

Personhood FL ProLife PAC

To Enjoy and Defend Life!

Pro-Life Principles

Personhood FL ProLife PAC

P.O. Box 493000

Leesburg, FL 34749

772-873-7187

info@personhoodFL.com

www.PersonhoodFLProLifePAC.com



Personhood Florida Inc. is a nonprofit, nonpartisan people's initiative to amend the Constitution of Florida. In Florida, legal protection doesn't extend to preborn children, and is presently in jeopardy with our elderly and disabled. **The Right to Life of All Persons Recognized and Protected proposed Amendment** will insure that the God-given right to life of every human being at any stage of development shall be recognized and protected. It will establish justice and respect for life from the moment of biological beginning until natural death.

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

Personhood Florida Endorsements

“The right to life is the right of all rights. Without the right to life all other rights are meaningless. Since January 22, 1973, when the U.S. Supreme Court issued the Roe v. Wade opinion, America has been on the wrong side of life, the Constitution, and most of all America has been on the wrong side of our Creator. Each one of us is accountable for our actions and failure to act. We must pursue every lawful means to defend the defenseless and to speak for the most vulnerable of our brothers and sisters in the womb. I applaud Personhood Florida for its effort to restore the legal protections of personhood to the preborn. I encourage you to be on the right side of history by working to restore a culture of life in Florida and throughout America.”

-Mathew D. Staver, Founder and Chairman, Liberty Counsel

Offices in FL, VA, and DC | (800) 671-1776 | www.LC.org

I applaud the good folks of Florida for challenging the culture of death and championing life at all stages. The Florida ProLife Personhood Amendment is a reflection of a growing pro-life sentiment across the country and points toward a post-Roe era. I support the petition drive for this amendment and look forward to the day it can go before the voters in Florida.”

-Tony Perkins, Family Research Council

“Each year when I share with our congregation about the sanctity of human life I am faced with a dilemma. Statistically 50% of those listening have been hurt by the pain that abortion causes. They do not want to hear the word abortion or a sermon about it because it can surface painful memories. So every year I must resolve that the risk of causing pain and being rejected is worth the probability that people will be healed by God. I’ve come to realize that saying nothing is not loving and doing nothing is not loving. We all need to do something when it comes to the life and rights of the unborn. So this year when the opportunity arises to do something about the Personhood Amendment, I humbly ask you to publicly support it among those entrusted to you by God.”

Pastor Jeff Steffel, Grace Family Church

“Personhood efforts should be in all 50 states and everywhere Life is held in high esteem. It’s the best way to keep our unborn children from dying. Do I hear an Amen!”

-Norma McCorvey, Founder of Roe No More Ministry, Operation Outcry

[Norma McCorvey is the Jane Roe in the Roe v. Wade decision.]

“American Life League proudly stands with Florida’s historic movement to recognize the most basic of all human rights – personhood. As we daily battle the ravages of the culture of death, it is clear the only way to heal our land and restore the Founders’ vision is to recognize human personhood as a fundamental and Constitutional right. Every human being is a person from his or her biological beginning. The mission is simple, the message direct and the result will be a profound return to the value that shaped our civilization.

As the Florida personhood movement blazes a trail for true human rights, we renew our commitment to human personhood as the center and mission of our work at American Life League. Human personhood is the core of Catholic Social Teaching and the foundation of true human rights and dignity. It is always the right time to fight for justice.”

-Judie Brown, President, American Life League

Table of Contents

Rape and Incest Exceptions.....	4-5
Life of the Mother Exception.....	5-6
Stem Cell Research.....	6-7
Human Cloning.....	7-8
RU-486.....	9-10
Tax Funding of Abortions.....	10-11
Fetal Tissue Research.....	11-12
Assisted Suicide and Euthanasia.....	13-14
Personhood Affirmation.....	15

Appendix

2009 Gallup Poll on Abortion

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 the victims of rape and incest, not on aborting the innocent child conceived.
- A child should not be punished for the crimes of the father.
- Abortion is a procedure that exploits women. A woman that is the victim of rape or incest deserves to be helped, not suffer through the additional trauma of abortion.
- Less than 0.5 percent of all abortions occur as a result of rape or incest.¹
- Abortion allows society to forget about the acts of incest and pretend that justice has been done, while often the perpetrator is protected from the crime.

