



Visit Our Web Site At:
www.rtlnm.org

VIVA



LIFE

JULY 2007
Vol. 25, No. 7

NEWSLETTER OF THE RIGHT TO LIFE COMMITTEE OF NEW MEXICO



JULY 4, 1776 THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness – that to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the Consent of the Government.

These great words written by Thomas Jefferson and from which much of our Constitution received its direction in its creation are now being ignored. The result is many unborn children, the elderly, and those who are mentally and physically challenged are now not treated as a citizen or are second class citizens. Let us look at these words and when done talk to others so they can learn what this great country did and must again do to value all human life.

"Self-Evident Truth" - this means it is always to be. It is not based on opinions, feelings, or interpretation by a few to change society to meet their needs.

"Unalienable Right to Life" - exists independently from what others want, be it government, the judicial branch, or the convenience of individuals who wish to ignore this essential part of all of us.

The government drives its "just Powers from the consent of the Governed" - The founding fathers believed in "the capability of a people to govern themselves." Roe vs. Wade was not created by the governed. Terry Schiavo was not allowed to have the people of Florida address her problem. Now government wants to tell us what health care we can have or not have.

The reason for government is "to secure these Rights." The Constitution is the instrument for the implementation of the Declaration of Independence. Thus, judges are not free to ignore the principles laid down in the Declaration of Independence. Government may not work "around" the Constitution, and the people of The United States of America will never be safe or respected unless we value what our forefathers had the foresight to put in place that values each and everyone of us.

We must demand our politicians and our judges get back to basics and truth.

OTHER WORDS THAT MATTER

While it is necessary to criticize our governments, judges, and those who work against our Declaration of Independence and Constitution, it is also necessary to see what our own role has been to change the course of the vision taken by our forefathers.

Right as defined by the dictionary is something that is correct, just, proper, or honorable. It can be a just action or decision. It is something (as a power or privilege) to which one has a just or lawful claim.

Of course, the unborn should have the right to life. However, we who have been born have rights that we

choose to ignore. When we talk about the government, we are talking about ourselves. We are the government. The government we have has been selected through the voting process and from that the judiciary, when not voted upon directly, is chosen by those we put in office with our votes.

Do we vote? Few of us participate in the voting process that was created for us by the same forefathers who created the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence so that we could have a government of the people and by the people. Many have forsaken the "right" to vote. How do we vote? Are we educated on the issues and the candidates' positions on all the issues? Do we sort assertions from fact? Or are we "schmoozed" by fancy rhetoric? Do we put allegiance to a party or a

(continued on page 2)

GUEST EDITORIAL

by Charlene Comba, State Board Director

BEGGING LETTER vs FUN FUNDRAISER

All of you dedicated, committed, pro-lifers raise your hand if you like begging letters!! Hmm, small showing. Okay, all of you pro-lifers raise your hand if you like a fun fundraiser!!! Wow! Much better. Now, with that raised hand grab your phone and dial 505-821-9101.

This is the home of John and Betty Eichenseer, who for the last five summers have forfeited their time to oversee the most successful fundraiser ever: concessions at the Isotopes games. No summer vacation for these folks, and thanks to them plus a hardy group of volunteers the Right to Life Committee of NM is better off for this effort. The money raised has helped us maintain our budget.

What if all of you reading this newsletter called to help??!! The more folks willing to spend a few hours at a ballpark with other great, dedicated pro-lifers would give us the opportunity to make more funds!! That, in turn, will keep the newsletters coming, make certain the office is open, staffed, and fellow citizens are educated about the life issues we all care about.

One volunteer, Heather, was the ONLY worker at Stand 6 one Sunday night, and she pulled in \$2,000.00!!!. That same night at Stand 1, a small crew of 13, taking no breaks, worked non-stop and rang up over \$8,000.00 at the registers. Net income for RTLNM for that one night was over \$850.00. Better than cutting a check in response to a begging letter.

