

An Innovative, Debate Shifting, Head Turning, Pro-Life Candidate's Message Guide with Talking Points

The First Thing You *Must Know, Digest, and Repeat*

There is a national epidemic of unwanted and unsafe abortions.¹⁻³

Fully two-thirds of all abortions are performed on women who felt pressured to agree to abortions that actually violate their own values and preferences.² These women are also most likely to report that their unwanted abortions contributed to a decline in mental health, harmed relationships, and fueled more frequent feelings of grief and loss.¹

Thus, for every woman who claims abortion benefited her life, **there are two** who say it caused them more harm than good.¹

Remember, all of these women are voters. And for two-thirds, their abortions are *ugly and painful* memories.

This is why, contrary to popular misconceptions, the vast majority of post-abortive women *do not* support the radical agenda of pro-abortion special interest groups. Instead, most would be glad to see abortion go away—but only if it can be done in a way that helps women.

Remember, they've been there, done that, and hated it. And they are deeply concerned about, and protective of, women who face the same problems and pressures they did.

This leads to the second most important fact to keep top of mind:

**Post-abortive women are keenly afraid
of judgment and condemnation.**

Therefore, the most important message you need to convey to post-abortive women and men is that **you truly do understand, accept, and care about them.**

Don't assume they will give you the benefit of the doubt. Assume, instead, exactly the opposite. The media tells them that pro-lifers are judgmental, even hateful.

Why would they assume you are any different? Why would they assume you

understand the pressures they faced? Why should they think you have any inkling of their deepest fears, their feelings of alienation, the awning depths of grief that threaten them whenever they hear the word abortion uttered on the news?⁴

This fear of condemnation is what disproportionately pushes post-abortive voters toward “pro-choice” candidates. Why? Not only because they are being told that pro-lifers are judgmental, but also because every time they hear “I’m pro-choice” the underlying message is “I don’t judge you, but my opponent does.”

In a nutshell, the fear and expectation of being condemned is the real driving force behind the voting gender gap.

Always be aware of that. Then, follow our advice. We will show you how to neutralize that fear of judgement. Even better, we will show you how to talk about the real concerns of post-abortive women and connect with them on a powerful emotional level.

If you follow this strategy, *you*, the pro-life/pro-woman candidate, will become the preferred choice over your *poor-choice* opponent. (That’s not a misprint. “Pro-choice” candidates are really the poor-choice alternative. They are defending and promoting abortions which are always the poorest choice.)

If you follow this approach, *there is no need to be afraid of the abortion issue*. There is no need to dance around difficult questions about abortion in cases of rape or incest, fetal anomalies, or any other What-If scenario. Your answer will always be the same: “Women should never feel pressured into unwanted or unsafe abortions. We simply need to always make sure that doctors are doing their jobs, and only recommend abortions when the benefits are truly greater than the risks.”

Notably, this approach will not lose your support from pro-life voters. It will actually strengthen it.

It will also strengthen your support among the fence-sitters on the abortion issue. They waffle between concern about the morality of abortion and a pragmatic desire to help women. They too will appreciate the morally sound, sensitive, and women-serving position you will be voicing because this position clearly puts you on the double high-ground—on the side of *both* unborn children *and* women.

There is one more advantage from this approach. You’ll have more fun. You will *no longer feel defensive* when the abortion issue comes up.

Instead, your compassionate, commonsense approach to the abortion issue will reveal that *you are the one who truly cares about women*, both before and after they have had abortions. Your poor-choice opponent, by contrast, will be

exposed as more concerned with protecting the abortion industry than the women who are being pressured into unwanted and unsafe abortions.

Bottom line: You are about to learn an approach to the abortion issue that makes you far more attractive to voters—regardless of how often or in what circumstances they believe abortion should be legal or not.

This new pro-woman/pro-life position will be of such strong appeal to voters, that it will become one of your favorite issues to address rather than the one you most dread. At the same time, as you are able to boldly, confidently, and compassionately address the real concerns of post-abortive women, your opponent will be left sounding evasive, insensitive, or confused.