Frequently Asked Questions and Answers

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

A. The way a child was conceived does not change what it is: a human being. While the victim has been hurt, she does not have to raise the child. She has the option of making an adoption plan. In the meantime, we need to make sure that she is being taken care of and receiving counseling and healing, rather than trying to force her to abort her child in one of the most traumatic moments of her life. We need to provide care for both her and her child.

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

A. The best options need to be available; however, abortion is not the best option. While the woman has been brutally harmed through rape or incest, abortion would only add to the pain. A 2006 study by Dr. David Fergusson along with a 2008 review by Dr. Martha Shuping confirms that over 40 peer-reviewed studies show that abortion has a negative psychological, physical, and emotional impact on women. Abortion wounds women.

A 2006 Study by Dr. David Fergusson, found that women who had abortions were three times more likely to having suicidal thoughts than women who were pregnant, but did not abort.²

Over 40 peer reviewed studies have confirmed, abortion significantly increases risk for several mental health problems including depression, anxiety, substance abuse and suicidal thoughts and behaviors.³

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 unborn child on the inside of the woman that is a separate, distinct human being.

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

A. Dr. David Reardon conducted a study which showed that 70 percent of the rape victims choose to give birth rather than have abortions.⁴

¹ The Guttmacher Institute. <http://www.guttmacher.org/pubs/psrh/full/3711005.pdf>. 2008

² Fergusson, Dr. David. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*. 2006

³ Shuping, Dr. Martha and Dr. Christopher Gaeck. *Big Girls Do Cry: the Hidden Truth of Abortion*. 2008

⁴ Reardon, Dr. David. *Victims and Victors: Speaking Out About Their Pregnancies, Abortions, and Children Resulting from Sexual Assault*.

Personhood FL's Position Statement on Rape and Incest

“Personhood FL opposes abortion for pregnancy resulting from rape or incest. Whereas we understand the trauma involved in such situations, the unborn child conceived is no less human than one conceived under more favorable conditions. In the case of rape, we assert the need to educate women to seek immediate medical attention after they are victimized. Instead of the further violence of abortion, 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.”

Life of the Mother Exception

- “Experts in Obstetrics and Gynecology, mental health, and molecular epidemiology presented new research, and shared clinical experiences on issues surrounding maternal healthcare to the packed Symposium attended by more than 140 Irish medical professionals. Particular attention was paid to the management of high-risk pregnancies, cancer in pregnancy, fetal anomalies, mental health and maternal mortality. The Symposium’s conclusions were issued in the Dublin Declaration on Maternal Healthcare which states:
 - “As experienced practitioners and researchers in Obstetrics and Gynecology, we affirm that direct abortion is not medically necessary to save the life of a woman.
 - We uphold that there is a fundamental difference between abortion, and necessary medical treatments that are carried out to save the life of the mother, even if such treatment results in the loss of life of her unborn child.
 - We confirm that the prohibition of abortion does not affect, in any way, the availability of optimal care to pregnant women.”⁵
- “When the life of the mother is truly threatened by her pregnancy, if both lives cannot simultaneously be saved, then saving the mother’s life must be the primary aim. If through our careful treatment of the mother’s illness the pre-born patient inadvertently dies or is injured, this is tragic and, if unintentional, is not unethical and is consistent with the pro-life ethic. But the intentional killing of an unborn baby by abortion is never necessary.”⁶

Frequently Asked Questions and Answers

Q. Won’t this position endanger the lives of mothers?

A. No. When the life of a pregnant mother is in danger, physicians should be allowed to provide necessary care to the mother even if such care results in the unintentional death of the unborn child.

