



Visit Our Website at:
www.rtlcnm.org

NEWSLETTER OF THE RIGHT TO LIFE COMMITTEE OF NEW MEXICO

**VOTE PRO-LIFE –
YOUR LIFE MAY DEPEND UPON IT!**

Our endorsement sheet is enclosed once more so that you will support our candidates for both National and State elections. If you don't know your state or house districts, look on your voter registration card or call the county clerk. *Each and every vote is important!* Help these good men and women help you by voting for them to be in the office where they can work for you and the pro-life cause.

BORN TO RUN



Run, Walk, jog, or crawl in Born To Run 2008 on November 8, 2008, at Balloon Fiesta Park in Albuquerque. Bring the entire family, as we will have additional activities for the kids, including a balloon jump. Born To Run is more than just a run or walk. It's more than just a fundraiser.

It's a statement to our elected leaders that there are many New Mexicans who will stand up for the victims of abortion, infanticide, and euthanasia. As more people attend Born To Run, our elected leaders will definitely take notice that we are a force to be reckoned with. It is also a great excuse to meet your fellow pro-lifers from around the state. You don't have to be a competitive runner, or even a runner, to participate. We have many walkers join use. So whether you run a five-minute mile or walk a 20 minute mile, we hope to see you there. Groups (e.g. Knights of Columbus, County RTL chapters, etc.) that would like to walk together behind their organizational banner are encouraged to do so. If you have misplaced your runner brochure from last month's *Viva Life*, you can download the application form from our website at www.rtlnm.org (feel free to make additional copies as needed), you can pre-register online at www.active.com, or you can register the morning of the run starting at 7:30 a.m. Register early to guarantee a T-shirt. Questions? Call the State Office at 881-4563. Join us to have a wonderful time with some of the best people in the state. Hope to see you there!

MOVING NEEDS



As has been mentioned in previous editions of *Viva Life*, RTLNCNM's state office will be moving to a new location starting November 15, 2008. The new office offers much-needed space to accommodate our organization's growing responsibilities. Consequently, we'll need office furniture and accessories to enable the office to continue to operate at maximum efficiency. If you know of a business that is moving or going out of business that would like to donate (and get a tax write

off) their gently used desk(s), chair(s), bookcase(s), file cabinets, etc., please have them contact our State Office at 505-881-4563. Thank you for your help.

WHAT THE PARTY PLATFORMS SAY

by Dauneen Dolce

RTLNCNM Political Action Committee Chair

Having been a delegate to several national conventions, I know that the platforms reflect the philosophy of the Republican and Democrat candidates. So it is important for people to know about the planks that deal with pro-life issues. To find out about other issues, you probably will find the planks on the websites of each party.

On pro-life issues, the differences can be no greater than these two platforms.

DEMOCRAT PLANK

The Democrat Party strongly and unequivocally supports Roe vs. Wade and a woman's right to choose a safe and legal abortion, regardless of ability to pay, and we oppose any and all efforts to weaken or undermine that right.

The Democrat Party also strongly supports access to comprehensive, affordable family planning services and age-appropriate sex education, which empower people to make informed choices and live healthy lives. We also recognize that such healthcare and education help reduce the number of unintended pregnancies and thereby also reduce the need for abortions.

REPUBLICAN PLANK

Because the UN has no mandate to promote radical social engineering, any effort to address global social problems must respect the fundamental institutions of marriage and family. We assert the rights of families in all international programs and will not fund organizations involved in abortion. We strongly support the long-held policy of the Republican Party known as the "Mexico City Policy," which prohibits federal monies from being given to non-governmental organizations that provide abortion or actively promote abortion as a method of family planning in other countries. We reject any treaty or agreement that would violate those values. That includes the UN Convention on Woman's Rights signed in the last months of the Carter Administration and the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.

We lament that judges have denied the people their right to set abortion policies in the states and are undermining traditional marriage laws from coast to coast. Because the family is our basic unit of society, we fully support parental rights to consent to medical treatment for their children, including mental health treatment, drug treatment, alcohol

What the Party Platforms Say... (continued from page 1)

treatment, and treatment involving pregnancy, contraceptives, and abortion.

We oppose school-based clinics that provide referrals, counseling, and related services for abortion and contraceptive. Schools should not ask children to answer offensive or intrusive personal non-academic questionnaires without parental consent.

We oppose using public revenues to promote or perform abortion and will not fund organizations that advocate it. We support the appointment of judges who respect traditional family values and the sanctity and dignity of innocent human life.