Please read on, and you will see how polling data and human psychology confirm that this approach is *the* best way to align public sentiments around your pro-woman/pro-life message.

Your Stump Speech; or Mix and Match Talking Points

- Let's begin with two facts. First, every abortion ends an innocent human life. At the very least, abortion is something that should be avoided and regretted.
- The second fact is closely related to the first: The vast majority of women say their abortions were contrary to their own personal values and preferences.²
- Only one-third of women freely choose abortion in accordance with their own values and preferences.² The rest feel backed into unwanted abortions, because of the pressures they face from other people or circumstantial pressures.
- In fact, one in ten specifically describe their abortions as “coerced.”²
- This is why I am deeply grateful for, and supportive of, all the great post-abortion healing programs out there which are helping women to recover from the grief, guilt and trauma that almost always follow unwanted abortions.
- These groups, mostly run by post-abortive women themselves, are helping women escape the bonds of impacted grief, drug addiction, alcoholism, sexual dysfunction, insomnia, and other self-destructive behaviors.³
- This is also why I am deeply committed to passing laws that will help to stop unwanted, unsafe, and unnecessary abortions.

- Abortion clinics have failed to provide adequate pre-abortion screening and counseling.
- The American Psychological Association has identified at least 15 risk factors that identify the women at highest risk of more psychological problems following abortions,³ and feeling pressured to have an unwanted abortion is at the top of the list!
- But abortion clinics aren't adequately screening for these risk factors. Why?
 - First, because they face no liability for the injuries caused by unwanted abortion. It costs them nothing to ignore both the risk factors that predict post-abortion traumas and the complications themselves.
 - Second, if they did do proper screening and counseling, many women would not have these contraindicated abortions, and that would reduce the abortion clinics' profits.
 - Third, proper screening and counseling takes more staff time. It might even require some women to come back for a second or even third counseling session. And that would reduce abortion clinic profits.
 - The modern abortion industry is built on an assembly line model: one-size-fits-all, fifteen-minute pre-abortion counseling sessions. Quick in. Quick out. That's how they maximize profits.
 - Individualized counseling would disrupt the steady flow of their assembly line abortions.
 - Individualized screening and counseling is the bane of assembly line abortions! But it is the ONLY way to properly care for and protect the rights of women.
- My position is that the rights and welfare of each individual woman must always come before the profits of the abortion industry.
- My opponent says he is protecting reproductive rights. But in fact, he's protecting abortion industry profits at the expense of women who are feeling pressured into unwanted and unsafe abortions.
- True reproductive freedom necessarily includes a right to not be pressured into an abortion that violates your own values and preferences. But thousands of these unwanted abortions are occurring every day!

- The epidemic of unwanted abortions demonstrates that the present regulations governing abortion are a national disgrace. They are allowing over 60% of all abortions to be done on women who are being pressured into what are fundamentally *unwanted* abortions! And over 1 in 10 abortions are literally coerced, forced on women by those with power over them.
- Abortion providers know this. They know they are complicit in cooperating in unwanted abortions. They are negligent in failing to provide the true evidence-based screening and alternatives counseling women deserve. But abortion providers don't care. Because they earn more when their patient pool is three times higher because of the pressures that push women into unwanted abortions.
- Some abortion providers are also ideologically driven to increase abortion rates, not to help women, but to curb climate change, or to reduce the birth rates among the poor, or any other reason that has nothing to do with helping each individual woman to act according to her own values and preferences.

Powerful Positions, Tactics, and Talking Points

Dealing with Women Who *Do Not* Regret Their Abortions

In debates, media interviews, and other venues you may find your questioner trying to move the issue to “What about the women whose lives have been helped by an abortion?”

