



Visit Our Web Site At:
www.rtlnm.org



MARCH 2007
Vol. 25, No. 3

NEWSLETTER OF THE RIGHT TO LIFE COMMITTEE OF NEW MEXICO

WEBMASTER IS NEEDED

Do you have the qualifications, skills, and dedication to the pro-life cause to volunteer to be our Webmaster? This is a very important job, as our website must provide accurate information on the subjects of abortion, infanticide, euthanasia, assisted suicide, and stem cell research - subjects that need constant up-dating. Our website also covers events and at times fundraising. If you have time to volunteer for this important project, please contact Dauneen Dolce at 505-881-4563.

PETITION DRIVE TO OPPOSE EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH

RTLNM is continuing with the petition drive and asks that you help get more names to be used for the national level and any future action in our state legislature. However, if you copy a petition, it must be copied just like the original. Do not change the wording on the petition and make sure all the fields are copied. To get a copy, go to our web site www.rtlnm.org or send a stamped self addressed envelope to RTLNM, 2800 San Mateo Blvd NE, Suite 107, Albuquerque, NM 87110.

CONFERENCE BOOK PATRONS/ADS

This very important fundraiser to get us through to the summer months should have your support. It not only raises much needed income but creates a very important educational book. Please consider being a patron or advertiser.

If you need a patron or ad form, you may e-mail to info@rtlnm.org or call 505-881-4563. The deadline is March 9, 2007.

COMPUTER POSITION AVAILABLE

The State RTL office in Albuquerque has an opening for a part-time (approximately 20 hours a week) computer clerk. The majority of the work is data entry using our organization-specific software. Interested parties, please contact the State office at 505-881-4563.



Happy
St. Patrick's
Day!



Coming Events in 2007

→ The Right To Life Committee of New Mexico State Convention • March 24, 2007

Come and honor Congressman Steve Pearce for his many years of supporting the pro-life cause from the NM State Legislature to the U.S. Congress. For those who profess to be pro-life, this convention is a must! First, you can learn facts about the pro-life issues from many angles, and thus you can share this with others. We are all educators in our circles. Second, we have an opportunity to thank a strong pro-life supporter, Congressman Steve Pearce. His record of votes and his dedication to the cause should have all of us standing up and giving appreciation.

The Workshops cover very important topics.

1. **The Legislative process** covers many factors in getting pro-life bills passed or preventing pro-death bills from coming to fruition. It starts with the election of a politician, good legislation, and constituent support. What is done in New Mexico to "kill" our bills needs to be known, as well as guidance as to what can be done.

2. **Understanding Stem Cells** is needed to understand what is good and what is bad in this research. Knowing what to support and what to resist is very important to each and every one of us.

3. **Euthanasia Update** - The fastest growing anti-life philosophy and movement is euthanasia. What it is, how it affects each one of us, and what can be done to protect our elderly and handicapped citizens is very important.

Come - Listen and Learn! The Life You Save May Be Your Own!

→ National Right To Life Committee 2007 Convention June 14-16, 2007 in Kansas City, MO

As usual, NRL is bringing many workshops - 70 in three days - that cover all aspects of the pro-life issues of abortion, euthanasia, stem cell research, assisted suicide, workshops for chapters in the state, RU-486, Statistics and Polling, to mention a few.

It is a possibility that a bus could be chartered for New Mexico if there are enough people interested in attending. Contact the State office if you are interested. E-mail info@rtlcnm.org, call 505-881-4563 or mail to: RTLNM, 2800 San Mateo Blvd. NE Suite 107, Albuquerque, NM 87110.

What we know can change hearts and minds.

LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES TO DATE

Embryonic Stem Cell Research

Governor Richardson announced he was planning to submit legislation to raise funds for embryonic stem cell research in New Mexico. However, he never submitted a bill but decided to request the funding in a health bill via an appropriations request. This change took place because the Governor misread many of his own Democrats who opposed embryonic stem cell research. **Because of RTLNCM's efforts that included the gathering of petitions**, legislators were well educated on the subject and on their constituents' position. He also underestimated the Catholic Church's strong involvement in opposing embryonic stem cell research.

The appropriations request was going to be reduced from \$25 million to \$6 million, but several other major road blocks arose. First, no research can be done at any facility that receives federal funding due to the federal ban on embryonic stem cell research, which President Bush has upheld by vetoing bills that have passed supporting embryonic stem cell research. **Thank you, President Bush!** The other blockade was a bill that was passed in New Mexico in 1978 that is called The Maternal, Fetal, and Infant Experimentation Act banning all fetal experimentation.