At its core, abortion is a fundamental assault on the sanctity of innocent human life. Women deserve better than abortion. Every effort should be made to work with women considering abortion to enable and empower them to choose life. We salute those who provide them alternatives, including pregnancy care centers, and we take pride in the tremendous increase in adoptions that has followed Republican legislative initiatives.

Respect for Life requires efforts to include persons with disabilities, employment, the justice system, and civic participation. In keeping with that commitment, we oppose the non-consensual withholding of care and treatment from people with disabilities, as well as the elderly and infirm, just as we oppose euthanasia and assisted suicide, which endanger especially those in the margins of society.

BARACK OBAMA TRIES TO DECEIVE THE AMERICAN PUBLIC

On the third televised debate between John McCain and Barack Obama, the issue of partial-birth abortion and the rights of infants who survive abortions was finally discussed. The response by Barack Obama was highly misleading, according to Douglas Johnson, longtime legislative director for the National Right to Life Committee (NNLC). His response to Osama's answer:

The Illinois Born-Alive infants Protection Act (BAIKPA) was a simple three-sentence bill to establish that every baby who achieved "complete expulsion or extraction" from the mother, and who showed defined signs of life, was to enjoy the legal protections of a "person." As a state Senator, Obama led the opposition to this bill in 2000, 2002, and 2003. On March 13, 2003, Obama killed the bill at a committee meeting over which he presided as chairman. In the October 15 debate, Obama said, "The fact is that there was already a law on the books in Illinois that required providing lifesaving treatment." This claim is highly misleading. The law "on the books," 720 ILCS 510.6, on its face, applies only where an abortionist declares before the abortion that there was a "reasonable likelihood of sustained survival of the fetus outside the womb." But humans are often born alive a month or more before they reach the point where such "sustained survival" – that is, long-term survival – is likely or possible (which is often called the point of "viability"). When Obama

spoke against the BAIPA on the Illinois Senate floor in 2001 - the only senator to do so – he didn't even claim that the BAIPA was duplicative of the existing law. Rather, he objected to defining what he called a "preivable fetus" as a legal "person" – even though the bill clearly applied only to fully born infants. These events are detailed in an August 28, 2008 NRLC White Paper titled "Barack Obama's Action and Shifting Claims on the Protection of Born-Alive Aborted Infants – and Why They Tell Us About His Thinking on Abortion," which contains numerous hyperlinks to primary sources.

Because 720 ILCS 510.6 gives complete discretion to the abortionist himself, and because a 1993 consent decree issued by a federal court nullified key provisions (such as the definition of "born alive"), the law was so riddled with loopholes as to be virtually unenforceable, even with respect to babies who had clearly achieved the capacity for long-term survival. Obama opposed these bills too. On April 4, 2002, Obama opposed a bill (SB 1563) that would have more strictly defined the circumstances under which the presence of a second physician (to care for a live-born baby) would be required during a post-viability abortion. Obama argued that this would "burden the original decision of the woman and the physician to induce labor and perform an abortion...{I}ts important to understand that this issue ultimately is about abortion and not live births."

In the debate, Obama said that the state BAIPA "would have helped to undermine *Roe vs. Wade*." To evaluate this claim, one must examine the actual language of the BAIPA. The original 2001 bill was only three sentences long; the third sentence was as follows: "(c) A live child born as a result of an abortion shall be fully recognized as a human person and accorded immediate protection under the law." As recently as August 19, 2008, the Obama campaign issued a memo in which it singled out that sentence as "Language Clearly Threatening *Roe*." This claim is consistent with Obama's 2001 argument that a "preivable fetus" should not be regarded as a person, even when born alive.

At the March 13, 2003 committee meeting over which Obama presided, the "immediate protection" clause was removed and replaced with the "neutrality clause" copied from the federal BAIPA, which said explicitly that the bill had no bearing on the legal status of any human "prior to being born alive." Obama then led the committee Democrats in voting down the bill, anyway.

He just didn't tell the truth, but the facts are there and can be authenticated on FactCheck.org and Politifact.org, which agrees with NRLC. Here are a few other facts and quotes people should contemplate.

Barack Obama is a co-sponsor of the "Freedom of Choice Act." If passed, it would overturn virtually all pro-life legislation, make partial-birth abortion legal again, require taxpayer-funding for abortion, and strike down essentially all limitations on abortion, including parental involvement laws.