In general, you should not directly attack the presumption that some women are actually helped by abortion. The claim that some women are helped by abortion should simply be left floating without direct engagement. Just return to your focus, reiterating that *at least some women are being hurt by unwanted abortions*, and they are the ones you are trying to help. (The unspoken, underlying message in this response is that those who claim abortion helped them clearly don't need your help.)

On some occasions, you may face women who will say to you, either privately or publicly, “I had an abortion. And I don't regret it. It was the right

thing for me to do.”

How should you respond to her? Simply acknowledge and accept her satisfaction with her abortion, then seek to draw out her concern for those not as fortunate, like this:

I'm glad that you haven't had any physical or psychological complications. I hope that you never do.

But I'm sure that you can understand that not all women are as lucky as you have been. Some were at very high risk for emotional complications after an abortion because it went against their moral beliefs and maternal desires. Some are victims of abuse and were literally forced into unwanted abortions.

Surely you would agree that we need to do everything we can to help those women who want to be protected from unwanted abortions.

Right?! That's my goal...to help those women whom abortion is hurting.

Dealing with the Claim That Some Abortion Clinics Are Doing A Good Job: “No Unwanted Abortions Here!”

You will eventually hear the claim that Planned Parenthood, or your local abortion clinic, is doing a good job of protecting women from coerced abortions: “Our counselors watch for signs of abuse. We only do abortions when a woman freely gives her consent.”

Don't get drawn into a futile effort to prove they are lying. Instead, accept their claim at face value. Thank them for agreeing that it is extremely important to provide the kind of pre-abortion screening necessary to protect women from “unwanted, unsafe, and unnecessary abortions.” Then ask if they will partner with your efforts to bring all abortion clinics up to the same high standards of care.

Always turn the conversation to the fact that all good-hearted people, on both sides of the debate, should be working together to simply ensure that “bad abortion providers” can be held liable whenever they are guilty of negligence. If “good abortion providers” are already providing adequate screening and counseling, they have nothing to fear. Indeed, they should be joining you to make sure their competitors are not cutting corners that endanger their patients.

Coerced Abortions = Domestic Violence

Various polls have shown that American women are far more concerned about stopping domestic violence than they are with promoting abortion. Therefore, when you link coerced abortions to domestic violence you are hitting a hot button issue for millions of American women.

Abused women will instantly recognize this linkage, and non-abused women will instantly recognize that this linkage is credible.

Research has shown when an abusive male partner is unwilling to welcome or tolerate the birth of a child, his pregnant partner may be subjected to verbal or physical abuse aimed at compelling her to submit to an unwanted abortion.^{4,5}

According to one study of battered women, the target of battery during their pregnancies shifted from their face and breasts to their pregnant abdomens,⁶ which suggests hostility toward the women's fertility.

Women are literally being killed after refusing to abort.

The leading cause of death during pregnancy is homicide.⁷⁻⁹ In one study of violent deaths among pregnant women, three out of every four were killed during their first 20 weeks of pregnancy.⁹

Check out our special report, *Forced Abortions in America* for specific examples.⁵

When to Use the Phrase “Unwanted Abortions”

I'd suggest that you strive to never use the word abortion without the preface “unwanted.” If you have the verbal space, you might go further, underscoring the need to stop “unwanted, unsafe, and unnecessary abortions.”

By avoiding the word abortion without the “unwanted” qualifier, you make it harder for the media to censure the fact that you are specifically talking about the problem of unwanted abortions.

Whether or not some women truly want their abortions is not your issue. You are focused on helping the vast majority of women for whom abortion is *unwanted*.

So, look forward to questions about abortion as an opportunity to talk about unwanted abortions, your main concern. Keep the focus there.

Most voters already know that coerced abortions happen. Most just don't realize how often they really happen. Even if they doubt it happens as often as the studies show, most are unlikely to pretend that it is not a reasonable concern, at least in some cases. Either way, you only need to convince voters that it is enough

of a problem to justify your concern. Whether they believe it is a big or small problem, you are showing that you are the one who truly cares about the victims of unwanted abortion. Conversely, poor-choicers are ignoring them.

