

“The Hidden Pro-life Crisis”

Misoprostol is its name. Used with mifepristone, the combination is the now familiar RU 486, currently in use in this nation. Alone, misoprostol is only slightly less deadly but “under the radar” as it is the active ingredient in Cytotec, a prescription drug approved to relieve gastric ulcers. **It can be a one-pill, one-day, “homemade” abortion.**

Normally, the woman begins hemorrhaging; then is able to go to a medical clinic and claim she is miscarrying. There is no evidence she has ‘self-aborted’. Nor is the doctor aware that, by removing the now-dead baby, he is completing an elective abortion.

Pro-abortion groups see misoprostol as their ultimate “final solution;” **particularly in countries where abortion is illegal.** People need to be aware of this unapproved, off-label use of misoprostol and of how women are being encouraged to violate U.S. and international laws and regulations.

Though no specific group appears to take responsibility for the website, its content states its goal: www.misoprostolabortion.com,

“...to provide information to pregnant women who want to end their pregnancies, women who live in countries with restrictive abortion laws, countries where abortion is illegal, or for women who for some reason or other do not have access to legal abortion service.”

Since this drug has a legitimate medical use, we cannot demand that it be removed from the market. However, according to the Population Research Institute (PRI), our Food and Drug Administration (FDA) does have a watchdog role to play here.

Groups encouraging the off-label use of misoprostol can and should be subject to regulatory action.

See: “Misoprostol and the Hidden Pro-Life Crisis.”

<http://pop.org/main.cfm?EID=1134>

Please express your concerns to: FDA, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857, or 1-888-INFO-FDA

Questioning the Unexpected

Does one of your favorite charities make grants to Planned Parenthood or fund the destruction of human embryos for medical research purposes?

Life Decisions International’s (LDI) purpose is to study the financial contributions/grants of all corporations, both for-profit and non-profit, to establish whether or not abortion/abortifacients or ESCR, (embryonic stem cell research) is included.

The following are two unpleasant surprises:

The **American Cancer Society** grants both Planned Parenthood and ESCR.

The **Muscular Dystrophy Association** (MDA) funds ESCR.

For verifiable information, see: www.ldi.org

The National Education Association (NEA)

Pro-Life Educators and Students (PLES) protested at the NEA national convention in July in Washington. The NEA endorsed Barack Obama, who opposes all limits on legalized abortion.

Bob Pawson of PLES says the NEA should be one of the leading **opponents of abortion** because it is killing the next generation of students.

“A pro-abortion position isn’t just morally outrageous: it’s stupid; economic suicide. 25 abortions equal one lost classroom, lost teaching careers, and catastrophic losses to America’s future.”

Express your concern to the NEA at: www.nea.org/aboutnea/contact.html

Legislation

S.1810 – Prenatally and Postnatally Diagnosed Conditions Awareness Act.

Co-sponsored (amazingly!) by Sen. Sam Brownback (R-KS) and Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-MA), this bill requires that:

Parents whose children are diagnosed – before birth or until a year after birth – with Down Syndrome or another impairment be provided with the latest information on the condition and the support services available to those parents.

Also, a registry of families willing to adopt special needs children is to be established.

It is estimated that 90% of American children diagnosed in the womb with Down Syndrome, spina bifida, cystic fibrosis and dwarfism are aborted – often due to inadequate information and/or a perceived lack of available support.

Intercessors for America, July, 08

H.R.5910 – Human-Animal Hybrid Prohibition Act

This Act places a ban on the creation, transfer or transportation of a human-animal hybrid, covering the mixing of either the human ovum or the human sperm with any non-human/animal flesh or genes.

Introduced by Rep. Chris Smith, this legislation also is of interest to environmental advocates.

“Human-animal hybrids present an optimal opportunity for genetic transfer that could increase the risk for transmission of both human and animal diseases, such as Bird Flu and SARS.”

“Bill to Ban...” Weston, John-Henry, LifeSiteNews, 4/25/08

“Seek-and-destroy” for Downs Syndrome

Being developed in England and Hong Kong, a non-invasive prenatal test of the mother’s blood will detect Downs with a supposed 90% accuracy.

The test “will inevitably mean more pre-natal testing, leading to more abortions of [those] babies...”

“Describing this as a ‘breakthrough’ is offensive to people who live with Downs and to all who recognize the equal right to life of disabled people,” says Alison Davis, of the British Society for the Protection of Unborn Children.