On Sunday, February 18, 2007, SB 894 sponsored by Senator John Ryan (R) amending the Maternal, Fetal, and Infant Experimentation Act went to the Senate Public Affairs Committee. Had this bill passed, the State would have been in a position to be able to do embryonic stem cell research once the federal ban was removed. Fortunately, six of the eight committee members voted against this bill. **Please thank these members:** Senators Steve Komadina (R), Mary Kay Papen (D), Mary Jane Garcia (D), David Ullibarri (D), Steve Nevelle (R), and Gay Kernan (R). The two senators who supported the bill were Senators Dede Feldman (D) and Gerald y Ortiz (D). Mail letters to: Sen. __State Capitol, NM 87503. **Embryonic Stem Cell Research is not possible in New Mexico.**

Parental Notification Bill

HB 239 with co-sponsors Representatives Larry Larranaga (R) and Andrew Barreras (D), as well as additional sign-ons Representatives Manuel Herrera (D), Ernest Chavez (D), Nora Espinosa (R), Gloria Vaughn (R), and Diane Hamilton (R), went to the Consumer and Public Affairs Committee on February 1, 2007 where it was tabled by the four Democrats on the committee and supported by the three Republicans.

The four that voted to table the bill are Representatives Gail Chasey (D), Irvin Harrison (D), Antonio Maestas (D), and Al Park (D). Those who supported our bill were Representatives Tom Anderson (R), Nora Espinosa (R), and W. C. "Dub" Williams (R). The bill was tabled.

Many people came to testify, and for this we are grateful. The sad part is that one of the Democrats indicated he would support the bill and did not.

When you have two sponsors, both sponsors are present to explain the bill and to urge for its passage. Representative Larranaga did this. However, Representative Barreras did not show up, saying the committee he sat on would not let him go (something that does not happen, as sponsors of bills can always get away to present a bill or have the bill moved to another time). Unfortunately, it has come to our attention that the

committee Representative Barreras was on was dismissed almost an hour before HB239 was heard. It is hard to trust when such deception takes place.

SB 442 is co-sponsored by Senators Pete Campos (D) and Kent Craven (R) with sign-ons Senators David Ullibari (D), Phil Griego (D), Carlos Cisneros (D), William Sharer (R), Rod Adair (R), Clinton Harden (R), Steve Nevelle (R), Lee Rawson (R), and Mark Boitano (R). The bill was heard in Public Affairs on February 20, 2007. **We won in this committee by a vote of 4-3!!!!** Senators David Ullibari (D), Gay Kernan (R), Steve Komadina (R), and Steven Nevelle (R) voted for it. Senators Ingle (R) and Papen (D) were absent.

Many people came to testify, and after waiting a whole afternoon the bill was passed in the evening. It now will go to the Judiciary Committee; the results of that probably won't appear in this newsletter but in April's. However, if we have your accurate e-mail address, you will get information on the bill long before April. Send your e-mail address to info@rtlncm.org. If you didn't receive this newsletter by e-mail, we do not have your current e-mail address.

FEDERAL LEGISLATION

Arkansas

The State Agencies and Governmental Affairs Committee of the Arkansas House held a hearing on February 7, 2007 to vote on HJR 1002, a resolution that supporters claim would make Arkansas the 36th state to ratify the federal "Equal Rights Amendment" submitted to the states by Congress in 1972.

HJR 1002 is part of the so-called "three-state strategy," which is based on the premise that the U.S. Supreme Court was wrong in 1982 when it said that the 1972 ERA was dead because it had not obtained the required ratification from 38 states by the deadline established by Congress. A national organizer for the "three-state strategy" campaign is quoted in the *Kansas City Star* (February 7) explaining, "This is very much under the radar." According to the national pro-ERA newsletter *The ERA Campaigner* (Jan.31), "the hopes of ERA supporters all over the country are now high that the Arkansas legislature will ratify the ERA within the next few weeks."

The "three-state strategy" is an attempt to evade the requirements for amending the federal Constitution. When Congress proposed the federal ERA in 1972, it attached a seven-year deadline. Twenty-six of the ratifying state legislatures explicitly referred to that deadline in their ratifying resolution. Moreover, five of the 35 ratifying state legislatures rescinded their ratifications before the deadline.