"With one more vacancy on the Court, we could be looking at a majority hostile to a woman's fundamental right to choose for the first time since *Roe vs. Wade*, and that is what is at stake in this election."

“I put Roe at the center of my lesson plan on reproductive freedom when I taught Constitutional law.”

“Throughout my career, I’ve been a consistent and strong supporter of reproductive justice and have consistently had a 100% pro-choice rating with Planned Parenthood and NARAL Pro-Choice America.”

“I am pro-choice. I believe in *Roe v. Wade*.”

“The first thing I’d do as president is sign the Freedom of Choice Act.”

I DON’T UNDERSTAND!

by Dauneen Dolce

RTLNCM Political Action Committee Chair

This election year has shown some conflicting pro-life actions and attitudes that have me greatly confused. In the presidential election of all presidential elections, we have not had a united front in the pro-life movement. We have to struggle with those who should be supporting our efforts.

First, getting volunteers to help in political activities was not what it should have been under the circumstances. With the possibility of losing 35 years of hard work to establish pro-life laws and to come so close to overturning *Roe vs. Wade*, you would have thought that pro-life supporters would be breaking down the door to protect these advances and to assure future ones. You would think they would consider their families and the moral climate that can only get worse.

One of the activities that RTLNCM does for National RTL, whose Political Action Committee (PAC) endorses federal candidates, is literature drops at Catholic churches in New Mexico. These churches are targeted because the Catholic Church opposes abortion and euthanasia.

In New Mexico, most Catholics are Democrats. They will vote their party line unless they are informed about the positions of the candidates on abortion. There is such a clear choice on this issue that National RTL has endorsed John McCain and is supporting Steve Pearce, Ed Tinsley, Darren White, and Dan East. They know how critical this election is.

We don’t coordinate this with any pastor, as we do not want to put the church at risk for losing its tax-exempt status. We also know that the parking lot has been ruled by the Supreme Court to be public parking on weekends, as the church is inviting people to attend their masses. We also know that distribution of political literature is freedom of speech. Thus, this activity is perfectly legal and necessary, since many people are not aware of the positions and voting records of these candidates.

However, the Conference of Bishops sent a letter that was distributed to all pastors across the nation that said what we were doing is illegal and puts the church at risk. This is just not true. Our attorneys, and there are many who are well aware of Supreme Court ruling, such as James Bopp Jr., General Council of National RTL, has shared this information with the Bishops who choose to ignore it.

What happened after this is most unfortunate. The Catholic Church has been part of the army to stop the culture of death in our country. We have been allies at the federal and state level in either trying to stop anti-life legislation or

to promote pro-life legislation. Now the Church leadership in the United States decided to unarm National RTL and its chapters throughout the United States in our war against evil. This evil is beyond any election. It is beyond abortion. It is the evil that has created the culture of death that exists and is growing.

All that was being shared are facts that can be proven. It didn’t force anyone to do anything but did give the information they were not likely to get anywhere else, such as on TV, in newspapers, or other common sources of information. In fact, what have provided are many lies and distortions.

A long time ago, Archbishop Robert Sanchez told me that I wasn’t just to save babies but the souls of the people in our state. This is what the literature drop was about. We want to stop abortion. We want our president and congress to make laws to protect innocent human life. We want to share the truth. And, yes, we want to prevent people from putting their souls in jeopardy by voting for someone who supports killing the most innocent of all, the unborn baby. To vote for someone who will continue and probably increase this killing is to aid and abet murder. They are ignoring their churches precepts, but more important they are ignoring their GOD! This is true for anyone in any church or religion who actively works for those who will kill, destroy, and do harm to women, families, society, and that tiny baby who cannot speak for herself/himself.

For those who do not have a religious affiliation of any sort, we want to prevent you from ignoring the constitutional right of life for that child and other vulnerable unwanted people. Our Declaration of Independence says all men are created equal with the inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. These people need to protect themselves from being “not wanted” at some time in their lives; they must support this philosophy and constitutional commitment.

So why were we harassed in many areas in the state? Why were many in the church so mad at what we did? We were only telling the truth. We were only doing what would compliment their pro-life messages from the pulpit (if there was one), and we were trying to guide the conscience of their parishioners to do the right thing.

Many volunteers became fearful or questioned what we were doing. Most were not and bravely carried out their project with faith and perseverance. We must have faith in what we are trying to do. Fear is a tool of the devil. We will make people angry because we do have the truth. Evil does not like the truth. Fear is our enemy as well as pride. Faith is our salvation.