Q. Aren’t there some cases where abortion is medically necessary?

A. There are no situations where abortion, defined as the direct and intentional killing of an unborn child, is medically necessary to save the life of the mother. Bernard Nathanson, M.D., who himself performed over 30,000 abortions, said, “In our first book [after he stopped doing abortions], we proposed a lengthy list of illnesses (including but not limited to heart or kidney disease) which would justify abortion. We regard that list now with...disbelief: if women with heart and liver transplants can be carried successfully through pregnancy, we can no longer conceive of any medical condition which would

⁵ <http://www.lifenews.com/2012/09/11/experts-abortion-not-medically-necessary-to-save-the-life-of-a-mother/>

⁶ <http://www.prolifephysicians.org/rarecases.htm>

legitimize abortion. In short, we have slowly evolved to an unshakable posture of no exceptions...[W]orkable, morally acceptable legislation proscribing abortion can have no exceptions written into it – not even medical ones.”⁷

Personhood FL’s Position Statement on Life of the Mother Exception

“There is, therefore, no need to provide a specific exception for the life of the mother in a statute or constitutional amendment prohibiting abortion. Moreover, an explicit exception for the life of the mother is dangerous. One should never attempt to codify in law the importance of one innocent human life over and above another. Physicians must make their best effort to save both patients, giving equal care to mother and child. They should never be given a license to intentionally kill either of them. Finally, many abortionists believe that the very condition of pregnancy itself is a life threatening condition. Consequently, a life of the mother exception can become a massive statutory loophole through which to drive abortion on demand.”

Stem Cell Research

- Human embryos are human beings by their genetic makeup and therefore are 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 that saves human life- not destroy it.
- Adult stem cell research has treated and cured over 73 diseases to date.⁸
- In May 2009, adult stem cells cured a boy in Texas of sickle cell anemia.⁹
- Embryonic stem cell research has cured 0 diseases to date.¹⁰
- Our taxpayer dollars should not go to the funding of the destruction of innocent human life.

Frequently Asked Questions and Answers

Q. Do you oppose stem cell research?

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

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 very hard to control which have led to complications in some cases. (ESC has resulted in zero cures for diseases.) 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.)

⁷ Bernadell Technical Bulletin, April 1991

⁸ The Coalition for Americans for Research Ethics www.stemcellresearch.org

⁹ “Adult Stem Cells Cure Child.” <http://www.onenewsnow.com/Culture/Default.aspx?id=543298>. May 2009.

¹⁰ The Coalition for Americans for Research Ethics www.stemcellresearch.org

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 destroys human life. We will not promote any research that puts the value of one person's life over that of another for a potential cure. Embryonic research has resulted in no cures, whereas 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.

Recent Polls show 62% of those polled in 2008 said that they agreed that an embryo is a developing human life, and therefore it should not be destroyed for scientific or research purposes.¹¹

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 its stage of life. (For instance, you can say the term "infant" and it does not determine what the living being is but rather the stage that the animal or child is currently. According to the Law of Biogenesis, 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 together, 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 3000 babies have been born who were once viewed as "excess leftover embryos."¹²

Personhood FL's Position Statement on Stem Cell Research

Personhood FL supports research that can save lives of human beings without causing harm to other lives. Stem cell research where adult stem cells, cord blood, or other sources are used receive the support of Personhood FL. We oppose all forms of research where living human embryos are destroyed; this includes destructive embryonic stem cell research, as well as fetal tissue research. As Florida continues to become a haven for biotech companies, we must ensure that our laws protect all human life at the embryonic stage of development.

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 research.
- Research cloning involves the deliberate creation of human life for the purposes of killing it for use in research.
- Research cloning requires the usage of eggs in order to create the clone, and therefore will place a demand on the already short supply of eggs.

¹¹ Levin, Yuval. "Public Opinion and the Embryo Debates." *The New Atlantis: A Journal of Technology and Society*. <http://www.thenewatlantis.com/publications/public-opinion-and-the-embryo-debates>. Question 7.

¹² Lester, Natalie. "Embryo Adoption Becoming the Rage." *The Washington Times*. <http://washingtontimes.com/news/2009/apr/19/embryo-adoption-becoming-rage/>. April 19, 2009.

