

**NH Right to Life
Political Action Committee**
2018 Policy Manual

Pro-Life Principles



“The care of human life and happiness, and not their destruction, is the first and only legitimate object of good government.” -Thomas Jefferson.

Table of Contents

<u>Rape and Incest Exceptions.....</u>	<u>3-5</u>
<u>Stem Cell Research</u>	<u>6-9</u>
<u>Human Cloning.....</u>	<u>10-12</u>
<u>RU-486.....</u>	<u>13</u>
<u>Tax Funding of Abortions</u>	<u>14-16</u>
<u>Fetal Tissue Research</u>	<u>17-20</u>
<u>Assisted Suicide and Euthanasia.....</u>	<u>21-23</u>
Personhood Affirmation form	<u>24</u>
Appendix	
2013 Gallup Poll on Abortion	<u>25</u>

Rape and Incest Exceptions

- Rape is a horrible crime that must be punished to the full extent of the law.
- Our focus needs to be on providing resources and compassionate care for victims of rape and incest, not on aborting the child conceived thereby.
- A child should not be punished for the crimes of the father.
- A woman that is the victim of rape or incest deserves to be helped, not suffer through the additional trauma of abortion.
- Abortion allows society to forget about the acts of incest and pretend that justice has been done, while often the perpetrator is protected from prosecution for the crime.
- Up to 85% of women pregnant by rape carry to term.

Frequently Asked Questions and Answers for Candidates

Q. Why should a woman be punished to raise a child that was born from rape or incest? Hasn't she already been hurt enough?

A. The way a child was conceived does not change that he or she is a human being. This woman has been hurt and needs care for both her and her child. She does not have to raise the child. Open or closed adoption choices give the mother dignity and hope. She needs time, counseling and healing, as opposed to trying to force her

to abort her child in one of the most traumatic moments of her life.

Q. Wouldn't an abortion help to provide relief to the already emotionally traumatized woman?

A. First, she needs time to stabilize and get back to a sound mind after trauma. Since she has been brutally harmed through rape or incest, she should not be forced to make life and death decisions. Dr. Martha Shuppig confirms that over 40 peer-reviewed studies show that abortion has a negative psychological, physical, and emotional impact on women. Abortion hurts women.

Abortion is an additional trauma that robs a woman of her maternity and makes her complicit in denying the right to life for her child. Resources should be available to help her come through victoriously.

Women who had abortions were six times more likely to having suicidal thoughts than women who were pregnant but did not abort.

Q. Where do you think you get the right to tell a woman what to do with her body?

A. Every citizen in the U.S. is given equal rights from the youngest to the oldest under the U.S. Constitution. Women deserve equal protection under the law, yet so does the preborn child on the inside of the woman who is a separate, distinct human being.

Q. What percentage of victims of rape and incest decide to not have abortions?

A. Up to 85% percent of the rape victims choose to give birth rather than have abortions.¹

NHRTL Position Statement on Rape and Incest

“NHRTL opposes abortion for pregnancy resulting from rape or incest. While we understand the trauma involved in such situations, the unborn child conceived is no less human than one conceived under more favorable conditions. In cases of rape, we assert the need to educate women to seek immediate medical attention after they are victimized. We believe women should be provided with compassionate, competent emotional and health care. In the case of incest, we stress the need to help the entire family correct the situation, which led to the pregnancy. Again, the unborn child is an innocent party and should not be destroyed as a ‘solution’ to all the complex problems involved.”

¹ 18 Shocking Abortion Statistics, Rape Victims
<http://healthresearchfunding.org/18-shocking-abortion-statistics-rape->

Stem Cell Research

- Human embryos are human beings by their genetic makeup and therefore deserving of protection.
- Embryonic stem cell research destroys young human life. It is never morally or ethically justified to kill one human in order to benefit another.
- Adult (non-embryonic) stem cell research does not require the destruction of human lives.
- We need to work to provide funding for research to save human life and not research that destroys it.
- Adult stem cell research has treated and cured over 73 diseases to date.²
- Our taxpayer dollars should not go to the funding of the destruction of innocent human life.

Frequently Asked Questions and Answers for Candidates

Q. Do you oppose stem cell research?

A. I support the ethical forms of stem cell research, which includes adult stem cell research and iPS (Induced Pluripotent Stem Cell) research. I do not support embryonic stem cell research which destroys human life.