Call John and Betty. The small group of dedicated volunteers needs help. If all of you work just one game or maybe a couple of games, we could raise enough money so that RTLNM could expand the organization and thus do a great deal more to educate our people in New Mexico on pro-life issues that affect their lives. Bring some family, friends, or church members and have fun.

OR, if you prefer begging letters, then just ignore the previous invitation for fun and fellowship.

charismatic candidate above principle? Do we pull a lever or make an X without thought or conscience so that we vote away the inalienable right to life given to all of us?

Freedom is defined as the quality of the state of being free: independence, a political right. Are we "free" in this nation? Probably more than most nations, but there are policies, regulations, and laws that have been unjustly made that are not independent from us. In New Mexico, we pay taxes for abortions that kill the unborn baby who has an unalienable right to life. Is the baby who dies free, or are those paying to kill him or her free? What choices have we sacrificed? What have we gained when we sacrifice freedoms?

In the dictionary responsibility says the quality of a state of being responsible or something for which one is responsible. It says that responsible is 1) liable to be called upon to answer for one's acts or decisions; 2) able to fill one's obligations: reliable, trustworthy; 3) able to choose for one's self between right and wrong; 4) involving accountability for important duties.

The question has to be begged, are we a responsible nation with responsible people? We can clearly say there is much to be desired. We have a society too often that works on self-centeredness and produces little to advance our culture or carry out our history. Rights are subjugated to "what feels good for me is my right" Thus, we have children who are not responsibly raised by parents who many times don't take their responsibilities as they should. This creates families in trouble, separated, and in despair. Schools reflect what happens when there are irresponsible families and children. In turn, they act and live not taking responsibility in their lives.

Is it a wonder that politicians, people in religion, the medical field, teachers, the press, even those in sports don't want to take responsibility? We want to blame others, but we personally don't want to take responsibility for what our country has become.

Duty in the dictionary says is conduct due to parents or superiors: 1) respect; 2) the action taken by one's occupation or position; 3) assigned service or business; 4) a moral or legal obligation.

Each and every one of us has a duty, whether we are a parent, grandparent, or a family member, an employer or politician, or an average person to preserve what our forefathers provided at the cost of their lives and fortune. They understood the moral and legal obligation and the assigned service they were given.

We must respect life, and we have a duty to defend it. We have the freedom to do this, and we have the responsibility. Responsibility is the other side of the coin called Freedom. Duty is the other side of the coin of Right. When our nation and each of us as individuals give the time, money, prayers, and energy to restore respect for life, then we will turn this culture of death around. WE WILL AGAIN CELEBRATE THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE FOR EVERYONE!

BORN TO RUN – WE NEED SPONSORS!



We want to apologize that the sponsor form was not in the June Viva Life. The brochure just did not get to us in time. However, it is in this edition, and we are asking you to be a sponsor either as an individual, organization, business, or as a political candidate or elected official.

Why is this so important? There is so much facing the pro-life movement in New Mexico that is challenging our resources, materials, and having enough involved people. Being the only state-wide pro-life

organization that has chapters and an educational program in place to educate the citizens of New Mexico always puts a burden on the Right To Life Committee of New Mexico to meet these educational needs. A fact of life is that we need income to work our mission. We need volunteers to reach our goals. Our source for both of these needs is YOU! There is no other source of income or people from which we can draw.

We are willing to meet the demands and hope you see the need to support Born To Run with your donation. If there are others you know that you believe would like to be a sponsor, just call the office, and we will get you the additional forms you need or mail them for you. Please note the deadline (August 17) for this aspect of the Born To Run event.

If you have questions, please call 881-4563 or e-mail info@rtlmm.org. Thank you for your consideration.

ADIEU TO A STAUNCH SUPPORTER

Margaret Neff was a person who gave and then gave some more. She supported our organization and its movement in thought, word, and deed. She gave in financial support along with her husband Steve. She gave in time at the state office, and when she couldn't come into the office, she did work at home.

Her life, her dedication, her faith, and her sense of humor will be greatly missed, but the lessons she taught us on how to continue even under adversity will not be forgotten. Thank you, brave and faithful warrior. You will be truly missed.