- The process of egg extraction is unsafe for women. At least 25 women have died and thousands have had problems while trying to donate eggs. Research cloning would target women, especially young, low-income women.¹³ (i.e. female college students)
- Any process that involves the creation of human life to destroy it devalues life.

Frequently Asked Questions and Answers

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.¹⁴

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. Florida can pursue stem-cell research, without needing to clone human embryos.¹⁵

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 it to use it for research. Even though the human life may not grow beyond 4 or 5 days, it still does not change what it is: a human being. Human life begins at conception. Regardless of how that life was created, it is still a human being. When human life is created just to be destroyed for research, human beings will be seen as commodities to be created, manipulated, and destroyed rather than distinct individuals created in the image of God.

Personhood FL's Position Statement on Human Cloning

Personhood FL 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, 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 Personhood FL opposes 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.

¹³ Problems with Egg Donation. <http://www.handsoffourovaries.com/pr.htm>

¹⁴ Reproductive vs. Therapeutic Cloning. <http://www.mccl.org/Page.aspx?pid=290>. last updated June 17, 2009.

¹⁵ Talking Points on Stem Cell Research and Cloning. <http://dl.aul.org/bioethics/human-cloning-and-stem-cell-research-talking-points>. last updated June 17, 2009.

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 which is also known as mifepristone, or Mifeprex. It is taken to end pregnancy, not to prevent it.
- RU-486 is a high dose steroid that hurts women. Thirteen (13) women have died as a result of taking the pill.¹⁶
- Any drug that ends a human life is not good for women or children.
- When a woman takes RU-486, it is normally in the 5th to 7th week of her pregnancy. By this point, the baby has a heart, brain waves, and arms and legs that are forming.
- RU-486 has a 1 in 3 failure rate when taken alone.¹⁷
- RU-486 has not been properly researched by scientists and was approved under accelerated regulations.
- The FDA has reported over 600 adverse effects by women taking this drug, 220 cases of hemorrhaging that were life threatening or extremely serious, 71 of which required blood transfusions. A total of 393 reports of surgery were required to repair damage as a result of taking the drug.¹⁸

Frequently Asked Questions and Answers

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

A. No, RU-486 is typically taken in the fifth to seventh weeks of pregnancy. By this point of development, the child already has a heart and is developing arms and legs. Brain waves are even detected by this point. RU-486 kills a human life.

Q. How is RU-486 administered?

A. A woman first takes three RU-486 tablets at a doctor's office or abortion clinic. This initial ingestion blocks progesterone from getting to the baby and the baby starves to death. Under the regimen approved by the FDA, the woman is to return 36 to 48 hours later to take a second drug, misoprostol (a prostaglandin), which causes the woman to expel the baby. The woman returns for a third visit three weeks later for an exam to confirm that the baby has been completely expelled and to monitor bleeding. If the procedure fails, a woman must undergo a surgical abortion.¹⁹

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. RU-486 is often touted by its promoters as a wonder drug. The abortion pill has been rumored to help arrest breast cancer and treat endometriosis, adrenal gland disorders, certain forms of brain cancer, and even AIDS. None of these claims has been scientifically substantiated. Rather, many of the combined dangers of RU-486 and prostaglandin pose a very real threat to the health of women and their future children.

Q. Why is RU-486 considered to be dangerous for women?

¹⁶ RU 486 Deaths. <http://www.lifeissues.org/ru486/deaths.htm>. June 2, 2009.

¹⁷ Wendy Wright, *RU-486: Deadly Approval*, Family Voice 7, 10 (Jan./Feb. 2003).

¹⁸ RU 486 Deaths. <http://www.lifeissues.org/ru486/deaths.htm>. June 2, 2009

¹⁹ Ibid.