So for those who helped in this activity – you will be blessed. For those who didn’t volunteer but could have, you may pay the price in ways you never thought of. And for those who tried to be an impediment to our activity, justice will come. I am not mad at the priests, who mostly ignored us, but at the bishops who are to lead the sheep and did not. Had the people in the Catholic Church been guided to the truths of its faith and guided to vote pro-life, we would not have had to be in that parking lot. There was a situation where the parishioners objected to a sign on the church parking lot that says “Vote Pro-life.” These parishioners haven’t a clue about their faith or God. In this election, the bishops did not have faith! Words are great, but without actions to support them,

they can become hollow. RTLCNM DID NOT BREAK THE LAW! We were trying to be a guiding light.

ABORTION AND SLAVERY – HISTORY REPEATS

by J. C. Willke, M.D.

Ever since *Roe vs. Wade* and *Doe vs. Bolton* decisions on abortion by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1973, spokesmen for the Right To Life movement have been comparing the abortion issue to slavery. They have pointed to the core analogy of legal personhood for Black Americans then and of unborn Americans today.

The 1973 decision has been compared to the *Dred Scott* decision of 1857. Its identical court majority of 7-2, its holdings, even the arguments justifying it then find almost exact echoes today in the abortion decisions.

Dred Scott was decided only three years before Lincoln's election and the onset of the Civil War. It attempted to settle, once and for all, the vexing slavery question. In judging the case of Mr. Dred Scott, a Black man from St. Louis, the U.S. Supreme Court certainly did clarify the issue. Black people, it ruled, were not legal persons; they were the property of the slave owner. He could buy, sell, or even kill them.

Abolitionists had objected. The ruling was outrageous, they said. It was immoral and discriminated against an entire class of living Americans solely on the basis of skin color. None other than Roger Taney, Chief Justice of the Court, and a chorus of others replied to them. So you folks have a different opinion? You object on moral and religious grounds to slavery? That is all right, they said. You abolitionists don't have to own a slave if you don't want to. No one is forcing you to own one, but don't force your morality on the slave owner. He has the "right to choose" to own slaves if he wishes. The Supreme Court has ruled this is a constitutionally protected right. It has so interpreted the Constitution. Slavery is legal.

The *Roe vs. Wade* decision has been seen as a direct parallel. It too was a 7 -2 decision by the Supreme Court. It too tried to settle a very vexing and controversial social issue. It too superseded existing state laws. Unborn people, it ruled, were not legal persons. They had no civil rights, no human rights. They were, henceforth, legally the property of the owner – the mother. She had the absolute legal right to keep or kill her unborn baby.

Pro-life people objected. This ruling was outrageous. It was immoral and discriminated against an entire class of living Americans solely on the basis of age (too young) and place of residence (still living in the womb). None other than Justice Blackman, *Roe's* author, and a chorus of others replied, so you folks have a different opinion? You object on moral or religious ground to abortion? You Right To Lifers don't have to have abortions if you don't want to. No one is forcing you to have one, but don't force your morality on the mother (the owner). She has a "right to choose" to kill her developing baby if she wishes. The Supreme Court has ruled this now a constitutionally protected right. It has so interpreted the Constitution. Abortion is legal.

Tragically, the high court never did reverse the *Dred Scott* decision. True, it was effectively demolished by the Civil War. Legally, however, it was only reversed by amendments to

the U.S. Constitution. The Thirteenth Amendment abolished slavery. The Fourteenth Amendment guaranteed civil rights. Finally, the Fifteenth Amendment tried to lock in the guarantee by giving the vote to Black men (women could not yet vote).

The parallel today is the Right To Life movement's dedicated push for a constitutional amendment to reverse the abortion decision. Its original hope for an amendment to abolish abortion and to guarantee civil rights to the unborn in a single amendment has given way to the acceptance of a multi-step approach by all but a small majority of the movement. The first step would be to reverse the abortion decisions.

In investigating the analogy between abortion and slavery is to reacquaint ourselves with the history of the time. Pro-slavery people were deeply indoctrinated with the defense of slavery as a positive good to both races and firm in the conviction that it must be protected and perpetuated. Further, they were convinced of the biological inequality and racial inferiority of Blacks and held positions as members of Congress, justices of the Supreme Court, and presidents of the United States. They held prominent positions in churches, colleges, and political parties. They exercised authority, within their spheres of influence, over the entire nation and helped to determine its policies, educational philosophy, and religious doctrines.