PS: The Right to Life Committee of New Mexico wishes to thank the Neff family for mentioning RTL-CNM as an alternative for donations rather than sending flowers. May others do this when a pro-life member passes on. It gives that person the last word on his or her pro-life convictions, and it gives RTL-CNM the opportunity to spread the word. Please keep us in mind when choosing an organization to donate to.

COMMENTARY FROM THE EDITOR

by Dauneen Dolce

It upsets me when we have a "victory" that there are pro-lifers that don't accept the victory and then go on to criticize those who do.

LET ME MAKE IT PERFECTLY CLEAR THAT THE SUPREME COURT'S UPHOLDING OF THE BAN ON PARTIAL BIRTH ABORTION WAS AND IS A VICTORY!!!

No, it did not ban all abortions. No, it did not overturn Roe vs. Wade. The law that was passed by Congress is now in effect, not an interpretation made by one of the Supreme Court Justices, who often in writing about a decision do not use the proper terminology. They did not rewrite the law but upheld it.

Our movement is one of "baby" steps. This ruling and this ban is progress.

First of all, we do have a Supreme Court that will deal with congressional legislation and may have the votes on issues that the opposition does not want placed into law. This, in turn, gives the states greater leverage when writing laws, as they have the assurance of "law" to support the legislation. It was when the Supreme Court ruled on Parental Involvement and Women's Right to Know laws that then allowed many other states to take on the legislation with the assurance it would win legal scrutiny.

Congress, once it has the pro-life votes in place, is now moved to pass more pro-life legislation. Furthermore, the message was clearly made that there is a type of abortion that is unacceptable. We did not have that before this ban was passed.

The ruling is said to have upheld a mere "regulatory" law. This is important, for we can't wait until Roe vs. Wade is overturned to put in place all the protections we can for the unborn, and for that matter, the mother.

Throughout history it took time, education, and laws to change social wrongs. This includes slavery and minority rights and women's rights. Many actions, laws, and attitudes needed to be changed. Laws help change those attitudes.

The desire is to have the court define the child as a person. This will not happen until legislation is passed, for to do so would bring the activism that took place when Roe vs. Wade was passed. That law invented a "privacy" and referred to personhood. Since personhood is not defined in our Constitution, many on the court do not feel they are the ones to define it.

This ban is not a compromise. It is a step towards the final goal of educating the public so that they will see the need to ban all abortions and to save not only babies but human life, which has become expendable.

Pro-life organizations should still rejoice in this one act that moves us forward to our final goal.

THE SUPREME COURT MAKES ANOTHER GOOD RULING

On Monday, June 26, 2007, the U.S. Supreme Court created a safe harbor for grassroots lobbying from the blackout period created by the "electioneering communication" prohibition in McCain-Feingold campaign reform bill. This bill created in 2002 prohibited corporations and unions from using general treasury funds for "electioneering communications," which are broadcast ads within 30 days of a primary and within 60 days of a general election that simply mention the name of a federal candidate. In 2003 the Supreme Court upheld the law on its face value in *McConnell vs. FEC*. In July 2004 Wisconsin Right To Life (WRTL) began running grassroots lobbying ads asking Wisconsin citizens to call their Senators Kohl and Feingold (then a candidate), and ask them to oppose the burgeoning filibusters of President Bush's judicial nominees.

The BeFair website was especially created for the anti-filibuster campaign and contained information about the senate confirmation process, the filibusters, federal courts, the judicial emergency clause by too few judges, and press releases about the anti-filibuster grassroots lobbying campaign.