Despite these facts, if three states adopt a resolution such as HJR 1002, Congress would be forced to vote on whether to declare the 1972 ERA as ratified. Whatever Congress does, the issues would ultimately be presented to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Similar ratification resolutions have been introduced this year in a number of other states that never ratified the 1972 ERA, including Arizona, Florida, Illinois, Missouri, and Mississippi.

The National RTL Committee and its state affiliates, including Arkansas RTL, are opposed to HJR 1002 and similar "resurrection resolutions" because the sweeping language of the proposed 1972 federal ERA would be used as a legal weapon against virtually all laws that

(continued on page 3)

regulate abortions, including laws that have survived scrutiny by federal courts under *Roe v. Wade*. In fact, state ERAs with similar language have already been used for such purposes in several states. For example, Connecticut and New Mexico are now under ERA-based court orders to pay for abortions under their State-funded Medicaid programs.

The New Mexico Supreme Court ruling (1) was based entirely on the ERA, (2) was unanimous, and (3) was a complete adoption of the legal interpretation of ERA.

NARAL, Planned Parenthood, ACLU, NOW, the League of Women Voters, and other pro-ERA groups submitted briefs to the court. Writing for the unanimous court, Justice Pamela Minzner wrote that “there is no comparable restriction on medically necessary services in relation to physical characteristics or conditions that are unique to men... {The restriction on funding abortions} undoubtedly singles out for less favorable treatment a gender-linked condition that is unique to women.”

The same analysis that limits abortion is by definition a form of sex discrimination and therefore impermissible under ERA and can be used to invalidate any federal or state restrictions that are specific to abortion, even limits on partial-birth abortions and third-trimester abortions (since these are sought “only by women”); federal and state “conscience laws” that protect medical professionals; and parental notification and consent laws. In fact, the ACLU “Reproductive Freedom Project” has published a booklet that encourages pro-abortion lawyers to use state ERAs as legal weapons against state parental notification and consent laws.

The Result of the Arkansas Vote

Supporters of the three-state strategy received a stunning setback as the Arkansas House committee killed the ratification resolution after 20 sponsors abandoned it.

In Arkansas, “Many ERA supporters were not candid with the legislators and that came back to bite them,” said Douglas Johnson, Legislative Director for National Right to Life Committee (NRLC), which opposes the 1972 ERA language. “Some lawmakers changed their minds once they learned how ERAs have been used to require tax funding of abortion in New Mexico and Connecticut. Some legislators also learned for the first time that the 1972 ERA contained a seven-year deadline and cannot be revived by any number of states....”

NOTE: It is a shame that New Mexico has to pay the penalty of its ERA being used to pay an ever-increasing number of Medicaid money for surgical and chemical (RU-486) abortions. However, it is good that our example is preventing others from moving forward in trying to get the ERA Amendment from being passed.

– Information provided by NRLC – February 7, 2007.

GRASSROOTS LOBBYING UNDER ATTACK

A coalition of inside-the-beltway special interest groups, funded in large part by liberal foundations, is working with the new Democratic leadership in Congress to enact laws that would restrict what they call “grassroots lobbying” – by which they mean organized efforts to motivate members of the public to communicate with their congressional representatives about pending legislation.

Under proposed new laws, many genuine grassroots organizations – including state-level pro-life and pro-family organizations – would be saddled with burdensome new registration, record keeping, and reporting requirements.

National RTL, a federation of 50 state Right To Life organizations, and many other grassroots organizations are fighting the proposals. The American Civil Liberties (ACLU) is also urging Congress to reject such regulations as infringements on rights protected by the First Amendment. NRLC Legislative Director Douglas Johnson commented, “The current campaign to restrict so-called ‘grassroots lobbying’ is another attempt by certain well-funded liberal elites to cripple genuine grassroots political movements, such as the pro-life movement, in order to increase their already powerful influence over officeholders. They want to enhance their own form of political influence, which depends heavily on the demonstrated willingness of many elements of the institutional news to relentlessly propagandize on behalf of every so-called ‘reform’ pushed by these special-interest groups. While the speech-regulation groups claim they want to make Congress less beholden to ‘special interests,’ in fact they push constantly for laws that would make officeholders more insulated from real constituents and more dependent on liberal elites, including the fat-cat foundation bosses who fund these groups and their allies in the news media.”

NRLC and its allies won an initial victory in the U.S. Senate on January 18 when the Senate voted 55-43 in favor of the Bennett Amendment, which stripped provisions to regulate so-called grassroots lobbying from an omnibus “ethics reform” bill.