Furthermore, the fact that you express an understanding of why women abort--even against their consciences and maternal desires--will strongly connect with those post-abortive women who fit that profile. They will love you for caring, for understanding, for taking their side and working to spare other women what they have been through.

So, this is a no-brainer. Always, always, always express your concern for stopping “unwanted abortions.”

“The real crisis in this country is not unwanted pregnancies, it’s unwanted abortions.”

Moreover, as more and more people follow your lead and the phrase “unwanted abortions” becomes more deeply embedded in the national lexicon, this verbal association will begin to strengthen in peoples’ minds the emotional perception that abortion is an “unwanted” thing, even when using the word abortion in isolation.

An Example of a Horrific Forced Abortion

Some poor-choice advocates will insist that women aren’t being forced to have abortions; they’re just exercising their free choice. This is where you should be ready with a hard-case example of how the abortion industry conspires with abusers.

A common example is when abortion clinics perform abortions on the 14-year old victims of 31-year-old sexual predators. The predator insists on the abortion, accompanies the girl to the clinic, and pays for it. The abortionist not only complies, but doesn’t report the statutory rape to authorities. So, the abuse continues and the predator may even move on to acquire more victims.

Incest victims are especially likely to be forced to have unwanted abortions. Take for example, the story of ‘Denise Kalasky’ who became pregnant during the course of a series of incestuous rapes by her father.¹⁰ When she became sick, doctors discovered she was pregnant. To cover his own sin, the father accused his daughter of being promiscuous and demanded an abortion. When Denise refused for moral reasons, the attending emergency room physician also refused. The father demanded that the local abortionist be called. Denise writes:

Within one hour, this man arrived at the hospital, talked with my parents and decided to do the abortion, without speaking to me. I refused and tried to get off the examining table. He then asked three nurses to hold me while he strapped me to the bed...[and] prepared to kill my baby. I continued to scream that I didn't want an abortion. He told me, "Shut up and quit that yelling!" Eventually, I was placed under general anesthesia and my child was brutally killed.

I was told that an abortion would solve my problem, when it was never really the problem in the first place.

I was told, "Your parents know what's best," when they obviously were only concerned about their own reputations.

I was told, "You made the right decision," when I was never given a choice. More important, where was my baby's choice?

I grieve every day for my daughter. I have struggled to forget the abuse and the abortion. I can do neither. All I think of is, "I should have done more, fought more, struggled more for the life of my child."'¹⁰

If you don't defend young girls like Denise, who will? Consider sharing her story on the campaign trail.

Describe Your Personal Relationships with Post-abortive Women

From my friends and relatives who have had abortions, I've learned that abortion isn't a safety net; it's a safety hazard.

Using a line like the above is important. It tells your audiences how your views on abortion have been shaped by your own relationships with friends, relatives, or constituents.

This accomplishes two major objectives. First, it clarifies that you are representing not just your own views but the views of the women directly affected by their own abortions.

Second, it conveys to every post-abortive woman who hears you that you are openly friendly with other post-abortive women. Since you're not judging and condemning those friends and relatives, then you probably wouldn't judge and condemn her. In essence, you are clearly stating, "I am the friend of women and

men who have had abortions.” Your audience needs to hear this.

If you don’t have any post-abortive friends who have shaped your views on abortion . . . get some!

Just ask the leaders of your local post-abortion counseling programs (which are often affiliated with pregnancy help centers) to arrange for a private, confidential meeting with their leaders and/or with past program participants who would be willing to share their experiences with you. Their stories, insights and advice are guaranteed to touch your heart, broaden your mind, and deepen your resolve to defend the authentic rights of women.

Link “Pro-Choice” with “Poor-Choice”

As mentioned earlier, there is not even one statistically validated study of a random sample of women showing that abortion generally makes women’s lives better.^{3,11}

So, the best medical evidence actually indicates that abortion is a poor choice. It produces no proven benefits, but is strongly linked to countless negative outcomes. That’s precisely why it is very accurate to say that those who promote abortion without adequate pre-abortion screening and counseling are actually poor-choice advocates.