One cannot repeat too often that belief in the biologic inequality and racial inferiority of the "Negro" not only sustained slavery but also determined the attitude of the public, the zeal of law enforcement officials, the reasoning of judicial bodies, the efficiency of administrative functionaries, and the definition of policies by legislators. Legalized slavery enshrined this, prevented a practical demonstration of its falsity, and filled public offices and the councils of religious, educational, and political institutions with men reared in the atmosphere.

For decades our nation tolerated, indeed stoutly defended, an institution that embodied the theory that a whole race of people were biologically inferior to others. They formulated ingenious rationalizations for their conduct, devised legal barriers to its correction, and heaped indignities upon those who spoke out in protest. They challenged the right of free inquiry and discussion, and finally, tragically sent their own men out to kill each other when the political machinery broke down.

But did not a Black man bleed if cut? Did not a Black woman reproduce if fertilized? Were they not both alive and totally human? Your author is old enough to recall bi-racial blood banks in some states when he was in medical school, even though the pathologist in the laboratory could not tell the blood apart under the microscope.

Is the unborn child not alive? Will he or she not bleed? Is there not a heart beating at three weeks, one that can be heard by us at six to eight weeks? A fully intact tiny human boy or girl from fertilization? Most certainly so! We have no more excuse for calling the unborn child non-human today than our forefathers did for calling a Black man non-human then. Yet today's Supreme Court did just that. Lynn Jackson, great-great granddaughter of Dred Scott, understands abortion's injustice saying, "It is pretty violent. It is a baby, and life does begin at conception."

Rightly so, America ultimately came to reject the Supreme Court's flawed *Dred Scott* decision. Thankfully, mankind, regardless of color, is now protected under our constitution. Not long into the future, America will also ultimately come to reject the Supreme Court's flawed *Roe vs. Wade* decision. With it will come the constitutional protection of all innocent life from womb to tomb.

Jack Willke, M.D. is past president of The National Right To Life Committee and is now president and publisher of Life Issues Institute, Inc. He is also an OB/GYN doctor.

CHANNEL 27 CELEBRATE LIFE BROADCASTS – NOVEMBER SCHEDULE

Thursday, November 6 th	11:00 p.m. – Midnight - Life Talk
Thursday, November 13 th	11:00 p.m. – Midnight - Life Talk
Thursday, November 20 th	11:00 p.m. – Midnight - Life Talk
Thursday, November 27 th	11:00 p.m. – Midnight – Feminists for Life and Sex Sacrifices

Life Talk is a Pro-Life Monthly News.

ADULT STEM CELL TREATMENT RESTORES SIGHT TO NEARLY-BLIND PATIENTS

Six patients who thought that their eyesight had been irretrievably lost have had their eyesight restored through a new adult stem cell treatment. The six patients had lost their sight due to injuries to their limbal cells from accidental chemical burns or from a rare genetic disease known as uniria.

Limbal cells, found at the edge of the cornea, maintain the transparency of the cornea's outer layer. The corneas of the patients in question had become opaque, and blood vessels grew across their corneas causing painful inflammation and severely limited vision. The patients could barely tell when someone was waving a hand in front of their faces.

Researchers at Moorfields Eye Hospital in London, England grew limbal cells in the laboratory using stem cells from tissue donors. Surgeons transplanted the cells into 10 patients in late 2005. As of June 2008, six of those patients were able to read three to four lines down an eye chart. Nine additional patients who underwent the procedure in late 2007 have not yet had their recovery assessed.

Lead researcher Dr. Julie Daniels said the patients' eyesight could not be completely restored because the material on which the stem cells are being grown is not fully transparent. However, the results have generated excitement among researchers. Scientists at Moorfields are hoping to use adult stem cells to create small patches of retina cells, which detect light at the back of the eye, in order to treat other causes of blindness

Information provided by www.stemcellresearchreport.com
July-August 2008

THE SILENT SCREAM OF THE ASPARAGUS

by Wesley J. Smith

You just *knew* it was coming. At the request of the Swiss government, an ethics panel has weighed in on the "dignity" of plants and opined that the arbitrary killing of flora is morally wrong. This is no hoax. The concept of what could be called "plant rights" is being seriously debated.

