



Visit Our Web Site At:
www.rtlnm.org



OCTOBER 2008
Vol. 26, No. 10

NEWSLETTER OF THE RIGHT TO LIFE COMMITTEE OF NEW MEXICO



BORN TO RUN NOVEMBER 8, 2008

Whether you are a runner, walker, or stroller pusher, there is a place for you at this tax-deductible fundraising event for the Right To Life Committee of New Mexico Educational Trust Fund.

You can help raise additional funds by getting names of people who will support your run and the miles you want to aim for, be it 1 mile, 5 miles or more (you run the route more times). So now we need the people, *YOU!* Whatever your age, experience, or desire, you can participate. You just need to register. Fill out the form in the enclosed runner brochure and return to the Right To Life Committee of New Mexico's office along with your registration fee. The brochure has all the registration and race day information.

Be a sponsor, be a runner, be a walker, be a support of a runner/walker. There is room for each and every one of us to be involved. The results will be a fun time at a pleasant location in nice weather for a good cause. Please help us in these efforts.

Questions? Call our State office in Albuquerque at 505-881-4563 or e-mail to: info@rtlnm.org.

STATE FAIR

The State Fair was another huge success thanks to the many volunteers who helped. Your time at the Fair was very meaningful for RTLNCNM, for those to whom you spoke, and hopefully for you too. Thanks so very very much for your time and your dedication to spreading the pro-life message. Thanks also to Geneva Trujillo for coordinating the many hours of coverage – a huge job! A very special Thank You to Charlene Comba who once again was the overseer of the booth for all 17 days of the Fair. Her commitment to the babies, the handicapped, and the elderly is outstanding.

Anyone who has worked just one shift at the Fair knows the impact RTLNCNM's presence can have to people on both sides of the table. The stories we hear and the conversations that are held can be life changing for everyone. However, they are usually only known by the few who are in the booth at the time. Wouldn't it be wonderful to share this with others so we'd all know? It really is the very core of what we do – education. And sometimes that is just listening while someone tells his/her story.

We ask that all of you who have ever worked at the Fair, no matter what year, think back to your time spent and write down the meaningful things said, be it just a sentence, a short conversation, a long story. Those of you who have worked numerous times and years should have pages of recollection. Send your memories of State

Fair Issues to info@rtlnm.org or to RTLNCNM, 2800 San Mateo Blvd. NE, Suite 107, Albuquerque, NM 87110, and we will take it from there. Our hope is to gather all of these many, many recollections and compile them into a book or a booklet form. We will only refer to volunteers by their first names, so everyone's privacy will be respected. However, if you prefer to not have even your first name used, just let us know, and we will honor your wishes.



This is an opportunity to share real life stories so everyone can know the many good things accomplished by pro-lifers. So often we don't know what effect an encounter with another person has. Now we have that chance. We hope you will participate. We look forward to reading your memories.

A COMMENTARY FROM THE EDITOR DAUNEEN DOLCE

IF YOU ARE GOING TO VOTE FOR BARACH OBAMA, YOU ARE NOT PRO-LIFE.

Somebody who is pro-life supports those people who will protect the lives of the most innocent of all - the unborn, the elderly, and the disabled. They don't use lesser criteria that are not applicable to those who are killed by abortion or euthanasia to rationalize their vote. They don't think party first and human life last. They vote to promote solutions to human problems - not to use death as a solution or a convenience. They hold true to their religious beliefs - not make those beliefs a cafeteria style of selections when it is convenient. They walk the walk, not just talk the talk.

If you say you are pro-life but have not lifted a finger to help pro-life candidates so they can help the pro-life cause, you might ask yourself, What does being pro-life mean?

So many people are unwilling to fight for life. We are so afraid to "offend" someone. We don't want to risk disapproval from our friends or family. We want others to do this but not ourselves. We are apathetic, the main cause

(continued on page 2)

Commentary...*(cont. from pg. 1)*

as to why this country has not turned more quickly to adopting a pro-life philosophy.