Because Senator Feingold had chosen to run for reelection, WRTL's ads would have been forbidden "electioneering communications" from August 16 to November 2, 2004 because of McCain-Feingold's blackout period (79 continuous days because the primary and general election prohibition periods overlapped). WRTL filed suit so that it would be able to continue running its ads during the blackout period. WRTL argued in its suit that the blackout period could not be constitutionally applied to grassroots lobbying about upcoming votes in Congress. The right to petition the government is a specifically protected right of the First Amendment, and grassroots lobbying has nothing to do with elections. Incumbent politicians should not be able to prohibit citizens from lobbying their representatives through campaign finance laws. In 2004, the federal district court denied WRTL's request and dismissed the case in 2005 based on its belief that when the Supreme Court upheld the blackout provision on its face in *McConnell vs. FEC* it precluded such applied challenges. In 2006, the Supreme Court unanimously reversed the district court, ruling that as-applied challenges could be brought against the blackout period and remanded the

case for a decision on the merits of WRTL's suit as-applied challenge.

In December 2006, the district court held that the "electioneering communication" prohibition was unconstitutional as applied to WRTL's 2004 ads. They found there was no 'link' between WRTL's grassroots lobbying ads and Sen. Feingold's character of fitness for office (i.e., his role as a candidate as opposed to his role as a legislator).

The June 26, 2007 decision went beyond merely affirming the district court and created a constitutional safe harbor for genuine issue ads. It stated that only if the ad "is susceptible of no reasonable interpretation other than as an appeal to vote for or against a specific candidate" can the ad be prohibited during the blackout period. Furthermore, the Court rejected the argument by the FEC and McCain that ads could be banned based upon the speaker's intent to influence an election by the ads or the effect the ads might have on an election.

ONCE AGAIN, THANK YOU PRESIDENT BUSH!

On June 20, 2007, President Bush once again vetoed the embryonic stem cell bill passed by Congress for embryonic stem cell research. President Bush has said embryo destruction is a moral line that he will not cross. He has made it clear that he will not support legislation that will destroy embryos for "potential" cures, etc. That is what this legislation would do with only a "promise" of creating cures.

Instead, he gave his support to alternative research, such as using adult stem cells that have a proven record of being able to treat many diseases that in turn have created some cures and will create more with time and research.

Some of the alternatives are using stem cells from amniotic stem cells – stem cells found in the fluid that cushions babies in the womb. They appear to have all the [alleged] benefits of embryonic stem cells and none of the downsides.

"They grow fast, as fast as embryonic stem cells, and they show great pluripotentiality," meaning they can become many kinds of tissues, said Anthony Atala, who led the team of researchers at Wake Forest University and Harvard University. "But they remain stable for years without forming tumors," he added, "something that embryonic stem cells are not very good at."

Just a few weeks ago we wrote about the work of three research teams. Working with mice, they coaxed established cells – in this case, a skin cell – to go back in time, to revert to the status of embryonic stem cells. In effect, they pushed the cells' "reset" button.

In reprogramming adult stem cells, the researchers produced a cell that can grow into virtually any type of tissue without destroying a human embryo. As the *Times* put it, "This raises the possibility that everyone may possess the raw material to make stem cells with the same therapeutic potential as ones from embryos."

HOW DID OUR CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION VOTE?

REPRESENTATIVES

Congressman Steve Pearce voted against the Embryonic Stem Cell bill. He voted for the alternative stem cell research.

Congresswoman Heather Wilson and Congressman Tom Udall voted for the Embryonic Stem Cell bill and against alternative stem cell research.

These are consistent votes for Congressman Pearce and Congressman Udall. However, Congresswoman

(continued on page 4)

Heather Wilson used to support alternative stem cell research and now voted against it. You would think with the passing of time she would see the truth about all stem cell research. Enough has been provided to her. Both of her votes will be recorded as anti-life votes.

SENATORS

Senator Domenici voted against the Embryonic Stem Cell research bill and for the alternative stem cell research bill. This is the vote he has been casting consistently.

Senator Bingaman voted for embryonic stem cell research and against alternative stem cell research. -

OTHER FEDERAL LEGISLATION IN THE WORKS

STATE FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL IN THE HOUSE

Currently, the United States of America does not give money to organizations that promote abortions in foreign countries. This comes under a policy called the Mexico City Policy. The most important characteristic of the Mexico City Policy is that it establishes criteria for U.S. funding. If a group is unwilling to agree to avoid promotion of abortion, that group will not receive any type of U.S. support. This defines the type of organizations the U.S. will support.