“New Prenatal Test...” LifeNews.com, 7/1/08

...And – Good News!

H.R. 2642 – 2008 War Supplemental Bill

In June, the U.S. House stripped a Planned Parenthood funding provision from HR 2642 which would have given PP facilities discounted drugs at taxpayer expense.

The amendment was added to the Senate’s proposed version of HR 2642.

Currently, PP purchases birth control pills for \$2 for a month’s supply and sells them for \$18 to \$30. As the largest single provider of birth control pills in the nation, does PP really need more discounted drugs at taxpayer expense?

“Provision Giving PP More...” Baklinski, T., LifeSiteNews 6/20/08

Oregon’s Assisted Suicide – Progress?

Recently, lung cancer patient, Barbara Wagner, was notified that her prescription to slow the growth of her cancer is not covered by the Oregon Health Plan.

The Plan, however, would cover doctor-assisted suicide should she wish to kill herself.

Fortunately, later, a representative of the prescription manufacturer called Wagner to say that she would receive her medication without any cost.

Oregon oncologists did report that, increasingly, sufferers of recurrent cancer are not receiving coverage for chemotherapy. They are always eligible, however, for state-funded assisted suicide.

“We’ve been warning for years that this was a possibility in Oregon,” says bioethicist, Wesley J. Smith.