To be pro-life, one does take risks. When letters are sent to people on supporting a candidate, we upset people. When we have a booth that states the truth, we upset people. When we oppose pro-death legislation, we upset people. When we support pro-life legislation, we upset people. When I write this editorial, it is going to upset people. So be it, because the truth needs to be said. Without truth, how do we go forth to save the unborn and to create solutions?

I too want to be "comfortable." I don't like people calling me and telling me to go to hell and many other things I run into for taking a stand. But I have been given life, and in gratitude I must fight for life. I have been given children and grandchildren, and I must fight for their lives and the society they live in. Thus, I am willing to "ruffle feathers" and say it as it is. Am I saying you are not pro-life if you are not carrying out actions that are pro-life? There is an old saying, if the shoe fits, wear it.

To those faithful soldiers in this war against evil and death, this commentary does not apply at all. You are the ones who have given and then give again. You put up your yard signs, put bumper stickers on your car, volunteer at the state office, in the chapter, in the political campaigns. You speak the truth where you can and when you can. You pray and work for justice in this world. You are consistent in your philosophy all the way to the voting booth. You do not fear those who oppose us, for you know they are wrong and that it is honorable and necessary to do right. You know the reward is not on earth but will come later. You are the salt of the earth. Thank you for all you do in all the ways you do it. **TRUE PRO-LIFERS - LET'S CONTINUE THE WORK AND THE FIGHT!**

**THE LAST DAY TO REGISTER TO VOTE IS
TUESDAY, OCT. 7, 2008**

CANDIDATES SUPPORTED BY NATIONAL RIGHT TO LIFE PAC & THE RIGHT TO LIFE COMMITTEE OF NEW MEXICO'S POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE

**National Right To Life's Political Action Committee (PAC)
supports the following candidates:**

President: **JOHN MCCAIN**

Vice-President: **SARAH PALIN**

New Mexico U.S. Senate: **STEVE PEARCE**

New Mexico Congressional District 1: **DARREN WHITE**

New Mexico Congressional District 2: **ED TINSLEY**

New Mexico Congressional District 3: **DAN EAST**

**The Right To Life Committee of New Mexico's PAC
supports the following people for the New Mexico
State Legislature:**

SENATE

District 9: **Steven Komadina – 328-4696**

District 21: **Kent Cravens – 858-0799**

District 26: **Spiro Vassilopoulos – 247-2810**

District 28: **Joseph Gros – 590-1102**

District 37: **Lee Rawson – 649-2810**

HOUSE

District 2: **James Strickler – H: 327-4190 Cell: 401-3248**

District 7: **Timothy Lardner – 414-2999**

District 8: **Paul Gabaldon – 550-4476**

District 12: **Clyde Wheeler – 452-0175**

District 14: **Clara Pena – 877-7484**

District 15: **Teresa Zanetti – 344-7248**

District 17: **Ron Toya – 344-9092**

District 21: **Howard De La Cruz Bancroft – 220-7284**

District 26: **Rhead Story – 553-0964**

District 28: **Jimmie Hall – 294-3343**

District 32: **Phillip Skinner – 531-7913**

District 37: **D. Kent Evans – 524-4232**

District 51: **Gloria Vaughn – 434-2819**

District 53: **Stanford Locke – 640-6717**

District 55: **Cathrynn Brown – 302-2746**

District 57: **Dennis Kintigh – 623-1258**

District 58: **Candy Ezzell – 625-0550**

District 59: **Nora Espinoza – 623-5324**

District 60: **Paula Papponi – 896-0531**

District 63: **Matthew Rush – 780-7874**

District 67: **Dennis Roch – 799-7796**

District 70: **Mel Root – 425-3620**

**These good people are willing to fight for Life. Please
help them get elected. You can do that. You must do it!!!**

GUIDELINES FOR POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF THE CLERGY

It is important for the clergy to know what they can do personally and what can be done within the church. Religious leaders, as individuals, have the same rights as all other American citizens to involve themselves in political activity. Clergy, thus, have much greater latitude to involve themselves in political activities than churches or temples.

