Out...

(continued from pg. 3)

First, bad precedent may be created by courts striking down abortion prohibitions that will make future efforts to change the law — perhaps at a future time with a different court — more difficult if not impossible. Look for example, at the recent case involving the original Jane Roe where the attempt was made to lift the injunction against the Texas abortion law originally imposed by the Supreme Court in *Roe v. Wade*. The Federal District Court quickly dismissed Jane Roe's new case, and the Federal Appeals Court — rejecting the need to even hear arguments — agreed. In the process, the Federal Appeals Court issued the unfortunate opinion that abortion *regulations* enacted by Texas since Roe have *implicitly* repealed the pre-Roe abortion law still on the books. The decision is clearly wrong and may not bind future state courts, but it sets forth a theory that could be used to overturn the pre-Roe laws still on the books in Texas and other states.

Second, more abortions might be committed in a state because the time spent on ill-conceived legislation will prevent good legislation from being passed. Bills prohibiting abortion in 2005 will waste limited resources with no realistic hope of success, which could be applied to more promising bills that can clearly go into effect and have a positive impact. Legislators will miss opportunities to pass good legislation that will reduce abortion.

This is demonstrated by [the analysis of Harvard-MIT researcher Michael New](#), published by the Heritage Foundation earlier this year. New observed that abortions declined by 17 percent during the 1990's, and New attributed that reduction to laws prohibiting public funding of abortion and laws requiring informed consent and parental notice or consent. In 2005, there will be a compelling need for abortion clinic regulations and laws to protect the rights of conscience of medical professionals.

Ill-conceived state bills also threaten the credibility and influence of pro-life legislators. The attorney's fees paid to the abortion attorneys will be paid by the state legislatures, which will be used as a political issue against pro-life legislators and future legislation. Attorney's fees are a risk to take when well-crafted legislation has a chance of being upheld but not when the legislation is DOA.

These proposed prohibition bills may be driven by the persistent myth — contrary to mountains of evidence in numerous court cases over the past 30 years — that if Justices O'Connor, Souter, Stevens, Ginsburg, Breyer, and Kennedy are "just presented with the facts" they'll be struck by a revelation, admit their mistake, and overturn Roe. But the six suffer not from a defect of the intellect but a defect of the will. Just read the thorough, detailed, clinical way in which five of those justices described the partial-birth procedure in their 2000 opinion in *Carhart* — before tossing it out. They know exactly what happens to the unborn child in abortion.

Under the right circumstances — with the right court, at the right time, with a carefully drafted bill - a novel test case might be prudent. It might even be said that the *Carhart* case in 2000 was a worthy educational effort to bring the brutal facts of the reality of partial-birth abortion to the attention of the Justices. But that obviously had little effect on the majority, since they described the procedure in coldly clinical terms and then casually dismissed the sentiment of overwhelming majorities of legislative representatives in 30 states.

At a time when Justice Department attorneys are desperately battling against hostile federal judges to find a necessary fifth vote on the Supreme Court to uphold the federal restric-

tion on partial-birth abortion, a ban on abortion is clearly doomed. A ban in 2005 also makes the strategic mistake of claiming that something has been accomplished when nothing has been accomplished.

Bills prohibiting abortion in 2005 will do nothing more than fund the ACLU and Planned Parenthood keeping them fully employed, paid by tax dollars, for years. The states might as well skip the litigation and just mail them a check.

COMMENTARY FROM THE RTLNCM LOBBYIST

I felt it was important to share this information with the readers of *Viva Life*. As I ready myself to take on the task of lobbying pro-life legislation in New Mexico's state legislature that starts January 18, 2005, I am reminded of the people who criticize the organization's efforts as either being too little or oppose legislation that has exception for a mother's life or want us to carry other bills that can't be passed and yes, will have consequences such as Clarke Forsythe described.

We have lost supporters because we won't support an outright ban on abortion. No one wants to stop abortion more than I do. I want to pass every pro-life bill that is conceivable in New Mexico. However, I must be realistic. I must not travel a path that ends in a dead end, using up time and valuable donated money.

The past elections did not change the pro-life makeup of our legislature. The pro-abortion Democrat leadership still controls committees and the governor's office.

However, even if all aspects of the legislature were pro-life, I WOULD NOT SUBMIT A BILL BANNING ABORTION. It would be overturned by our State Supreme Court, and even after all appeals, the present U.S. Supreme Court would overturn this bill. Our funds in RTLNCM would have to be used to hire attorneys to defend our bill(s), and that would take away from other more productive uses of our money — mainly education.

We will present bills that have a chance and have been either approved by the current Supreme Court or were not challenged, thus are defined as "Constitutional."