However, Congresswoman Nita Lowey, who chairs the Appropriations Subcommittee, has submitted a bill that would effectively overturn this pro-life policy with language that would "only" allow abortion-promoting groups to receive U.S.-funded contraceptives. If that were what the language actually did, it would still re-establish assistance to groups that are determined to promote abortion as a method of family planning, which we oppose and would urge members to vote against. The fact is the language in Representative Lowery's bill goes much farther than this. On its face it prohibits the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAD) from denying grants to an abortion-promoting organization if the organization's program "includes" contraceptives. Under this language, even the most aggressive pro-abortion groups would recover full eligibility for U.S. cash assistance, as well as other forms of assistance.

Congressman Chris Smith and Congressman Bart Stupak (the co-chairs of the House Pro-Life Caucus) have offered an amendment to remove bill language that would mandate U.S. subsidies to organizations that actively promote abortion in foreign nations. This bill is entirely an abortion policy vote – it has nothing whatever to do with funding levels for contraceptive programs, anti-HIV/AIDS programs, or any of the other diversionary issues raised by opponents to the Mexico City Policy.

Please contact Congresswoman Heather Wilson and ask her to support the Smith-Stupak Amendment.

Post note: The House of Representatives voted for the Mexico City Policy without the Smith-Stupak Amendment by a vote of 205-218. President Bush has said he will veto this bill, and there are not enough votes to override his veto.

*A successful man is one who can
lay a firm foundation with the bricks
that others throw at him.*

A CONSPIRACY OF SILENCE AND SILENTLY GRIEVING MEN

by Dave Andrusko - Editor NRLC News

It has been my practice in writing about NRLC conventions for 27 years to drop in on several sessions in a given block of time and spend roughly the time – 45 minutes - in one. The workshop sessions at NRLC 2007 were so uniformly good it made this an agonizing decision.

Today I'm going to discuss two workshops that were particularly fascinating for me for quite different reasons.

Angela Lanfranchi, M.D., a surgeon, specializes in diseases of the breast. She is co-founder of the Breast Cancer Prevention Institute with Joel Brind, PhD. Together they have written, testified, debated, and attempted to raise consciousness about the link between induced abortion and increased risk of breast cancer. They've done so in a consistently brilliant and cogent manner.

Dr. Lanfranchi talked about both the "ABC Link" and why and how abortion has increased the number of premature births. After laying out the biological explanation of why abortion increased breast cancer in impeccable detail, she was asked if there was a greater recognition by the Medical Establishment of the connection.

In a word, her answer was no. Not that privately many physicians and leaders of medical organizations denied the connection. They didn't. They just said it was "too political."

But there are many who do refuse to see the very straightforward explanation. Dr. Lanfranchi offered what she called the "most well-known example of this resistance to new information" - the case of Dr. Ignaz Semmelweis and "childbed fever" (puerperal sepsis).

In the 1840's Dr. Semmelweis noticed that the death rates were staggering - 10 times higher on the doctor's maternity wards than the midwives wards. The midwives washed their hands frequently, as compared to the doctors who did not.

There were lots of bogus alternate explanations offered. Dr. Semmelweis tested his theory by having the doctors in his department wash their hands in chlorinated water. The death rate in women fell dramatically. (Doctors were unknowingly spreading a contagious disease that the disinfectant largely eliminated.)

Semmelweis's reward was to be ridiculed, his privileges reduced, and he was forced to leave the hospital. He was eventually acknowledged to be correct but only after his death.

Post note: I attended this workshop and was very impressed with the information Dr. Lanfranchi offered. We hope to bring her to New Mexico so that you too can learn what she has to say and that maybe medical people can come and learn and change their attitudes when they say there is no link between abortion and breast cancer (ABC).

The second workshop had Greg Hasek and David Wemhoff again offering a most important workshop: Lost Fatherhood, which explored the enormous impact on untold numbers of men following the abortion death of their child.