A few years ago the Swiss added to their national constitution a provision requiring "account to be taken of the dignity of creation when handling animas, plants and other organisms." No one knew exactly what it meant, so they asked the Swiss Federal Ethics Committee on Non-Human Biotechnology to figure it out. The resulting report, "The Dignity of Living Beings with Regard to Plants" is enough to short circuit the brain.

A "clear majority" of the panel adopted what it called a "biocentric" moral view, meaning that "living organisms should be considered morally for their own sake because they are alive." Thus, the panel determined that we cannot claim "absolute ownership" over plants and, moreover, that "individual plants have an inherent worth." This means that "we may not use them just as we please, even if the plant community is not in danger or if our actions do not endanger the species or if we are not acting arbitrarily."

This committee offered this illustration. A farmer mows his field (apparently an acceptable action, perhaps because the hay is intended to feed the farmer's herd but the report doesn't say). But then, while walking home, he casually "decapitates" some wildflowers with his scythe. The panel decries this act as immoral, though its members can't agree why. The report states, opaquely: At this point it remains unclear whether this action is condemned because it expresses a particular moral stance of the farmer toward other organisms or because something bad is being done to *the flowers themselves*.

What is clear, however, is that Switzerland's enshrining of "plant dignity" is a symptom of a cultural disease that has infected Western civilization causing us to lose the ability to think critically and distinguish serious from frivolous ethical concerns. It also reflects the triumph of a radical anthropomorphism that views elements of the natural world as morally equivalent to people.

Why is this happening? Our accelerating rejection of the Judeo-Christian world view that upholds the unique dignity and moral worth of human beings is driving us crazy. Once we knocked our species off its pedestal, it was only logical that we would come to see fauna and flora as entitled to rights.

The intellectual elites were the first to accept the notion of "speciesism," which condemns as invidious discrimination treating people differently from animals simply because they are human beings. Then ethical criteria were needed for assigning moral worth to individuals, be they human, animal, or now vegetable.

Rising to the task, leading bioethicists argue that for a human, value comes from possessing sufficient cognitive abilities to be deemed a "person." This excludes the unborn, the newborn, and those with significant impairments, who, personhood theorists believe, do not possess the right to life

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



The Silent Scream...

(continued from page 5)

or bodily integrity. This thinking has led to the advocacy in prestigious medical and bioethical journals of using profoundly brain impaired patients in medical experimentation or sources of organs.

The animal rights movement grew out of the same poisonous soil. Animal rights ideology holds that moral worth comes with sentience or the ability to suffer. Thus, since both animals and humans feel pain, animal rights advocates believe that what is done to an animal should be judged morally as if it were done to a human being. Some ideologues even compare the Nazi death camps to normal practices of animal husbandry. For example, Charles Patterson wrote in *Eternal Treblinka* – a book specifically endorsed by People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals – that “the road to Auschwitz begins at the slaughterhouse.”

Eschewing humans as the pinnacle of “creation” (to borrow the term used in the Swiss constitution) has caused environmentalism – a concern to properly steward resources and protect pristine environs and endangered species – into a willingness to thwart human flourishing to “save the planet.” Indeed, the most radical “deep ecologists” have grown so virulently misanthropic that Paul Watson, the head of the Sea Shepherd Conservation Society, called humans “the AIDS of the earth” requiring “radical invasive therapy” in order to reduce the population of the earth to under a billion.

As for “plant rights,” if the Swiss model spreads, it may hobble biotechnology and experimentation to improve crop yields. As an editorial in *Nature News* puts it:

The {Swiss} committee has ...come up with few concrete examples of what type of experiment might be considered an unacceptable insult to plant dignity. The committee does not consider that genetic engineering of plants automatically falls into this category, but its majority view holds that it would if the genetic modification caused plants to “lose their independence” – for example by interfering with their capacity to reproduce.

One Swiss scientist quoted in the editorial worried that “plant dignity” provides “another tool for opponents to argue against any form of plant bio-technology” despite the hope it offers to improve crop yields and plant nutrition.

What folly! We live in a time of cornucopian abundance and plenty, yet countless human beings are malnourished, even starving. In the fact of this cruel paradox, worry about the purported rights is the true immorality.

POSTNOTE: Switzerland has legal abortion and euthanasia. People don't count.

Happy
Thanksgiving!

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

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.; Verna Pochop, Treas.; Daureen Dolce, National Delegate; Editor: Daureen Dolce. VIVA LIFE! is printed by The Sherwood Co., Inc.