Religious leaders are concerned about the legal effects of political activity on themselves and their churches. Churches are exempt from federal tax only as long as they do not intervene in political campaigns.

The following should guide religious leaders regarding personal political activities that may relate to their positions (the terms "pastor" and "church" are hereinafter used generically):

1. A pastor may personally endorse candidates for political office.
2. A church may not endorse candidates for political office, and a pastor may not endorse candidates on behalf of the church.
3. A pastor may allow his name to be used as a supporter of a candidate in the candidate's own political advertisements. In this connection, the pastor may be identified as pastor of a particular church, if it is indicated that this is for identification purposes only and if it is indicated that the endorsement is by the pastor personally and not by the church.
4. Churches may engage in non-partisan voter registration, voter identification, get out the vote, and voter education activities so long as such activities are not intended for the supporters of any particular candidate or party.
5. A church may distribute a voter guide regarding the candidates' positions on various issues or a scorecard

(continued on page 3)

Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide...

(continued from pg. 3)

- reporting on the voting records of incumbents. In such publications, the church or pastor may not state whether the candidate's position or vote is consistent with the church's.
6. A church or pastor is free to state the position of a candidate on any issue and may comment on that position (including praising or criticizing the candidate for it).
 7. A church may allow political candidates to speak on church premises; however, all candidates should be invited and given equal opportunity to speak. A candidate should not be allowed to appeal to a church congregation at a church service for funds to be used in the political campaign, and no member of the church should endorse a candidate in conjunction with the candidate's visit.
 8. Church facilities may be used by political candidates on the same basis that civic groups are allowed to. If civic groups are required to pay rent for using the church property, a political candidate should also be charged the same amount.
 9. Lists of members of the church congregation may be provided to candidates for use in seeking support or raising funds only if rented at fair market value.
 10. A church may not establish a political action committee.
 11. Pastors and other like-minded individuals may establish a political action committee, but care should be taken that the committee is separate from the church and does not use the assets of the church.

This has been adapted from "Do's and Don'ts for Political Activities of Pastors" by James Bopp, Jr. General Council, James Madison Center for Free Speech in association with the Alliance Defense Fund, March, 2006.

These guidelines summarize the requirements of the Federal Election Campaign Act and the Internal Revenue Code and should not be construed as legal advice regarding your particular situation. Churches and Pastors may obtain free legal advice by contracting the James Madison Center for Free Speech at 812-232-2434 or the Alliance Defense Fund at 1-800-TELL-ADF.

CELEBRATE LIFE BROADCASTS ON COMCAST CH. 27 FOR OCTOBER



Thursday, Oct. 2 - 11:00 p.m. – Midnight
"The Right Choice" & "In Our Own Words"

Thursday, Oct. 9 – 11:00 p.m. - Midnight
"Abortion and Breast Cancer"

Thursday, Oct. 16 – 11:00 p.m. – Midnight
"First Days of Life" & "The Procedure"

Thursday, Oct. 23 – 11:00 p.m. – Midnight
"Birthright, a Friend for Life" & "Birthright: A Love Story"

Thursday, Oct. 30 – 11:00 p.m. – Midnight
*"Ultrasound: Window to the Womb" &
"A Doctor Explains the Abortion Procedures & Harder Truth"*

EUTHANASIA: HOW DOES IT AFFECT YOU?

Many people will be reading *Viva Life* for the first time. They may be surprised that The Right To Life Committee of New Mexico takes a stand against euthanasia, infanticide - a form of euthanasia - and assisted suicide.

Unfortunately, euthanasia, the killing of a human being via direct means (a shot or medication) or indirect means (denying food and water) is a world problem that is growing in numbers and in acceptance.

For the most part, euthanasia in the United States is being done by denial of treatment or by denying basic comfort care, which is food and water. It is happening in hospitals, nursing homes, and even in hospices.