²The Coalition for Americans for Research Ethics
www.stemcellresearch.org

Q. What are the main differences between embryonic and adult stem cell research?

A. Embryonic Stem Cell (ESC) Research involves the destruction of human embryos in order to obtain research. Embryonic stem cells are totipotent which means they have the potential to become any other type of tissue in the body. However, they are unpredictable.

Adult stem cells (ASC) are found in 12 different places in the body. They are pluripotent which means it is already determined what types of cells they will become. However, in 2008, iPS cells were discovered. They involve taking adult stem cells and reprogramming them to resemble embryonic-like stem cells. These cells would function as embryonic cells without the destruction of life, if they can be controlled. (Scientists are still working to control the iPS cells. ASC has resulted in 73 cures.)

Q. Why don't you support embryonic stem cell research? It's just an embryo. People can be saved through these treatments.

A. Embryonic stem cell research promotes the destruction of human life. I will not promote any research that puts the value of one person's life over that of another for a potential cure.

Adult stem cell research has resulted in over 73 treatments for diseases including diabetes, Parkinson's, breast cancer, leukemia, ovarian cancer, paralysis, lupus, multiple sclerosis, cirrhosis of the liver among other diseases.

Q. An embryo is a clump of cells. What proof do you have that it is a human being?

A. The term “embryo” is a term that refers to a biological stage of development. It does not determine what something is, but rather what stage in life it is. (For instance, you can say the term “infant” and it does not determine what the living being is but rather the stage that the child is currently.

Living beings reproduce after their own kind. When the DNA of a human female through the oocyte (egg) and the sperm of a human male are combined, the result can only be a human being.

Q. What about the leftover embryos from in-vitro fertilization? They are going to sit frozen in clinics, so why not use them for research?

A. How a person was conceived does not change his or her value. These embryos are still human beings by their genetic make-up and deserve legal protection. These extra embryos are being adopted by couples, who want to have children. Through groups like Nightlight Christian Adoptions, over 7000 babies have been born who were once viewed as “excess leftover embryos.”

NHRTL Position Statement on Stem Cell Research

NHRTL supports research that can save lives of human beings without causing harm to other lives. Stem cell re- search, where adult stem cells, cord blood, or other sources are used receive the support of NHRTL. We op- pose all forms of research where living human embryos are destroyed; this includes destructive embryonic stem cell research, as well as fetal tissue research.

Human Cloning

- Scientists differentiate between two types of cloning: **reproductive**, where the clone is created and carried to full term pregnancy, and **research or therapeutic** cloning, which involves the creation of human life to destroy it for research purposes such as stem cell re- search.
- Research cloning involves the deliberate creation of human life for the purposes of killing them for use in research.
- Research cloning requires the usage of eggs in order to create a clone and will place a demand on the already short supply of eggs.
- The process of egg extraction is unsafe for women. Many have had problems while trying to donate eggs.
- Research cloning would target women, especially young, low-income women (i.e. female college students)³.
- Any process that involves the creation of human life to destroy it devalues life.

³*Problems with Egg Donation.*

http://stemcellbioethics.wikischolars.columbia.edu/Ethical+Considerations+of+Egg+Donation#Risks_of_Egg_Donation

Frequently Asked Questions and Answers for Candidates

Q. What is the difference between reproductive and therapeutic or research cloning?

A. Cloning is done through a process called somatic cell nuclear transplantation (SCNT). This is the scientific term for cloning. All clones made through SCNT are made the same way; the only difference is what to do with cloned embryos after they are created.

In reproductive cloning, the clone is allowed to live and is brought to a full-term pregnancy. In research or therapeutic cloning, the clone is experimented upon in his or her first few weeks of life and then killed. (This is the type of cloning used to harvest stem cells for embryonic stem cell research.)

Q. Isn't human cloning necessary for stem cell research to advance?

A. No. Stem cell research can still advance and is advancing without the use of human cloning to create embryonic stem cells.

For instance, many adult stem-cell therapies use a patient's own cells, removing the possibility of tissue rejection. Those who cannot use their own cells can often get cells transplanted from a relative who has a compatible tissue type. Adult stem-cell research does not require human cloning for any reason. If a state wants to pursue stem-cell research, there are other ways of doing it without needing to clone human embryos.

Q. I'm against reproductive cloning. Why is research cloning seen as an unethical procedure?

A. Research cloning involves the creation of human life for the sole purpose of destroying them to use for research. Even though the human life may not grow beyond 4 or 5 days, it still does not change that it is the destruction of a human being.