So for those of you who are frustrated by the "slowness" of the legal wheel, or feel "now is the time", please know we understand that frustration as we too want to move more quickly. However, those who understand the "workings" of the Supreme Court and the "consequences" of each and every action we take must be allowed to use the expertise that has been acquired through time and experience.

PLEASE DON'T BE DISCOURAGED! I believe the election of George W. Bush put us on the path to victory, but it is bumpy and cannot be traversed quickly. Hopefully, there will be smoother traveling as we continue to build our pro-life legislative bodies and courts.

If we educate our people, we can turn this nation around with a Constitutional Amendment. But that take lots of work. In New Mexico it takes many chapters in all counties and many volunteers and donors to support our efforts. This is something each of us could do today, as there is much to be done in our state. Change the heart and mind and you will change the laws and save lives.

LEGISLATION BEING INTRODUCED

There will be two bills that RTLNCM will support. The first is the Parental Notification bill. Rep. Larry Larranaga will carry this bill in the House, and hopefully it will pass the

(continued on page 5)

Legislation Being Introduced...

(continued from pg 4)

committees and get over to the Senate in the sixty-day session. This bill only requires that one parent be notified when their minor daughter is seeking an abortion. Then there is a period of time set aside so the parent(s) has time to find alternatives. It does not prevent the teenager from obtaining an abortion.

Across the country it has been found that either consent bills or notification bills work effectively in helping teenagers make proper decisions that not only save babies lives but helps the teenager physically and emotionally. It also alerts a parent to the activities of the teenager and allows intervention that can prevent further pregnancies.

The second bill is the Unborn Victims Act modeled after the federal law that passed earlier this year. Sen. Kent Cravens is carrying this bill in the Senate, and we hope it will get through committees over to the House.

This bill makes it a crime to kill an unborn child in the act of committing a crime. There is a law already in New Mexico that makes it a crime to kill an unborn child in the case of drunk driving.

For consistency, we must expand this to all crimes. It does not speak to abortion at all; thus it does not impact abortion laws. It just acknowledges the unborn child as a fellow human being in need of protection.

There is no number to these bills. That doesn't happen until the legislature convenes. It will have a number when placed in a committee.

What the number is, what committees and what legislators need to be contacted at first will be coming in the future. If you have an e-mail and haven't provided it to RTLNM or have made a change, please e-mail this information to info@rtlnm.org as soon as possible. You will then be updated via email on the needs and progress of these two bills. **YOU ARE NEEDED!**

By the way, these bills, if defeated, can do no harm to the greater agenda in our country.

GOOD NEWS FOR TERRI SCHIAVO

The long battle to save a woman from having her food and water from being taken from her when she is not dying nor on any life support has taken a turn for the better.

Michael Schiavo, the husband of Terri Schiavo who was the first to instigate the removal of food and water and who has been fighting her parents, the legislature, and the governor who support her and the courts who have denied her, has decided to end his involvement in the ongoing legal battles. Michael Schiavo's attorney said he would cease responding to Terri's parents' efforts to prevent her from being starved to death.

In that aspect of the case, Bob and Mary Schindler are asking the courts to declare that removing Terri's feeding tube and causing her death would be a violation of her First Amendment religious liberties. The Schindlers say such an action would contravene Terri's Catholic faith and that recent statements by Pope John Paul II confirm the Church's strong opposition to euthanasia.

"There is no prospect of finality," George Felos, Michael Schiavo's attorney said on December 28, 2004. "They (the Appeals Court) allow the Schindlers to attack the judgment no matter how frivolous," Felos told the Associated Press. "The only way the case can end is if the Schindlers stop attacking the final judgment or the court says no more stays. Until then,

we are just going to be on this revolving door." Felos has informed the 2nd District Court of Appeal that he is not responding to the motion of the Schindlers appealing a judge's decision throwing out their religious liberties argument. Despite dropping the case, Felos and Michael Schiavo are sticking with their lawsuit seeking to overturn Terri's Law. It is headed to the U.S. Supreme Court on appeal.

Source: LifeNews.com Pro-Life News Report 12/29/04

UPDATE:

On December 29, 2004, the Florida's Second District Court of Appeal denied an appeal filed by the parents of Terri Schiavo saying that her death would be a violation of her religious liberties. They gave no written opinion. When the Appeals Court's decision is finalized in fifteen days, the stay put in place by Judge George Greer will be lifted. At that point, Michael will again be able to tell doctors to remove Terri's feeding tube. If removed, medical experts say Terri will die from seven to ten days in a painful and agonizing death as she is denied food and water. We can only hope for another intervention.

Source: LifeNews.com-December 30, 2004.