The reasons are basically the same as those for abortion. A person is sometimes inconvenient and costly. However, even families that wish to protect their loved ones may not be able to do so do to policies put in place such as "futile care". This policy (summed up) says to provide further care for this patient would be futile, as the patient will probably die and the cost is too much to provide care. This is applied to people from all age brackets and is sometimes applied to those who really aren't dying but are maintaining life. It is not known if and when the person is going to die, but they do know the patient needs continued care.

A famous case was that of Terri Schiavo, who, though not dying, had her food and water removed, and she died of dehydration a week after the removal. Terri was not dying. Her husband wanted her dead. Her parents did not, and a major battle in courts, the Florida State Legislature, and eventually Congress ensued. In this case, the courts had the final say, which was to remove her food and water. Usually the courts support this request.

The debate regarding Terri Schiavo as to whether she was in a persistent vegetative state (PVS) is still going on. "Persistent vegetative state," defined succinctly but accurately, is the denial of subjective experience in a brain-damaged human being.

PVS is the medical assertion that a human being is an object but not a subject. It is the only modern medical diagnosis that denies the personhood of a patient and thus is fraught with logical and ethical problems, says Dr. Michael Egnor, a professor of neurosurgery and pediatrics at State University of New York Stony Brook. He is an award winning brain surgeon who has been named one of New York's best doctors by *New York Magazine*.

Dr. Egnor has stated in Ms. Schiavo's case specifically and in other cases more generally, "Patients diagnosed with PVS are precisely those patients in whom discernment of awareness is most unreliable. We can never directly apprehend the thoughts of other people; we infer the thoughts of others only by their behavior. Patients with severe brain damage are precisely those people in whom expression of behavior is most impaired and in whom diagnoses based on assessment of behavior are most unreliable."

In Dr. Egnor's opinion, the political efforts to save Ms. Schiavo's life were well-intentioned and completely justified. It is believed that many of the medical opinions offered publicity to physicians who favored withdrawal of Ms. Schiavo's hydration and nourishment were rank pseudoscience. What was done to Ms. Schiavo was an atrocity.

Meanwhile, assisted suicide is being carried out in our country in the state of Oregon, and in the countries of

(continued on page 4)

Euthanasia: How Does It Affect You?...

(continued from pg. 3)

Belgium, Netherlands, and Switzerland. This subject will be covered in the next *Viva Life*.

Euthanasia in the Netherlands

The number of reported cases of euthanasia in 2007 has increased 10% in the Netherlands. In 2007 the Regional Euthanasia Review Committees received 2120 euthanasia reports, which are up from 1923 reported cases in 2006.

Euthanasia as defined in the Netherlands only includes voluntary actions that are requested by a person who is competent. Any intentional action that causes death of a person who is incompetent or involuntary is not counted as acts of euthanasia but rather deaths without explicit request.

The report that is published in the magazine of the right to die - *NL (NVVE)* does not include the number of assisted suicide deaths or the number of deaths without explicit request.

It was reported that there were approximately 550 deaths without request in 2005 and approximately 400 assisted suicides. It must be noted that these are the number of reported cases. There has been a long-standing problem with under-reporting in the Netherlands.

Experts had anticipated that the actual number of reports would decrease because of the increase in deaths by terminal sedation and dehydration. The report from *NVVE* does not include the estimated number of cases of terminal sedation and dehydration.

There was no explanation in the report as to why the euthanasia rate has increased in the Netherlands.

Note: The Netherlands was the first country to legalize euthanasia.

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS OMITS AWARENESS OF ABORTION-BREAST CANCER LINK

by: Joel Brind, Ph.D.

October is National Breast Cancer Awareness Month. For the Breast Cancer establishment - Komen Race for the Cure, the National Breast Cancer Coalition (NBCC), et al, - it's almost like Christmas season is for Macy's and Target. That's when these organizations make their big pitch for donations, and that pitch is usually some variation of the following: "(1) We don't know what causes breast cancer, (2) most women who get breast cancer have no known risk factors for the disease, and (3) there is no cure for breast cancer, so you'd better give us all the money you can so we can find a cure before the disease gets YOU!"