My opponent says he is pro-choice. But he is really a poor-choice advocate. Abortion is hurting countless women everyday...emotionally, socially, and physically.

His poor-choice position would leave women exposed to unwanted, unnecessary, and dangerous abortions.

Women deserve better, and I’m committed to giving women better options and helping those who have already suffered emotional or physical problems from a past abortion.

Whether you describe your “poor-choice opponent” with a tone of humorous wordplay or in a mocking retort, you will be issuing an unavoidable challenge to your opponent to either (1) prove that abortion is always a good choice, or (2) to join you in working to reduce the high number of unwanted and unsafe abortions occurring every day.

Here’s some reasons why poor-choice rhetoric can be an effective strategy.

1. Turn Public Ambivalence into Pro-Woman Advocacy

Verbalizing that abortion is a poor-choice echoes the general public's view that abortion is not generally improving women's lives but is more likely to cause harm.¹² By using this term, you are inviting people to recognize and verbalize what they already know: at the very best, abortion is a lousy choice. At the same time, you contrasting your own positive pro-woman proposals with your opponent's lazy tolerance of unregulated, unwanted, and dangerous abortions.

2. Use Poor-Choice Rhetoric to Remove Their Smokescreen

Abortion advocates almost never use the word "abortion" because it elicits negative reactions from voters. They hide the truth behind the word "choice," as if choice itself always leads to wonderfully good results.

But we all know there are good choices and bad choices. Which is it in cases of abortion?

By alleging that your opponent is actually the "poor choice" candidate, you are shifting the debate. The key question is no longer support for the neutral idea of a "right to choose." The new question is *when do* abortion choices end in good outcomes or poor outcomes. Is your opponent promising that all abortions end in good outcomes? Or for just some lucky few?

Describing their position as "poor choice," you are underscoring your own belief that abortion generally ends badly for women. This is a challenge. It invites your opponent to prove that abortion generally produces good outcomes. But that's hard to do. There's no medical evidence to support that claim. All they have are the anecdotal claims of some women, arguably a small minority.² Any claims based on the infamous Turnaway Study, asserting that the vast majority of women are satisfied with their abortion decisions, have been thoroughly disproven.¹⁻³

Moreover, since the majority of voters who instinctively believe, or know firsthand, that abortion is a negative experience,¹² any effort to claim that women rarely regret their abortions will be met with skepticism.

This puts your opponent in an uncomfortable spot. How do they sound more empathetic to women than you, while at the same time insisting that unregulated abortion is a great victory for women's health?

3. Beat Them at Their Own Game

Abortion advocates have spent millions of dollars over 20 years to market "pro-choice" as a good thing. With this simple, memorable, and ironic turn of

phrase, you can invert this marketing ploy on its head.

The similarity in sounds between “pro-choice” and poor-choice is so strong that it especially powerful in linking the two ideas. Once it’s pointed out, the mind can’t help but notice it.

Have you ever noticed the little arrow pointing to the right in the void between the “E” and the “x” in the FedEx logo? Once you look for it and see it, you will see it every time.

The same dynamic is true with the “poor choice” label. As our polling show, people already think abortion is an ugly experience with negative effects on women.¹² Giving voice to this preconception, using “poor-choice” rhetoric, is like pointing out the hidden arrow in FedEx. Once the mental link is there, the ideas will connect again and again: pro-choice, abortion, poor-choice, regret, grief, sorrow, et cetera.

Similarly, once the phrases “poor-choice,” “poor-choice advocates,” and “poor-choicers” are repeated enough in every arena of the abortion debate, they will soon seep widely and deeply into the subconscious mind of every American. Poor-choice can become just as much a part of the English language as the phrase “pro-choice” has become.