Human life begins at conception. Regardless of how that life was created, there is still a human being. When human life is created, just to be destroyed for research, human beings are seen as commodities to be created, manipulated, and destroyed rather than as distinct individuals, created in the image of God.

NHRTL Position Statement on Human Cloning

NHRTL strongly advocates for the passage of tightly written legislation at the national and state level that will permanently ban all human cloning including research on embryos. If human cloning proceeds, our minds can conjure up many scenarios of abuse of human cloning as our society creates human beings not in God's own image but in our own.

Human cloning is an inherent violation of human dignity. As with abortion and assisted reproductive technologies, such as in-vitro fertilization, human cloning denies the most fundamental of human rights - the right to life. The research process inevitably requires scientists to destroy and discard their 'failed' experiments. For example, it took 277 attempts at cell manipulation and 29 embryo implants before the sheep, Dolly, was produced.

Cloning would further violate human dignity by denying the intrinsic value and uniqueness of each human life, thereby viewing human beings as products or commodities. For this same reason, we oppose surrogate parenting contracts, genetic screening of embryos before uterine implanting, and sex selection abortion. Cloning could not possibly respect the intrinsic value of the person created, because a cloned person will not be created simply for his or her value as a person. There will always be an intended and specific utility attached to a cloned person because he or she was created with a particular genetic make-up for some purpose. Any action taken to create or destroy human beings based on their genetic qualities denies their intrinsic value.

RU-486

- RU-486 is a chemical abortifacient, also known as mifepristone, or Mifeprex. It is taken to end pregnancy, not to prevent it.
- Women take RU-486 through the 9th week of pregnancy. By this point, the baby has every organ and his or her body is being formed.

Frequently Asked Questions and Answers for Candidates

Q. Isn't RU-486 the same as the "morning after pill"?

- A. No. RU-486 is typically taken in the fifth through the ninth week of pregnancy. By this point of development, the child already has a heart and is developing arms and legs. Brain waves have been detected at this point. RU-486 kills a human being.

Q. Does RU 486 have legitimate medical uses?

- A. The *only* proven use of RU 486 is to stop the heartbeat of a human fetus.

NHRTL Position Statement on RU-486

NHRTL opposes the RU-486/prostaglandin abortion technique because it kills unborn babies whose hearts have begun to beat. The powerful synthetic steroid RU 486 has had no proven use other than abortion.

We also join with numerous other pro-life groups in supporting the boycott of the company Danco, which produces and distributes the drug.

Tax Funding of Abortions

- Any money that goes to the destruction of human life is wasted money.
- Taxpayer dollars should not be used to fund abortions.
- Instead of paying for women to have an abortion, tax dollars should only be used for life-affirming pregnancy care through non-governmental organizations, like pregnancy resource centers.
- Federal funding currently provides for abortions in the case of rape, incest or to save the life of the mother.
- The U. S. government pays millions in grants and contracts to the nation's largest abortion provider, Planned Parenthood, totaling over 40% of PP's income.
- If abortion is a private matter, then taxpayers should not be forced to pay for this private decision.

Frequently Asked Questions and Answers for Candidates

Q. Do you oppose Tax funding of abortions?

A. Yes. We believe that any money spent paying, directly or indirectly, for the destruction of human life is an improper use of taxpayer dollars.

Q. Are there laws in existence that restrict federal funding for abortions?

A. Yes, the Hyde Amendment, which was enacted in 1977 prohibits federal funding for abortions except in the cases of rape or incest, or to save the life of the mother.

In January of 2017, the “Mexico City Policy”, which prevented abortion providers worldwide receiving Federal grants was reinstated.

However, these laws do not stop state governments from funding abortions through state funds.

Q. Don’t Planned Parenthood and other abortion providers need government funding to provide “family planning” services?

A. No, the abortion business is a very lucrative industry and does not need the help of the federal government to stay in business.

Planned Parenthood brought in over \$1.2961 billion dollars in income.¹⁴ Planned Parenthood also received over \$336 million in government grants, almost 43% of all revenue.

Q. Are there alternatives to family-planning clinics?

A. NH has 52 community health clinics and five Planned Parenthood facilities.^{26*}

NHRTL Position Statement on Tax Funding of Abortions

NHRTL is opposed to the use of tax dollars to pay for abortions, abortion research, and/or activities, which could encourage abortion as a "solution" to "problem" pregnancies. (The same policy is held regarding euthanasia and infanticide.)