A. The approved RU-486 regimen is dangerous and does not adequately protect women.²⁰ Moreover, anyone with a medical license, including untrained psychiatrists, podiatrists, and other non-related specialists, can prescribe RU-486.²¹ RU-486 is particularly dangerous because its side effects are confusingly similar to the symptoms of an ectopic pregnancy.²² The FDA has reported over 600 adverse effects by women taking this drug. 220 cases of hemorrhaging that were life threatening or extremely serious, 71 of which required blood transfusions. A total of 393 reports of surgery required to repair damage as a result of taking the drug.²³

Q. RU-486 was approved by the FDA, so proper clinical trials were done, right?

A. One of the FDA's rules is that "uncontrolled studies or partially controlled studies are not acceptable as the sole basis for the approval claims of effectiveness." Yet neither the French trials nor the U.S. trial solely relied upon in authorizing RU-486 were blinded or controlled, and they did not yield "safe and effective" results. Furthermore, RU-486 has not been tested on females under the age of 18, yet it is given to females in that age group. RU-486 was actually approved through the FDA's "Accelerated Approval Regulations." These regulations were designed for drugs "that have been studied for their safety and effectiveness in treating serious or life-threatening illnesses and that provide meaningful therapeutic benefit to patients over existing treatments."²⁴

Personhood FL's Position Statement on RU-486

Personhood FL opposes the RU-486/prostaglandin abortion technique because it kills unborn babies whose hearts have begun to beat and has injured and even killed women. We do not oppose testing for non-abortion related purposes, though at this time the powerful synthetic steroid RU-486 has had no proven use other than abortion that other drugs could not likewise provide. We also join with numerous other prolife 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 giving women the money to have an abortion, we need to work to give these pregnant women options and resources through pregnancy resource centers.
- In the state of Florida, federal and state funding goes to abortions in the case of rape, incest, and to save the life of the mother and will do so even if the proposed amendment 6 passes in the general election November, 2012..²⁵
- In 2008, the U.S. government gave \$336 million in grants and contracts to the nation's largest abortion provider, Planned Parenthood.²⁶
- If abortion is a private matter, then why should taxpayers be forced to pay for this private decision?

²⁰ Beth Kruse et al., "Management of Side Effects and Complications in Medical Abortion," American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology. 183:S65-S75, S72 (2000).

²¹ See Michael Schwartz, *The Patient Health and Safety Protection Act: H.R. 486*, available at:

<http://www.cwfa.org/articledisplay.asp?id=3982&department=CWA&categoryid=life>

²² "Medical Management of Abortion," ACOG Practice Bulletin: *Clinical Management Guidelines for Obstetrician-Gynecologists* 6 (Apr. 2001).

²³ RU-486 Deaths. <http://www.lifeissues.org/ru486/deaths.htm>. June 2, 2009.

²⁴ Smith, Mailee. "Deadly Convenience." http://www.aul.org/Deadly_Convenience. 2007.

²⁵ *Defending Life 2009: A State-by-State Legal Guide to Abortion, Bioethics, and the End of Life*. 2009.

²⁶ "Planned Parenthood Obscene Profits." http://www.jillstane.com/archives/2008/06/planned_parenth_39.html

Frequently Asked Questions and Answers

Q. Do you oppose tax funding of abortions?

A. Yes. We believe that any money spent paying for the destruction of human life is a poor 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. Similar laws apply for Medicare recipients, federal employees, military personnel, Native Americans who receive health care through the Indian Health Services, Peace Corps volunteers, women in federal prisons, and residents of the District of Columbia.²⁷ However, these laws do not stop the U.S. government from funding abortions abroad or state governments from funding abortions through state funds. In January of 2009, the Mexico City Policy was overturned which allowed for abortion providers worldwide to receive over \$461 million dollars in grants to fund their work.²⁸

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 survive. In 2007, Planned Parenthood brought in over \$1.017 billion dollars in income.²⁹ Planned Parenthood also received over \$336 million in government grants.

Recent polls show that 58 % of Americans disagree with taxpayer funding for overseas family planning groups that provide abortions.³⁰ (i.e. recent overturn of the Mexico City Policy)

Personhood FL's Position Statement on Tax Funding of Abortions

Because Personhood FL is opposed to abortion, we also oppose the use of tax dollars to pay for abortions, abortion research, and activities, which could encourage abortion as a "solution" to problem pregnancies. Furthermore, Personhood FL opposes tax dollars going to any abortion provider. (The same policy is held in regard to euthanasia and infanticide.)