The lies are numbered for the convenience of the reader, who might just be wondering why, with such an actual, widespread, life-threatening disease, and such a genuine need for research and education about it that those dedicated to fight it need to rely on a pack of lies to raise the funds to do so.

Wonder no further: The reason is political correctness. Most breast cancer is attributable to "women's liberation" and the changes in childbearing patterns it has wrought. So, breast cancer advocates like NBCC president Fran Visco are out there in the media decrying all the "misinformation out there," even as they spread it around themselves.

Speaking about a new survey conducted by the NBCC, Visco told the *Chicago Tribune* that "we need to educate, not just raise awareness." Among the bits of "misinformation out there," according to the NBCC survey, is that "Most women believe breast cancer can be prevented." Christopher Wanjek, writing for Life Science's Bad Medicine website, actually calls this his number 3 "myth." He also calls a variation of this widespread belief: "Risk factors are mostly to blame" his number 1 "myth." He elaborates, "More than two-thirds of women with breast cancer have no known risk factors for the disease."

Here are the real facts:

1. We do know what causes most breast cancer. About half the breast cancer in the U.S. is attributable to delaying first childbirth until after age 25 or 30 or forever. The younger a woman is when she has her first child, the lower her lifetime risk. For a pregnant teenager, the proverbial silver lining of her cloud is the fact that, if she continues the pregnancy and gives birth at term, she will reduce her lifetime breast cancer risk by at least two-thirds, compared to having her first child at age 30 or older. Breastfeeding her children lowers a woman's risk still further.

But postponing childbearing denies a woman the natural protection her children give her, even while still in the womb. Even worse, what she may do to avoid childbearing adds to her risk, i.e., years of taking contraceptive steroids (be they in birth control pills, patch, implantable, injectable or ring form), and abortion.

Actually, abortion is the single most avoidable cause of breast cancer (even though Wanjek calls "Abortions cause breast cancer" his number 5 "myth"). No, that doesn't mean that most women who have an abortion will get breast cancer or that most women who get breast cancer have had an abortion. It just means the effect of abortion is so strong that choosing abortion even once causes a measurable increase in breast cancer risk. Contrast this, say, to taking hormone replacement therapy or the pill where it takes years of daily use - thousands of pills - to make a measurable difference in risk. In a normal pregnancy, a woman is exposed to far more estrogen, which stimulates the multiplication of breast cells, than any pills or normal cycles could provide. If the pregnancy is not allowed to go to term (or at least to 32 weeks gestation), a woman is left with more places for cancer to start. But a full-term pregnancy matures the breast tissue into cells that can make milk but can no longer multiply. So, full-term pregnancy leaves a woman's breasts with fewer places for cancer to start and permanent protection against breast cancer.

2. Most women in the general population do have known risk factors for breast cancer, let alone those who actually get the disease. Just for starters, about 75% of American women have taken birth control pills, a risk factor that even the World Health Organization (finally!) acknowledges. Not to mention that a substantial proportion of American women have had an abortion.

3. Here's some really good news. Most cases of breast cancer - about 80% - are actually cured! In fact, at least half of all newly discovered cases of breast cancer are stage 0 or stage 1, which are cured over 95% of the time and without mastectomy!

Breast Cancer Awareness... (continued from pg. 4)

Of course, the best news of all is that breast cancer is largely avoidable. Avoiding abortion is the simplest way to reduce the risk. And that's also one reason why there is really is such a lot of "misinformation out there."

Dr. Joel Brind is a Professor of Human Biology at the Baruch College, City University of New York. This article appeared on LifeNews.com at www.lifenews.com/nat3504.html.