There are two points that have to be made. First, many people simply don't think to ask themselves if men grieve the loss of an unborn child. Even if they do, many perhaps don't understand that men do so differently than women.

Second, this is no tiny ripple effect. Many are almost paralyzed by their shame and grief and anger. Others are plagued by a variety of symptoms. Some are virtually identical to those women suffer; others are more specific to men.

(continued on page 5)

If that is true, and it is, what does that mean, say, for a pastor preaching on abortion? Not only are there post-abortive women in his congregation, and not only are there the child's living siblings (as well as the mother's own siblings) and a woman's immediate family in the pews, there are also many grieving men. These men are looking for help, healing, and wholeness.

My conclusion is a simple one: our hearts must reach out and embrace the tens of millions of men who are dealing with unresolved sadness, guilt, and shame.

Post note: With abortion we have the destruction of the child, and many times the health of the mother. But the psychological effects on women, men, families, and society have created a great sadness, a great guilt, and a country in mourning. When will we learn that killing the innocent kills far more than that life but also the spirits of many?

KOMEN CNM RACE FOR THE CURE

Everyone wants a cure for breast cancer. Many people give money and time towards this goal. It is so sad that one aspect of breast cancer is being ignored.

Most people who have had breast cancer have it for various reasons that have nothing to do with an abortion. However, more than 35 world wide studies have shown women who have had an abortion on their first pregnancy have a higher risk than the average woman in having breast cancer. If there is a history of cancer in the family, the risk is even higher.

The studies given were done with good methodology and in a frame of time that can prove the results, yet cancer societies deny the connection. Shouldn't we give women the information so that they could avoid the possibility of getting breast cancer by taking positive actions regarding their unplanned pregnancies?

What seems even more ironic is that one of the sponsors for The Susan B. Komen Race for the Cure was Planned Parenthood. I know a few years back the head of the Komen organization quit because of this association. I don't know if PP gets money in the form of grants, but Komen CNM should disassociate itself from that which has caused the very thing they are fighting.

Credit should be given to Komen CNM for acknowledging that adult stem cell research can greatly help in seeking a cure in breast cancer. They are right to support this, and we hope adult research will bring healing to many.

Please look at the research done on abortion and the breast cancer link.

JACK KEVORKIAN IS RELEASED FROM PRISON.

Jack Kevorkian is a pathologist who championed a "terminal" patient's "right to die" via physician-assisted suicide. He claims to have assisted 130 patients to that end. He has infamously stated "dying is not a crime." He became known as Dr. Death.

Kevorkian was imprisoned in 1999 for a 10-25 year prison sentence for second-degree murder in the 1998 poisoning of Thomas Youk, 52, of Oakland, California. He only served eight years and was released on June 1 but is expected to live less than one year due to a case of Hepatitis C that he contracted during service in Vietnam.

On June 4, 2007, Jack Kevorkian appeared on the Larry King Show. Here is some of the interview.

King: You knew you were breaking the law, right?

Kevorkian: Oh, yes.

King: All right. Why did you knowingly do that?

Kevorkian: The same reason Rosa Parks did it. She knew

that was a right of hers and sir, I knew this was a right of mine. These are natural rights.

King: Were all your killings painless?

Kevorkian: Don't say "killings" please.

King: What do you call them?

Kevorkian: Your medical procedures, were they painless?

By nature, Larry King is not a tough interviewer, but King did ask some tough questions. He aired a video clip of a family member of one of Kevorkian's "patients" who was very, very angry at "Dr. Death." (According to King, the speaker, Tina Allerellie, was Karen Shoffstall's sister.) Shoffstall died with Kevorkian's "assistance." We hear, "She did not want her lifestyle to change one iota," Allerellie said. "She didn't want to learn to live with MS (multiple sclerosis). She wanted the MS gone. August 13, 1997, my entire family's lives changed forever and not for the better. We've been living in hell ever since."

"I just miss her so much. The deep love was always there. I want her back. I want a do-over. Thanks to Jack Kevorkian that can never happen."