Fetal Tissue Research

- Any time we support the use of aborted fetal tissue for research, we support the practice of abortion and the devaluation of life.
- Taxpayer dollars should not be spent buying aborted fetuses from abortionists so that scientists can conduct research.
- It is the very humanity of the unborn that makes aborted fetal tissue so attractive to abortionists.
- Fetal tissue research exploits women by implementing more dangerous methods of abortion to obtain intact, live tissue.

²⁷ "Abortion Access: Restrictions on Public Funding and Insurance Coverage." Center for Reproductive Rights.

<http://reproductiverights.org/en/project/abortion-access-restrictions-on-public-funding-and-insurance-coverage>

²⁸ Jones, Derrick. "Obama Abortion Agenda Launched Today." http://www.nrlc.org/press_releases_new/Release012309.html January 23, 2009.

²⁹ <http://www.lifenews.com/nat3822.html>

³⁰ Gallup Polls February 2, 2009. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/114091/Americans-Approve-Obama-Actions-Date.aspx>

- The financial motives of pharmaceutical companies and medical researchers present a great danger for the exploitation of women, unborn children, and gravely ill patients most likely to fall prey to promises of miracle cures.
- Fetal tissue is hard to control when used in experiments and therefore can cause complications such as tumors.
- The practice of fetal tissue transplantation and experimentation creates a market that is costing numerous irreplaceable lives.

Frequently Asked Questions and Answers

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

A. We should never do evil so that good may result. The problem is that by supporting the sale of aborted fetuses we are financially supporting the abortion industry. "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 in and 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."³¹

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.³² In fact, they are still hard to control 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.³³

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

A. Aborted fetuses with the ability to be used for research now have a potential for profit. Instead of abortions being performed to be the safest for women, doctors may want to keep the fetus intact so that the organs will be easier to sell or "donate" for research. 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. **These changes put women in greater danger.** Abortionists might choose a procedure that "preserves" fetal body parts such as dilation and evacuation which would keep the baby intact but pose a greater risk to the mother.

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

A. No, we do not. Under the Clinton Administration, the ban on federal funding of fetal tissue transplantation was rescinded. While it is not legal to sell the aborted fetal tissue in the U.S., abortionists find ways to get around the law by leasing out a portion of their abortion clinic to researchers who are on site when the abortions take place to receive the organs of the aborted fetuses.³⁴ Florida law permits research on fetal tissue resulting from abortion.³⁵

Personhood FL's Position Statement on Fetal Tissue Research

Because Personhood FL is opposed to abortion, we also oppose fetal tissue research and the use of tax dollars to pay for abortion, fetal tissue research, and activities which could encourage abortion as a "solution" to problem pregnancies. Personhood FL supports extending the ban on fetal tissue research to cover fetal tissue resulting from abortion. (The same policy is held in regard to euthanasia and infanticide.)

³¹ Department of Irreligious Studies. <http://www.boundless.org/2005/articles/a0000350.cfm>

³² Stem Cell Scoreboard. www.stemcellresearch.org . June 8, 2009.

³³ Stem Cell Boy Develops Tumors. <http://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/139368.php> . February 18, 2009.

³⁴ Industry for Baby Body Parts. Coral Ridge Ministries <http://www.nutritionhighway.com/babies.html>. 2000.

³⁵ *Defending Life 2012: A State-by-State Legal Guide to Abortion, Bioethics, and the End of Life*. 2012.

Assisted Suicide and Euthanasia

- Because every human being has an innate worth and value, any procedure that violates the sanctity of human life should be opposed.
- When we as a society start to condone assisted suicide and euthanasia, we are sending the message that some lives are not worth living.
- Our goal needs to be to provide resources for these patients on how to treat their pain or disease, not to provide an early death.
- The practice of physician-assisted suicide creates a duty to die. Death may become a reasonable substitute to treatment and care as medical costs continue to rise.
- Pain management techniques have improved and have offered relief for up to 95 percent of patients.
- Physician-assisted suicide often ignores depression, a legitimate cry for help.