UN-POPULATION FUND LOSES \$235 MILLION

The Bush Administration again withheld nearly \$40 million from a United Nations organization deeply involved in programs of forced abortion and coercive sterilization in China. This is the seventh consecutive year that U.S. dollars have been withheld, with the amount totaling nearly \$235 million since 2001. That money has been redirected to child survival programs and anti-trafficking programs, among others. The U.S. continues to be the world's largest donor to women and children's health programs.

The research prompting the yearly decision was done by the Population Research Institute headed by Steven Mosher. The group's investigators studying China's barbaric one-child policy found "strict birth limitation regulations, obligatory contraception services, mandatory abortion, involuntary sterilization and financial penalties such as job loss and destruction of homes or property to induce compliance." Mosher's book is titled *Population Control – Real Costs, Illusory Benefits*.

Note: Barach Obama would restore this funding should he become president.

THE STEM CELL ARGUMENT IS OVER

by: J. C. Willke, M. D.

It looks like the argument over embryonic stem cells is finally over. It will be if the secular press and a great number of politicians are willing to look and listen, even briefly, to the scientific happenings of the last six months. To read most of the secular press, one gets the impression that human embryonic stem cells contain within themselves the secrets of an amazing number of cures for human injuries and diseases.

Just give them enough time and money, and they will present to us a cornucopia of a new world of medical miracles. Based on these rosy predictions, huge amounts of money have been appropriated to fund this needed investigation, i.e., \$3 billion in California and other major sums elsewhere. Some time has now passed, and to date almost no curative discoveries in animals have materialized, and a sum total of zero cures have been achieved for humans.

Needless to say, any attentive person has certainly been aware of a continuing chain of reports on the benefits available through *adult* stem cells and those obtained from the umbilical cord and placenta. Hardly a week goes by without hearing of another advance of using adult stem cells in humans. However, a majority of those in the U.S. Congress and many other legislative bodies seemed to have turned a deaf ear to the adult stem cell progress or have continued to place their absolute trust in the much ballyhooed potential for embryonic stem cells.

The three strikes against the use of embryonic stem

cells in humans have been available for anyone to see and are worth reviewing.

- 1) The moral objection is obvious. Human embryonic stem cells are obtained by killing a five day old living human embryo and extracting the cells from within that tiny forming body. For many, this moral objection is totally governing.
- 2) These cells are foreign tissue if implanted in a human. The embryo has a different DNA, and cells extracted from this tiny body will probably be rejected by the recipient body, just as a transplanted kidney would be. The counter argument has been that these are so primitive that they will not be rejected – a fact not proven. And, that if we clone these embryos, then most of the rejection potential will be neutralized. Again, this is an unproven claim.
- 3) These cells placed in animal bodies frequently form tumors. They tend to grow uncontrollably into many different cellular types, which may be malignant and fatal to the recipient. Their response has been that there must be an answer for this if only research continues. And so the clamor for using your tax money for further research on embryonic stem cells continues.

But now we have a startling and a very welcome development. In the last 11 months there has been a series of scientific breakthroughs that probably have rendered all of the above arguments moot.

The first was in November, 2007. There was an announcement in two scientific journals that top level researchers, one in Japan and one in Wisconsin, had found a new method of obtaining embryonic stem cells. They were able to reprogram ordinary adult skin cells to create "induced pluripotent stem cells," which are the equivalent of embryonic stem cells. Dr. James Thompson of the Wisconsin team, who had first discovered stem cells a few years ago and has been a pioneer in continuing research since, stated that these cells "meet the defining criteria for pluripotent human embryonic stem cells." The method that he and the Japanese scientist Professor Yamamaka used is efficient and cost effective. The skin cells used are those of the patient himself, and therefore these new pluripotent cells that are re-implanted in this original body will not be rejected, for they are the same DNA as the patient's. This eliminates the tissue rejection problem. This also eliminates the moral question of killing five-day-old embryos to obtain these cells. An initial criticism was that the cells used to date have been fetal skin cells. This problem has been eliminated by currently using adult skin cells.