After hearing the phrase “poor-choice” often enough, even your political opponents will begin to struggle with this mental link. Soon, “poor-choice” will be popping into their heads when they’re really trying to say “pro-choice.”

What would you give for a film clip of your opponent saying, “I’m poor-choice!”?

4. Remind People that Women Want Positive Choices, Not Poor Choices.

The poor-choice rhetoric is also a good lead-in to the “*women deserve better*” message. Used together, these slogans emphasize the fact that those of us who are opposed to abortion really *do* care about women. We really do believe that abortion is a poor choice to offer women. The people who really care about women— pro-woman/pro-life advocates—are working to give women better options and happier lives.

Notes on When and How to Use the Poor-Choice Label

The “poor-choice” label should *only* be directed at your opponent or the professional pro-abortion lobbying groups.

You are not attacking women for their “foolish choices.” Instead, you should strive to make clear when you use the term that you are directing it against those who represent the interests of the abortion industry which reaps millions of dollars in profits each year off of its false promise that abortion is a “good choice.”

The poor-choice rhetoric lends itself to short, tight messages. For example, consider this little bumper sticker:



If you're not above a little negative campaigning, you may want to print up bumper stickers that read “Your Poor-Choice Vote: [Opponent’s Name Here]”

Such a bumper sticker carries with it an additional meaning. It links your opponent’s name not only with abortion advocacy, but also with the idea that he or she is a “poor-choice” on the election day.

When You Debate Your Opponent

Look for an opportunity to describe your opponent as holding a “poor-choice” position. Bait your opponent with this label as often as possible. Only two things can happen.

He or she will ignore the label and it will stick.

Or, your opponent or the moderator will challenge your use of the term, insisting that the proper description is that he or she is “pro-choice.” That is your opening to point out that abortion either helps women or hurts them. If it is hurting them, he is either making a poor choice to defend it or doesn’t care if women end up making poor choices because they are not given enough information or options to make a better choice.

Within this context you can then reassert your position:

Women deserve better than abortion. I’ve described how I’m going to stop unwanted and dangerous abortions. What are you going to do to protect women from abortionists who care more about maximizing their client base than they do about the welfare of individual women?

Knowing how many women are haunted by grief over their past abortions, I would be a poor choice for voters if I didn’t take the

position I have.

Notably, this is your opportunity to challenge your opponent to support specific legislative goals that would protect women from being coerced into *unwanted* abortions.

This challenge must be repeatedly and insistently made. Your goal is to force your opponent to either agree to pro-woman abortion regulations (and thus alienate his or her radical pro-abortion supporters) or dance around such pro-woman protections. Any sign of the latter should be portrayed as evidence that he or she is more interested in protecting the profits of the abortion industry than the welfare of women.

Point out that both the abortion industry and population controllers have a vested interest in increasing abortion rates, even at the expense of the women pressured into unwanted and unsafe abortions.

Consider sharing the fact that the plan implemented by the Clinton administration to bring the abortion pill into the United States was rooted in classist bigotry. This is documented in the Clinton presidential library where you will find that the files for their RU-486 campaign begin with a letter to the president from **Ron Weddington**, co-counsel with his wife Sarah in *Roe v Wade*. In it, Weddington encouraged the president to arrange the transfer of the abortion pill's manufacturing rights to an American non-profit group in order to make cheaper abortion more readily available precisely **“to eliminate the barely educated, unhealthy and poor segment of our country” since “26 million food stamp recipients is more than the economy can stand.”**^{13,14} Acting on this advice, Clinton arranged for the patent rights to be transferred to a population control group with a deep history in the eugenics movement.¹⁵ He also ordered the FDA to expedite the abortion drugs approval. Complying with that order, the FDA waived all the requirements for the systematic investigations of risks and benefits that apply for other drug reviews.¹⁴ The only data pertinent to the FDA's final approval was simply evidence that the drug succeeded in inducing abortions at a high rate with nominal maternal deaths. Negative psychological effects and non-life-threatening complications were never required to be investigated. As long as the drug cheaply increased abortion rates, the goals of population controllers and the Clinton administration were achieved.