Excerpted “Oregon offers...” Waggoner, Tim, LifeSiteNews 6/4/08

Commemorating a Special Occasion

A gift received from
Bob & Jean Zecha

Honoring

Jake, Robert and Oliver

In celebration of their baptism
June 21, 2008

~~~~~  
Thank you

Pikes Peak Citizens for Life  
707R N Nevada, Colo Spgs – 80903  
[www.ppcitizensforlife.org](http://www.ppcitizensforlife.org) 630-1999

## President's Corner - Thoughts on Voting # 3

In the last two President's Corners we looked at what a candidate must understand to qualify for office and how a politician's stand on the sanctity of human life reveals how he will govern.

This month we are publishing some of the returns from our candidate's questionnaire, those relating to primary races. All responses to the questionnaire are posted on our web site.

The questionnaire had four core questions (numbered as you see them in the results):

Question two asks if the candidate understands the basic qualification – **that the primary duty of government is to protect the inalienable right to life and that no government has the authority to declare any part of the human family to be non-persons.**

Questions three, four, and five are clarification questions. If it's the government's primary duty to protect the right to life, then **the sanctity of human life must be a foundational principle.** If that is so, then it **must take precedence over party loyalty.** And finally, if the sanctity of human life is a foundational principle that forms the basis of the government's primary duty, then a politician **cannot support a pro-abortion candidate running against a pro-life candidate.**

The last question is the real test. It is the one where we can hold politicians accountable. A politician who is *theoretically* pro-life can answer the first three questions correctly, but the last question involves **commitment to action.**

Note that when a candidate waffles on the last question, other considerations or *issues* are brought into the discussion. This **devalues** the sanctity of human life to being **one of many "issues,"** not a foundational principle, and thus the protection of the right to life is not the government's primary duty.

If a politician is unwilling to stand firm on the sanctity of human life and take the heat, his principles are not worth much.

### Candidate Questionnaire - 2008

1. Do you consider yourself pro-life?
2. Do you agree with the following statements?
  - a. The primary duty of government is to protect the inalienable right to life given by the Creator.
  - b. And, the U.S. Constitution states that no person can be deprived of his right to life except by due process of law. Thus, no government has the authority to declare any part of the human family to be non-persons.
3. Is the sanctity of human life a foundational principle, or is it one among many issues of equal importance?
4. Does your stand on the sanctity of human life take precedence over loyalty to your political party?
5. Would you endorse a pro-choice candidate who is running against a pro-life candidate?
6. At what stage of development did we become persons? Single Cell (**S**), Birth (**B**), Other (**O**)
7. Do you want *Roe v Wade* and *Doe v Bolton* to be overturned?
8. Will you support a pro-life constitutional amendment, state and/or federal, upholding the sanctity of life from single cell stage of development\* to natural death? (\*Single cell stage of development covers human cloning and other emerging biotechnologies as well as fertilization.)
9. Will you support federal and/or state efforts to ban **A**) Late term abortion? **B**) Embryonic stem cell research?

Answer code: (**U**)=undecided; (**?**)=comments unclear; (**NR**)= No response. For clarification, call our office – 630-1999.

### Candidates for August Primary - 2008

| Position | Pty | Name            | 1        | 2A       | 2B                     | 3        | 4        | 5        | 6        | 7        | 8        | 9A               | 9B       |                                 |
|----------|-----|-----------------|----------|----------|------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------------|----------|---------------------------------|
| 4th DA   | R   | Dan May         |          |          | <b>Did not respond</b> |          |          |          |          |          |          |                  |          |                                 |
| 4th DA   | R   | John Newsome    | <b>Y</b> | <b>Y</b> | <b>Y</b>               | <b>F</b> | <b>Y</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>S</b> | <b>Y</b> | <b>Y</b> | <b>Y</b>         | <b>Y</b> |                                 |
| CD 5     | R   | Bentley Rayburn | <b>Y</b> | <b>Y</b> | <b>Y</b>               | <b>F</b> | <b>Y</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>S</b> | <b>Y</b> | <b>Y</b> | <b>Y</b>         | <b>Y</b> |                                 |
| CD 5     | R   | Doug Lamborn    | <b>Y</b> | <b>Y</b> | <b>Y</b>               | <b>F</b> | <b>Y</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>S</b> | <b>Y</b> | <b>Y</b> | <b>Y</b>         | <b>Y</b> |                                 |
| CD 5     | R   | Jeff Crank      |          |          | <b>Did not respond</b> |          |          |          |          |          |          |                  |          |                                 |
| HD 15    | R   | Douglas Bruce   | <b>Y</b> | <b>Y</b> | <b>Y</b>               | <b>F</b> | <b>Y</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>S</b> | <b>Y</b> | <b>Y</b> | <b>Y</b>         | <b>Y</b> |                                 |
| HD 15    | R   | Mark Waller     |          |          | <b>Did not respond</b> |          |          |          |          |          |          |                  |          |                                 |
| HD 17    | R   | Catherine Roupe |          |          | <b>Did not respond</b> |          |          |          |          |          |          | (Gazette 3/9/08) |          | "...I'm a pro-choice candidate" |
| HD 17    | R   | Sheila Hicks    | <b>Y</b> | <b>Y</b> | <b>Y</b>               | <b>F</b> | <b>Y</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>S</b> | <b>Y</b> | <b>Y</b> | <b>Y</b>         | <b>Y</b> | Incl the elderly & disabled     |
| SD 4     | R   | Bob Denny       |          |          | <b>Did not respond</b> |          |          |          |          |          |          |                  |          |                                 |
| SD 4     | R   | Mark Scheffel   | <b>Y</b> | <b>Y</b> | <b>Y</b>               | <b>F</b> | <b>Y</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>S</b> | <b>Y</b> | <b>Y</b> | <b>Y</b>         | <b>Y</b> |                                 |

For further details and comments, see our website: [ppcitizensforlife.org](http://ppcitizensforlife.org)

### **The United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)**

Always there to “serve”, the UNFPA recently provided 220,000 condoms to the cyclone survivors in Myanmar where the Red Cross estimates 2.5 million survivors are in desperate need of food, shelter and clean water.

UNFPA’s response to the Sichuan Province, China, earthquake was to “provide reproductive health supplies” to the people.

In 2004, the UNFPA called for \$28 million to supply condoms to victims of the tsunami in Indonesia.

“UNFPA Sending...” Baklinski, T., LifeSiteNews, 5/22/08

### **Bush & the UNFPA**

In accord with the prolife 1985 Kemp-Kasten Amendment, President Bush again revoked taxpayer funding for the UN Population Fund (UNFPA) who promotes abortion and backs the one-child forced-abortion policy in China.

Along with the almost \$40 million this year, Bush has denied a total of **\$235 million** to the pro-abortion agency since he took office in 2001.

Our thanks to George W. Bush for his strong support of prolife legislation and Life during his presidency.

Excerpts: LifeNews, 5 July 08

## **Colorado 2008 Primary Election – Tuesday, August 12**

Look for primary candidate information inside our newsletter.

All the candidates have been sent a survey form.

Those who do not respond generally are pro-abortion or not fully pro-life.

**Please remember the babies as you vote.**