After the clip, King said, "You assisted in ending her life after she contacted you after suffering from years of MS. Karen was 35, still young and active, according to her family. Her family claims that her biggest problem with the illness was depression. Kevorkian's response? "I don't remember details of the case."

In another interview, Mike Wallace made the statement about Tom Youk saying, "Tom Youk was a man, and it was a compassionate murder, but you murdered him."

Kevorkian answers, "But it was a man whose life didn't measure up anymore. You know {philosopher} David Hume said it, 'No man ever threw away a life while it was worth keeping.'"

This statement is very revealing about Jack Kevorkian and those who think as he does about assisted suicide. What is his definition of lives not "worth keeping?" His definition is very expansive.

We must remember that all lives have value no matter the reason for coming into the world or the condition we find ourselves while living in it. Compassion and love make all lives worth keeping.

VATICAN URGES END TO AMNESTY AID

The Vatican has urged all Catholics to stop donating money to Amnesty International, accusing the human rights group of promoting abortion.

The Vatican said it was an "inevitable consequence" of the group's policy change.

Amnesty said it was not promoting abortion as a universal right, but the group said that women had a right to choose, particularly in cases of rape and incest.

"No more financing of Amnesty International after the organization's pro-abortion about-turn," said a statement from the Roman Catholic Church's Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace.

The council president, Cardinal Renato Martino, described abortion as "murder."

"And to justify it selectively, in the event of rape, that is to define an innocent child in the belly of its mother as an enemy, as something one can destroy," the Cardinal said.

Amnesty says it does not take any position on whether abortion is right or wrong.

"We are saying broadly that to criminalize women's management of their sexual reproductive right is the wrong answer," Amnesty's Deputy Secretary General Kate Gilmore told Reuters news agency.

Some 45 million unintended pregnancies are terminated around the world every year, the World Health Organization says.

**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

GOVERNOR RICHARDSON DOES NOT WANT TO END ALL WARS

Bill Richardson has said he wants to end the war in Iraq and save the lives of many being killed there.

However, he seems to forget the greatest of all wars that is going on in our own country. This war has claimed over 48 million lives, and continues to destroy more lives at a rate of over 3400 each day. The lives are unborn children and the method of killing is abortion.

Not only does Gov. Richardson ignore this war and the deaths of millions of innocent human beings, he has decided to go one step more than the other Democrat candidates who also support abortion. He has made a decision to stack the Supreme Court, if he is president, with pro-abortion judges. Thus, ensuring abortion to continue.

In Des Moines, Iowa their newspaper covered this story and remarks made at a forum at Drake University. If he were president, Democrat Bill Richardson said he would ask potential Supreme Court nominees about their view on abortion and reject those who believe Roe v. Wade should be overturned.

Presidents typically say they don't ask potential justices about their views on specific cases, but Richardson said Friday that he would make an exception for the landmark 1973 case, which legalized abortions nationally.

"I know I am going to upset some people, but this is what I would ask them," said Richardson. "I would say 'Do you believe that Roe vs. Wade is settled law? If they say yes, they

have a good chance of being picked. If they say no, I will not pick them.'"

Richardson said he'd treat abortion rights differently than other issues because it's so crucial to so many Americans. "I say this because we always dance around the issue," said Richardson. "I'm also going to ask them, 'You do support civil rights, right? You do support a right of privacy right?'"

Post note: Unfortunately, Gov. Richardson does not support the right of life of our unborn. He does not recognize their civil rights. So those who support him in his effort to be president are saying they too do not recognize the rights of the unborn child in the womb and wish the killing to continue.

Gov. Richardson is counting on people voting their party, their ethnic background or any other reason than their moral convictions. For the sake of human life from fertilization to natural death, and your own life, please vote for life when that time comes.



ABORTION CLINIC CLOSURES RISING

Due to financial problems clinics such as the Aradia Women's Health Center has closed after 34 years of operation and 54,000 abortions. Planned Parenthood which had 938 clinics in 1995 is now down to 817 clinics. There is a change in Americans and their attitude towards abortion. They are rejecting Planned Parenthood's agenda.

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.