However, pro-regulation groups such as Democracy 21 (headed by liberal activist Fred Wertheimer) and the OMB (Office of Management and Budget) controlled by representatives of labor unions and certain industries are redoubling their efforts. They are pushing the leaders of the newly installed Democratic House majority to restore grassroots lobbying provisions when the House considers ethics reform legislation soon.

The House Democratic leadership is expected to unveil its own version of ethics reform legislation around mid-February, and most observers expect the restrictions on grassroots lobbying will be part of their package. The provision that the Senate rejected defined grassroots lobbying as the voluntary efforts of members of the general public to communicate their own views on an issue to federal officials or to encourage other members of the general public to do the same. Under the provision, a group or individual who engaged in “paid efforts to stimulate grassroots lobbying” would have been forced to register with Congress as a federal lobbyist or even as a “grassroots lobbying firm” and to file complicated quarterly reports with Congress. This requirement would have applied, for example, to some paid staff members of state Right To Life organizations and many other citizen activists across the political spectrum.

The Senate provision made violations punishable by a civil fine of up to \$200,000 per infraction. “Corrupt” violations were punishable by up to 10 years in federal prison with the determination of whether a given violation was considered “corrupt” to be made by a U.S. Attorney, a federal political appointee.

The pro-regulation lobby seemed to regard the Senate’s adoption of the Bennett Amendment as an

(continued on page 4)

Federal Legislation... (continued from pg. 3)

unexpected but temporary setback. Craig Holman, a lobbyist for *Public Citizen*, told *National Journal*, "They succeeded narrowly in getting it {grassroots provision} removed in the Senate, but we are going to get it back in the House."

Note: If the House has not addressed this legislation by the time you get this newsletter, please contact your congressman/woman and ask them to pass the "Bennett Amendment" in the House. I say this while we still can, as I am asking you to lobby by writing letters, calls, faxes and e-mails. I hope I won't get arrested.

– Executive Director Dauneen Dolce

Addresses: Representatives Tom Udall, 1414 Longworth House Office Bldg; Steve Pearce, 1408 Longworth House Office Bldg; Heather Wilson, 318 Cannon House Office Bldg., all in Washington DC, 20510. Tele: Udall 202-225-6316; Pearce 202-225-2365; Wilson 202-225-6316. See individual web sites for more information.

POST ABORTION SYNDROME

It is sad to see the denial of this serious mental illness. There are many women who would benefit from our knowing and caring about those who have this affliction. It also benefits women to know ahead of time the possibility of their having this mental disorder after having an abortion.

While listening to testimony given on why we didn't need parental involvement, the subject of post abortion syndrome was denied. Hopefully we can share with these people and others that post abortion syndrome is not only real and creating much unhappiness in many women's lives, but it can lead to other disorders such as alcohol and drug abuse, the inability to have a normal relationship with a man, and even the possibility of suicide.

Is there a Post-Abortion Syndrome? Emily, Do You Really Need to Ask?

The title of the January 21 cover story in the *New York Times Magazine*, "Is there a Post-Abortion Syndrome?" suggests the article will address the strength of the available scientific evidence on the topic, which has obvious bearing on recent and future legislation. Instead, what Emily Bazelon, granddaughter of pro-abortion judge David L. Bazelon and the cousin of pro-abortion feminist Betty Friedan, offers is an unconvincing circuitous voyage around the recent and rapidly accumulating scientific evidence that clearly shows the negative psychological consequences of abortion.

Dr. Priscilla Coleman, who was interviewed by Ms. Bazelon and briefly mentioned in the article, was disturbed by what she considers "out-right misrepresentation of the science by a reporter who was given the evidence and clearly understood it."

Bazelon writes, "The idea that abortion is at the root of women's psychological ills is not supported by the bulk of research." She offers this conclusion early in her lengthy essay after having received from Dr. Coleman an overview of the more than dozen studies published just since 2002 by the *Bowling Green State University Researcher* and her colleagues suggesting otherwise.

Dr. Coleman said these studies address many of the methodological problems that plagued earlier research. The newer wave of research has strengths that more definitely pinpoint abortion as the culprit in many women's mental health problems.

Dr. Coleman noted that Bazelon also failed to mention a recent study by David Fergusson. He and his colleagues found strong association between abortion and anxiety, depression, substance use, and suicide ideation. As a self-described "pro-choice" researcher, Fergusson's result has sent shockwaves.