Frequently Asked Questions and Answers

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 them to kill his or herself. The patient dies of a drug overdose rather than of natural causes.) Note: Currently under Florida law, assisted suicide is considered manslaughter.

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 drug overdose rather than a natural death.)

Q. Would you favor the legalization of euthanasia?

A. No. We believe every human being has an inherent worth and dignity, and euthanasia attacks that dignity. Our focus in Florida should be on creating policy that supports people in terminally ill or handicap situations to provide effective care and successful pain management, not on killing them and ending their lives prematurely.

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

A. People do have the right to die at their appointed time. However, 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 nonvoluntary, and the problems for which death is now the legal "solution" include such things as mental illness, permanent disability, and even old age.³⁶

³⁶ Key Points on Assisted Suicide. <http://www.nrlc.org/euthanasia/facts/keypoints.html>. June 1, 2009.

Personhood FL's Position Statement on Euthanasia

Personhood FL 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.

On the other hand, Personhood FL supports the traditional Judeo-Christian ethic that holds that although one must use ordinary, appropriate means to maintain one's health, 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 and contain no hope for a reasonable return of health.

Personhood FL 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.

For more information and for references on the above information, see www.PersonhoodFL.com and <http://personhoodflprolifepac.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/2012-Personhood-FL-ProLife-PAC-Principles.pdf>

Visit our website to print out petitions to distribute to your friends and family.
www.PersonhoodFL.com 772-873-7187 Info@PersonhoodFL.com



Personhood Affirmation

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,” Personhood FL ProLife PAC affirms the principle that the right to life is the bedrock upon which all other Constitutional rights are derived;

IN ADDITION, 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”;

THEREFORE, I affirm my support for the **The Right to Life of All Persons Recognized and Protected proposed Amendment** to the Florida Constitution and other actions that would support these principles. This would assure that regardless of race, age, degree of disability, manner of conception, or circumstances surrounding a terminal illness, that the civil rights of the pre-born at an embryonic or fetal level, the elderly, and those with mental or physical infirmities are protected by law.

These rights are violated when we allow destructive embryonic stem cell research, therapeutic or reproductive cloning, animal human hybrids, abortion, infanticide, euthanasia, and/or assisted suicide.

Affirmation for Endorsement

I agree to uphold these principles and positions.

Print Name: _____ Date: _____

Signature: _____

Email: _____ Phone Number: (____) _____

Fill out all that apply below.

In addition, please check the boxes, if agreeable, to allow Personhood Florida to use your position/title in publications.

- Current Political Office Held: _____
- Candidate For: _____
- Organization Affiliation, Title, Location: _____
- Church Affiliation, Title, Location: _____
- Other: _____

Appendix

May 15, 2009


More Americans “Pro-Life” Than “Pro-Choice” for First Time

Also, fewer think abortion should be legal “under any circumstances”

by Lydia Saad

PRINCETON, NJ -- A new Gallup Poll, conducted May 7-10, finds 51% of Americans calling themselves "pro-life" on the issue of abortion and 42% "pro-choice." This is the first time a majority of U.S. adults have identified themselves as pro-life since Gallup began asking this question in 1995.

With respect to the abortion issue, would you consider yourself to be pro-choice or pro-life?




The new results, obtained from Gallup's annual Values and Beliefs survey, represent a significant shift from a year ago, when 50% were pro-choice and 44% pro-life. Prior to now, the highest percentage identifying as pro-life was 46%, in both August 2001 and May 2002.

The May 2009 survey documents comparable changes in public views about the legality of abortion. In answer to a question providing three options for the extent to which abortion should be legal, about as many Americans now say the procedure should be illegal in all circumstances (23%) as say it should be legal under any circumstances (22%). This contrasts with the last four years, when Gallup found a strong tilt of public attitudes in favor of unrestricted abortion.