Fetal Tissue Research

- The use of aborted fetal tissue for research requires an abortion and devalues of life.
- It is unethical and inappropriate to spend taxpayer money to buy aborted babies from abortionists so that scientists can do research.
- The very humanity of the pre-born that makes aborted fetal tissue so attractive to abortionists and researchers.²⁷
- Fetal tissue research exploits women by implementing more dangerous methods of abortion to obtain intact, live tissue.
- The financially motivated pharmaceutical companies and medical researchers are dangerous predators that exploit of women, unborn children, and gravely ill patients most likely to fall prey to promises of miracle cures.
- Due to the uncontrollable nature of fetal tissue when used in experiments complications, such as tumors can occur.
- The practice of fetal tissue transplantation and experimentation creates a market for the destruction of human lives.

Frequently Asked Questions and Answers for Candidates

Q.

**What’s the big deal with using aborted fetal tissue?
The baby is dead already.**

A. The destruction of human lives for the betterment of others is not a right. Murder is a crime. The use of taxpayer monies to subsidize it, makes the taxpayer an accomplice to the crime.

“Suppose a murderer offered to provide a hospital a steady supply of body parts, cut from his victims, for people who needed transplants. Should the hospital take him up on his offer? Of course not, and that the fact that it would be ‘for a good cause’ would make no difference. The purchase would not only be wrong of itself but would provide the murderer with a financial incentive to commit even more murders. The use of tissues from aborted babies for medical research is equally wrong, and for exactly the same reasons.”

Q. Have fetal stem cells resulted in any cures for human beings?

A. Fetal stem cells have not cured any diseases in human beings to date.¹⁶ In fact, they are unpredictable and unsafe to use in humans.

In 2009, a study was published that illustrated just how unsafe these fetal stem cells are. A young Israeli boy was given fetal stem cells, and the stem cells resulted in tumors in his brain and spinal cord.

Q.

How can use of fetal tissue prove to be dangerous for women?

A. Those who engage in aborting babies to harvest their parts are more concerned with presenting intact parts than they are with the wellbeing of the mother. **These changes put women in greater danger**

For example, early suction abortions are less dangerous to the mother than are later abortions.

However, when suction abortion is used on unborn children slated for experiments, the abortion process is often slowed down, pressure from the suction machine is reduced, and larger dilation instruments are used.

Q. Don't we have laws against this kind of process?

A. While it is not legal to sell the aborted fetal tissue in the U.S., abortionists find ways to evade the law by leasing out a portion of their abortion clinic to on site 'researchers' who receive the organs of the aborted fetuses.

Q.

Has the sale of prenatal body parts ever been a problem?

A. Yes. On numerous occasions the abortion procedure has been altered specifically to obtain useful fetal body parts, even to the extent that the children were delivered whole, intact, and alive for the harvesting of their parts. ³²

This puts additional risk on the mother. Financial compensation may drive the timing and type of procedure used. An older fetus may bring the abortion vendors more money, but at increased risk of trauma to mothers during later term abortions.

NHRTL Position Statement on Fetal Tissue Research

NHRTL is opposed to the use of tax dollars to pay for abortions, abortion research, and activities which could encourage abortion as a "solution" to problem pregnancies. (The same policy is held regarding euthanasia and infanticide.)

Assisted Suicide and Euthanasia

- Every human being has an innate worth and value, any procedure that violates the sanctity of human life should be opposed.
- Condoning assisted suicide and euthanasia sends the message that some lives have no value.
- Resources should be provided for these patients to help them to ease their pain and treat disease.
- Physician-assisted suicide creates a duty to die. Death may become a substitute to treatment and care as medical costs continue to rise.
- Physician-assisted suicide often ignores depression, a legitimate cry for help.
- Physician-assisted suicide forces a doctor to violate their oath to do no harm.

Frequently Asked Questions and Answers for Candidates

Q. What is assisted suicide?

A. Assisted suicide involves providing a patient the means to kill him or herself. (i.e. A doctor prescribes drugs to a patient and instructs the patient on how much to take to kill him or herself. The patient dies of poisoning rather than of natural causes.)Q. What is euthanasia?

A. Euthanasia involves the direct killing of another person. Euthanasia can be requested by a patient, requested by someone else for the patient, or be

carried out against the wishes of the patient. (i.e. A doctor directly injects a patient with a deadly drug. The patient dies of an intentional poisoning rather than a natural death.)