Had Bazelon shared Fergusson's results with her readers, she could not have so easily shrugged off the vast literature in highly respected academic journals, dismissing them as the working of biased pro-life researchers with a political agenda.

In addition to ignoring the studies that clearly indicate abortion poses serious risks to women, Bazelon uses the now familiar strategy of focusing on older, small scale, scientifically flawed studies.

For example, Bazelon claimed rates of depression in women who abort are not significantly different from depression rates found in pregnant women, citing a study by pro-choice researcher Brenda Major and colleagues. But Dr. Coleman noted that the authors themselves made no such claim.

Instead, Major noted that the rate of depression observed in women who have aborted is similar to that observed in the general population (not in pregnant women). General population statistics are based on life-time prevalence rates as opposed to being event based.

A study by Schmiede and Russo published in the *British Medical Journal* and held as proof of the safety of abortion is highly problematic as well, according to Dr. Coleman. They excluded women, who at some point prior to the decision to abort, indicated that they wanted their pregnancy. Numerous studies show that women who are ambivalent about the decision to abort are at higher risk for post-abortion mental health problems.

The researchers also removed a large group of vulnerable women and underreported negative outcomes. Their results do not speak to the typical woman choosing abortion, according to Dr. Coleman. There were other blatant methodological weaknesses in this study as well.

According to Dr. Coleman, Bazelon's article includes the insulting suggestion that women use a past abortion as an excuse for other problems in their lives or have been cajoled into feeling bad by the pro-life community. Bazelon not only refuses to sincerely acknowledge their pain but also has methodically set out to obscure the suffering that she knows all too well exists in women who have aborted.

Bazelon's bias is blatantly obvious elsewhere in the story, according to Dr. Coleman. Most notably, Bazelon spends pages describing her experiences interviewing one post-abortion counselor at the expense of reviewing the science. With an air of disbelief and condescending tone, she takes us into the woman's world, a woman who shares her response to her own abortion, her faith, and her efforts to reach out to other women.

Dr. Coleman believes that instead of using the prestigious pages of the *New York Times Magazine* to offer a balanced piece, which would include conveying understanding and hope, Bazelon belittles hundreds of thousands of women who struggle to overcome the

(continued on page 5)

Post-Abortion Syndrome...

(continued from pg. 4)

consequences of abortion, women who are courageous enough to speak in their efforts to recover and help others do the same.

It is worth mentioning that Bazelon does not have a degree in psychology, medicine, social work, or any field that would provide the necessary training to evaluate the scientific literature to understand the personal trauma of abortion.

The account Bazelon wrote, Dr. Coleman says, flies in the face of the experiences of millions of post-abortive women.

— Information provided by NRLC

UCLA Psychiatrist: Profession Must Acknowledge Abortion Hurts Women Los Angeles, CA

A UCLA psychiatrist says more should be done to help women who suffer from mental health problems following an abortion. While not acknowledging the full range of problems women suffer, she said the mental health profession needs to acknowledge that a large number of women have serious post-abortion issues.

Dr. Miriam Grossman sat down with Kathryn Jean Lopez of *National Review* for an interview about her latest book, "Unprotected: A Campus Psychiatrist Reveals How Political Correctness in Her Profession Endangers Every Student." Grossman says she wrote the book in part to "highlight the existence of an invisible group: women (and men) with emotional scars from an abortion. "They are out there in numbers; many must seek support from networks outside our mental-health system," she said. "This is because although individual practitioners may be sensitive to the trauma of abortion, the mental-health establishment denies it exists." As a psychiatrist, Grossman criticized "the refusal of my profession to formally acknowledge and reach out to those who suffer with severe emotional disorders following an abortion."

— [LifeNews](#) - December 21, 2006

American Psychological Association Pulls Briefing Paper from Website Denying Abortion/Depression

The American Psychological Association (APA) publicly dismissed the idea of a link between abortion and depression, and many in the abortion lobby used the APA's declaration as justification for their own denials of the link.

However, now that a major New Zealand study undertaken by a self-described "pro-choice" researcher has found strong evidence of the link, the APA rebuttal has quietly disappeared from the group's website. Study author David M. Fergusson singled out the APA by name for criticism.

Fergusson found that among the young women he studied, "those having an abortion had elevated rates of subsequent mental health problems including depression, anxiety, suicidal behaviors and substance abuse disorders."

Fergusson's work was hardly the first to find a negative aftermath. Various studies and surveys have found a connection between abortion and a host of subsequent psychological and social disorders and dysfunctions. They range from anxiety, emotional numbing, and depression to substance abuse, intrusion events (flashbacks, nightmares) and suicidal ideation, a cluster of common post-

traumatic stress reactions some have identified as "post-abortion syndrome."