(Source: www.gallup.com/poll/11833. Last accessed May 16, 2009.)

Americans' recent shift toward the pro-life position is confirmed in two other surveys. The same three abortion questions asked on the Gallup Values and Beliefs survey were included in Gallup Poll Daily tracking from May 12-13, with nearly identical results, including a 50% to 43% pro-life versus pro-choice split on the self-identification question.

With respect to the abortion issue, would you consider yourself to be pro-choice or pro-life?



[^] Gallup Values & Beliefs survey
^{*} Gallup Poll Daily tracking


GALLUP POLL

Republicans Move to the Right

The source of the shift in abortion views is clear in the Gallup Values and Beliefs survey. The percentage of Republicans (including independents who lean Republican) calling themselves "pro-life" rose by 10 points over the past year, from 60% to 70%, while there has been essentially no change in the views of Democrats and Democratic leaners.

Recent Trend in Self-Identified Position on Abortion


Based on Republicans/Republican leaners



GALLUP POLL


Recent Trend in Self-Identified Position on Abortion

Based on Democrats/Democratic leaners



Similarly, by ideology, all of the increase in pro-life sentiment is seen among self-identified conservatives and moderates; the abortion views of political liberals have not changed.

Recent Trend in Percentage "Pro-Life," Based on Political Ideology




"Pro-Life" Up Among Catholics and Protestants

One of the more prominent news stories touching on the abortion issue in recent months involves President Barack Obama's commencement speech and the bestowal of an honorary doctorate degree on him at the University of Notre Dame -- a Roman Catholic institution -- on Sunday. The invitation has drawn criticism from conservative Catholics and the church hierarchy because of Obama's policies in favor of legalizing and funding abortion, and the controversy might have been expected to strengthen the pro-life leanings of rank-and-file Catholics.

Nevertheless, the swelling of the pro-life position since last year is seen across Christian religious affiliations, including an eight-point gain among Protestants and a seven-point gain among Catholics. (See Below)

Recent Trend in Percentage "Pro-Life," Based on Religious Preference




GALLUP POLL

Gender Agreement

A year ago, Gallup found more women calling themselves pro-choice than pro-life, by 50% to 43%, while men were more closely divided: 49% pro-choice, 46% pro-life. Now, because of heightened pro-life sentiment among both groups, women as well as men are more likely to be pro-life.


Men and women have been evenly divided on the issue in previous years; however, this is the first time in nine years of Gallup Values surveys that significantly more men and women are pro-life than pro-choice.

Recent Trend Abortion Position, Based on Women



GALLUP POLL

Recent Trend Abortion Position, Based on Men



Bottom Line

With the first pro-choice president in eight years already making changes to the nation's policies on funding abortion overseas, expressing his support for the *Freedom of Choice Act*, and moving toward rescinding federal job protections for medical workers who refuse to participate in abortion procedures, Americans -- and, in particular, Republicans -- seem to be taking a step back from the pro-choice position. However, the retreat is evident among political moderates as well as conservatives.

It is possible that, through his abortion policies, Obama has pushed the public's understanding of what it means to be "pro-choice" slightly to the left, politically. While Democrats may support that, as they generally support everything Obama is doing as president, it may be driving others in the opposite direction.

Survey Methods

Results are based on telephone interviews with 1,015 adults, aged 18 and older, conducted May 7-10, 2009. For results based on the total sample of adults, one can say with 95% confidence that the maximum margin of sampling error is ± 3 percentage points.

Gallup Poll Daily results are based on telephone interviews with 971 national adults, aged 18 and older, conducted May 12-13, 2009, as part of Gallup Poll Daily tracking. For results based on the total sample of national adults, one can say with 95% confidence that the maximum margin of sampling error is ± 3 percentage points.

Interviews are conducted with respondents on land-line telephones (for respondents with a land-line telephone) and cellular phones (for respondents who are cell-phone only).

In addition to sampling error, question wording and practical difficulties in conducting surveys can introduce error or bias into the findings of public opinion polls.