Q. Would you favor the legalization of euthanasia?

A. No. I believe every human being has an inherent worth and dignity, and euthanasia attacks that dignity.

Our focus in New Hampshire should be on creating policy that supports people in terminally ill or handicap situations to provide them options and successful pain management, not on killing them and ending their lives prematurely.

Q. Shouldn't people have a right to die?

A. To die is not a right, but a natural process. Our nation was founded on the right to life. Life should be valued. Neither euthanasia, nor assisted suicide values life

It is not the role of government to legislate when a person can or should die, but rather to provide a safeguard for life. Euthanasia is not about giving rights to the person who dies, but instead to change the public policy so that doctors, relatives, and others can directly and intentionally end another person's life.

Ultimately, this change in law would not give rights to the person who is killed, but to the person who does the killing. It would not create a right to die, but rather a right to kill.

Q. What's the big deal? Other nations have legalized euthanasia.

A. In the Netherlands, legalizing voluntary assisted suicide for those with terminal illness has spread to include *non voluntary* euthanasia for many who have no terminal illnesses.

Half the killings in the Netherlands are now non-voluntary, and the problems for which death is now the legal "solution" include such things as mental illness, permanent disability, and even simple old age.¹⁹

NHRTL Position Statement on Euthanasia

NHRTL opposes all attempts to legalize/condone euthanasia. This includes the intentional use of medical technology to cause death or speed up the dying process by withholding ordinary, appropriate, and prudent medical care including, but not restricted to nutrition and hydration.

On the other hand, NHRTL supports the traditional Judeo-Christian ethic that holds that although one must use ordinary, appropriate means to maintain one's health, including nutrition and hydration, one is not bound to use extraordinary and heroic measures. Thus, death may be allowed to come naturally to the terminally ill when such heroic means only prolong the dying process.

New Hampshire Right to Life believes that we owe our sick and dying something greater than unnecessary "right to die" bills, which would be first steps toward legalized euthanasia. There is a greater and clearer need to help the sick and dying to secure good health care.

Personhood Affirmation Form



WHEREAS, the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution states, “nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law,” and

WHEREAS, I agree with New Hampshire Right to Life PAC that the right to life is the bedrock upon which all other Constitutional rights are derived; and

WHEREAS, we believe, in the face of compelling biological evidence that a continuum of human life and personhood initiates from the beginning of the biological development of that human being and ends at natural death, the ethical treatment of human embryos must include their “best interests”; and

WHEREAS, The formation of legislation by endorsed candidates shall be scrutinized and affirmed or opposed as soon as possible, so as to encourage passage of legislation that, although may implicitly allow abortion or imposed death, will not explicitly do so, nor exclude a class or group of people from protection from the same.

THEREFORE, as a candidate for public office, I affirm my support for bills that would assure that regardless of race, age, degree of disability, manner of conception, or circumstances surrounding a terminal illness, that the right to life of the pre-born; at an embryonic or fetal level, the elderly, and those with mental or physical infirmities are protected by law.

Candidate Affirmation

As a candidate for public office, I agree to uphold these principles and positions.

Signed: _____ Date: _____ Print name _____

Candidate for _____

Address _____

Phone # _____ Email _____

Additional Social Media _____

Appendix

2018 Gallup Poll on Abortion

Current views on the legality of abortion, based on Gallup's annual Values and Beliefs poll, conducted May 1-10, are nearly identical to those from Gallup's prior measures since May 2006.

Gallup poses a follow-up question of respondents who opt for the middle position -- those saying abortion should be "legal only under certain circumstances" -- asking if it should be legal in most or in only a few circumstances. The responses break over 2-1 in favor of the more restrictive policy.

The resulting distribution of views shows 29% of Americans favoring legalized abortion under any circumstances, 14% favoring legality under most circumstances, 35% favoring it in only in a few circumstances, and 18% saying it should be illegal in all circumstances.

Do you think abortions should be legal under any circumstances, legal only under certain circumstances or illegal in all circumstances? (Asked of those who say abortion should be legal under certain circumstances)n. Do you think abortion should be legal in most circumstances or only in a few circumstances?

Combined data based on full sample

	Legal under any	Legal under most	Legal only in a few	Illegal in all	No opinion
2018 May	29	14	35	18	3
2017 May	29	13	36	18	4
2006 May	30	13	39	15	3

<https://news.gallup.com/poll/1576/abortion.aspx> accessed 2018-08-01