In 1984, research therapist Anne Speckhard interviewed 30 women who were identified as having difficult reactions to their abortion experiences. Ninety-two percent reported feelings of depression. A larger survey conducted by the Elliot Institute of 260 women reporting negative abortion reactions found 88.2% reporting feeling depression after their abortions.

As results began to be publicized and debated, the APA convened a panel of experts in 1989 to examine and assess women's psychological responses to abortion. Two interesting things about this move should be noted.

First, the APA already had a strong position in favor of abortion. As early as 1969, it argued that abortion should be considered as a "civil right of the pregnant woman," a position reaffirmed multiple times since.

Second, the panel of experts assembled by the APA had a decidedly pro-abortion tilt. It included Henry David, Nancy Adler, Brenda Major, Nancy Russo, and others who either had already publicly expressed strong pro-abortion positions or established one through their articles or statements.

Not surprisingly, the report by the panel, published in *American Psychologist* in October 1992, declared the "best studies available on psychological responses to unwanted pregnancy terminated by abortion in the United States suggest that severe negative reactions are rare, and they paralleled those following other normal life stresses." Though individual factors and previous psychological history may affect how a particular woman reacts, the authors said that the evidence shows that "abortion is usually psychologically benign."

Arguments in the scientific literature have gone back and forth. People like Major and Russo hit back hard whenever pro-lifers published studies linking abortion and depression or other negative social or psychological sequelae.

Armed with data from Russo and others, the APA put out a "Briefing Paper on the Impact of Abortion on Women" in March 2004 claiming that "[w]ell designed studies of psychological responses following abortion have consistently shown that risk of psychological harm is low." It said that rates of disorders, including depression and post-traumatic stress disorder, were lower, not higher, in post-abortion women compared to the rest of the population. Moreover, it also claimed that psychological measures were within normal bounds for both adults and minors after an abortion.

Pro-Abortion groups have cited the APA's position as proof that there was no such thing as post-abortion syndrome and that there was no link between abortion and depression. NARAL declared that "The American Psychological Association, the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, and other groups with medical and health expertise have investigated the alleged existence of 'post-abortion stress' or 'post-abortion trauma.' None has found it to exist."

However, the arrival of the large, well-designed New Zealand study by David Fergusson in January 2006 definitively linking abortion and depression has thrown pro-abortion groups and their political allies for a loop. Fergusson, who is "pro-choice," singles out APA for criticism.

Quoting from the APA's Briefing Paper that stated that

(continued on page 6)

**RIGHT TO LIFE COMMITTEE
OF NEW MEXICO**

2800 San Mateo Blvd. NE
Suite 107
Albuquerque, NM 87110-3166

RETURN SERVICE REQUESTED

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

Post-Abortion... (cont. from page 5)

well-designed studies show the risk of psychological harm from abortion as being low, saying "This relatively strong conclusion about the absence of harm from an abortion was based on a relatively small number of studies, which had one or more of the following limitations: a) absence of comprehensive assessment of mental disorders; b) lack of comparison groups; and c) limited statistical controls." Fergusson also chided the group for a statement that "appears to disregard the findings of a number of studies that claimed to show negative effects for abortion." He specifically cited Jesse Cogle, David Reardon, and Priscilla Coleman who have previously done research on abortion and depression, as well as work by Finnish researcher Mika

Gissler, who found higher suicide rates among aborting women.

The New Zealand study had a ripple effect, enough to prompt 15 of Britain's top obstetricians and psychiatrists to send an open letter to the *London Times*. In it they said that "Since having an abortion can no longer be said to have a low risk of suffering from psychiatric conditions such as depression, doctors have a duty to advise about long-term adverse psychological consequences of abortion" (*London Times*, October 27, 2006).

In that letter it was mentioned that the American Psychological Association has withdrawn an official statement on its website denying a link between abortion and psychological harm. The website now says, "This fact sheet is currently being updated."

Five Alive PROGRAM

RTLNCNM hopes you will sign up for the *Five Alive Program 2007*, 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. Betty Eichenseer, Pres.; Dr. Frank Maldonado, V.Pres.; Connie Johnson, Sec.; John Ewing, Treas.; Dauneen Dolce, National Delegate; Editor: Dauneen Dolce. **VIVA LIFE!** is printed by The Sherwood Co., Inc.