Scientific breakthroughs such as this are commonly viewed with some suspicion and hesitancy by the medical community until they are replicated by other scientists. Happily, we have been blessed by this confirmation happening rather promptly. Scientists at Harvard University have repeated studies similar to Wisconsin and Japanese ones and found them legitimate. Their report is that this new approach is "not a fluke" but a legitimate method of reducing the need for killing human embryos to advance science. Another medical center at UCLA in California using the same technique has also replicated these findings. They have reported their new stem cells to be "virtually indistinguishable from human embryonic stem cells." It is noted that both of these studies have used adult skin cells.

(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

Stem Cell Argument...

(continued from page 5)

It would seem that a number of the barriers have fallen. The moral issue of killing five-day-old human embryos is moot if you use the patient's own cells rather than the cells of a different human being. The problem of tissue rejection is solved if you use the patient's own cells to produce these new cells and then return them to his or her body. However, there was a third major problem and that was the proclivity to form tumors. Would these new cells have the same problem as the cells from embryos?

We now have heard, just in the last few weeks, of a further remarkable advance. Professor Yamanaka, the same scientist who did one of the first two reports above, has just announced that his team has found a way to grow these induced pluripotent cells without triggering tumor growth. He has successfully avoided tumor growth for six months now in the mice he is currently treating with these induced pluripotent stem cells. Again, this will need to be continued and replicated by other legitimate scientists, but assuming that it is, it looks now like the last major barrier to the use of these very primitive cells has been eliminated. If this is true, many of the rosy predictions held out for embryonic stem cells may now come true using these new pluripotent cells.

In the last few years, we have seen remarkable and heartening discoveries and progress using adult stem cells. Will these new cells add to the progress already made by adult stem cells in curing human conditions? Is it possible that these new cells may even be capable of doing a better job than adult stem cells? Stay tuned.

It would certainly seem that a new era is dawning. Let's pray to Almighty God that this will be true.

J.C. Willke, M. D. is past president of National Right to Life. He currently is president and publisher of *Life Issues* from which this article was derived.

WHAT IS PRO-ABORTION PLANNED PARENTHOOD UP TO NOW?

The Iowa Right To Life Committee broke a shocking story this week when it revealed that Planned Parenthood of Greater Iowa is now offering RU-486 abortions by webcam. According to IRLC, patients are no longer required to have an appointment or see a doctor in person in order to undergo this gruesome procedure. Instead, patients are apparently walking into some Iowa Planned Parenthood centers and receiving their medical abortions with an abortionist available for advice via webcam.

IRLC also stated that Planned Parenthood is violating the U.S. Food and Drug Administration protocol for RU-486, according to the FDA. The approved Mifeprex regimen for a medical abortion through 49 days of pregnancy is:

- **Day One:** Mifeprex Administration: 3 tablets of 200 mg of Mifeprex orally at once
- **Day Three:** Misoprostol Administration: 2 tablets of 200 mg of Misoprostol orally at once
- **Day Fourteen:** Post-Treatment - The patient must return to confirm that a complete termination has occurred. If not, surgical termination is recommended to manage medical abortion treatment failures.

The FDA's website also states, "The safety and effectiveness of other Mifeprex dosing regimens, including use of oral misoprostol tablets intravaginally, has not been established by the FDA."

Planned Parenthood is reportedly giving its customers a lower dose of Mifeprex and a higher dose of Misoprostol and provides only two appointments instead of the FDA-recommended three. In addition, its customers take the Misoprostol at home. All of these charges decrease Planned Parenthood's costs while its customers follow a regimen whose safety has not been evaluated by the FDA.

**Information provided by STOPP Report,
September 17, 2008.**

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

I understand that the Right To Life Committee of New Mexico (RTL CNM) 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 RTL CNM, 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.; Verna Pochop, Treas.; Dauneen Dolce, National Delegate; Editor: Dauneen Dolce. **VIVA LIFE!** is printed by The Sherwood Co., Inc.