ALBUQUERQUE RTL BUS ADS

Albuquerque RTL is excited to announce that starting December 21, 2004, there are small panel interior ads in buses #319 and 417 for ALL OF 2005. King-sized pro-life ads are on the outside of buses #210 and 213 and will be in place for one month. As more monies become available, we will continue the exterior ads.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD ANNUAL REPORT: MORE ABORTIONS, MORE PROFITS

Planned Parenthood has released its annual report for 2003-2004. The information reveals that the nation's largest abortion business performed more abortions at fewer abortion facilities during the last year. The pro-abortion group also took in fewer private donations and more money from the government. According to Jim Sedlak, President of STOPP International, a watchdog group that monitors Planned Parenthood, the abortion business performed 244,628 abortions, an increase of 6.1 percent. It has performed more than 3.5 million abortions since 1970. Planned Parenthood Federation of America's (PPFA) annual report shows more than one-third of Planned Parenthood's annual income comes from abortions. Surgical abortions accounted for \$104 million of the \$302.6 million its offices brought in. As it has in the past, Planned Parenthood continues to provide few alternatives to abortion. For every adoption referral made, it performed 138 abortions. The PPFA report reveals that the abortion business continues to sell the dangerous RU-486 abortion drug at a steady clip, despite the death of California teenager Holly Patterson, who obtained the abortion drug at a local Planned Parenthood office. The data shows 203 PPFA facilities sold more than 95,000 abortion pills. Some 49 Planned Parenthood offices that do not perform surgical abortions sell the drugs. Sedlak says Planned Parenthood continues to take in significant income from federal, state and local governments. Continued tax dollars accounted for a record \$265.2 million — nearly 33% of its \$810 million total income the supposedly non-profit group made. In fact, PPFA continues to make a profit, Selak explained. "For the 18th year in a row,

(continued on page 6)

RIGHT TO LIFE COMMITTEE
OF NEW MEXICO
2800 San Mateo Blvd. NE
Suite 107
Albuquerque, NM 87110-3166

NON-PROFIT
ORGANIZATION
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Albuquerque, NM
Permit #471

RETURN SERVICE REQUESTED

Planned Parenthood...

(cont. from page 5)

Planned Parenthood turned a net profit. This year's \$35.2 million brings its total profits over the 16 years to \$538 million," he indicated. Meanwhile, private donations dropped for the second time in three years.

Post Note: In New Mexico, Medicaid pays for RU-486 abortions. Also, isn't it interesting that the number of abortions done in the U.S. has declined. It's clear that Planned Parenthood's increased abortions show who is the enemy of life.

Source: LifeNews.com
December 17, 2004.

PAMPERED CHEF PARENT CORPORATION STOPS PLANNED PARENTHOOD FUNDING

On July 3, 2003, Berkshire Hathaway, the corporation founded by billionaire investment guru Warren Buffet, announced that it will cease funding Planned Parenthood. For the pro-life advocates working at Pampered Chef who had been fighting the donations since the company was sold to Buffet's company, the decision is a full-fledged victory.

Source: Pro-Life Infonet,
July 8, 2003

*Small opportunities are often the
beginning of great enterprises.*

Five A live PROGRAM

RTLNCNM hopes you will sign up for the *Five Alive Program 2005*, which helps provide a budget to keep our organization operational and meet our basic needs. You can fill out the form below. We will need this a.s.a.p. so that we can mail envelopes out and have you ready to start contributing your tax-deductible donation in January. \$5.00 a month from everyone would allow us to raise money for media and other educational tools, so come on board by sending in the form below...

I wish to donate \$5.00 monthly I wish to donate \$_____ monthly

Monthly thank you notes will not be sent.

Name _____ Phone _____

Address _____

City, State, Zip _____

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

I understand that the Right To Life Committee of New Mexico (RTLNCNM) is a non-sectarian, non-profit organization dedicated to the right to life of all innocent human beings from fertilization to natural death; that this organization takes a stand only on those issues that are directly related to abortion, infanticide and euthanasia.

I support the goals of RTLNCNM, including a Human Life Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, and hereby make application for membership (renewal) as follows:

- Individual — \$20.00
 Corporate — \$40.00 - for business organizations
 Family — \$30.00
 NRL News Subscription (\$5.00 with paid membership)

Name _____

Address _____

City/Zip _____

Wish to: (check one)

- Register to vote
 Re-register

I am a registered: (check one)

- Republican Democrat
 Other

Signature Required

VIVA LIFE! is published by the Right To Life Committee of New Mexico, 2800 San Mateo NE, Suite 107, Albuquerque, NM 87110-3166. Phone: 881-4563. Larry Uhrich, Pres.; Charlene Comba, V.Pres.; Connie Johnson, Sec.; Verna Pochop, Treas.; Dauneen Dolce, National Delegate; Editor: Dauneen Dolce. *VIVA LIFE!* is printed by The Sherwood Co., Inc.