Finally, whenever you feel it is appropriate, you may also assert that the *welfare of every mother and child is intertwined by God: To hurt one is to hurt them both. To help one is to help them both.*

You are choosing to help them both.

A Sample of Questions and Answers

MEDIA: What is your position on abortion?

CANDIDATE: I believe we absolutely must defend the rights of women and stop the common practice of dangerous and *unwanted* abortions, which are injuring hundreds of thousands of women every year.

We don't hear about it in the press, but our country is faced with a terrible epidemic of *unwanted* abortions. They make up over 60% of all abortion cases.^{1,2} These are the cases where mothers would rather carry their pregnancies to term but instead submit to unwanted abortions to satisfy the demands of others.

I oppose allowing abortion to be used as an escape route for unloving and irresponsible boyfriends, husbands, or a physical abuser. I oppose allowing parents to force their daughter into an unwanted abortion without regard for her own desire to keep her child. I oppose making women suffer the pain and aftereffects of abortion alone, just so others won't be inconvenienced.

MEDIA: Would you support legislation that would limit a woman's right to have an abortion?

CANDIDATE: I support laws that would protect women from being pressured into unwanted abortions. I support laws that would make abortion clinics accountable for failing to protect women from being coerced into *unwanted* abortions.

If abortion is to be a decision made between a woman and her doctor, then we should hold the doctor responsible for ensuring that no mother ever feels pressured to have an abortion that goes contrary to her own values and preferences.

If my opponent truly cares about protecting women's interests more than the abortion industry's profits, I hope he will promise to work with me in seeking legislation to protect these women from *unwanted* abortions.

MEDIA: Aren't your proposals actually intended to make it more difficult

for women to get abortions?

CANDIDATE: My proposals would simply codify the high professional standards which the Supreme Court itself described in *Roe v. Wade* and the other abortion cases. Namely, that it is the obligation of the physician to ensure that a woman's choice to abort is fully free and that she is fully informed of *all the risks* and alternatives.¹⁶ That is a provision that the abortion industry has ignored for over fifty years.¹⁷ Abortion providers should have a legal responsibility to protect their patients from unwanted, unnecessary, or dangerous abortions.

MEDIA: How would you propose to heal the divisions in our country over the abortion issue?

CANDIDATE: First, we need to protect women from feeling forced into unwanted abortions. Women deserve more support and better alternatives.

Second, I think all people of good will can agree that we need to do more to understand when and why some abortions are dangerous. In 1989, the Surgeon General, C. Everett Koop, reported that there had not yet been enough adequate research on the aftereffects of abortion. Dr. Koop recommended a \$100 million-dollar research project to study the effects of abortion.

What was the response from Congress? They ignored the Surgeon General's recommendation. Why? Because pro-choice advocates argued against doing more research because they are afraid that more proof of abortion's risks would further increase abortionists' liability for the injuries women suffer.

MEDIA: I don't understand what you mean by "unwanted" abortions. If a woman chooses to have an abortion, that's the choice she wants.

CANDIDATE: I can't tell you how many times I have heard women's stories of how they were threatened, badgered, pressured, and even literally dragged to abortion clinics by abusive husbands, angry parents, or selfish boyfriends. These women would rather have welcomed their babies, but the pressures they faced from other people or their circumstances made them feel they had no choice. Sadly, no one at the clinics they went to offered to help them to overcome these pressures.

The fact that most abortions involve women feeling pressured into having abortions that violate their own individual preferences and values is well documented. My campaign staff will give you copies of those studies.¹⁻³

MEDIA: What are your views on abortion in the case of rape or incest?

CANDIDATE: I support legislation that protects women's interests. Women who are victims of rape or incest deserve our support and the best medical care and counseling available. It doesn't benefit them to be rushed into an abortion regardless of the risks. That would only risk victimizing them a second time.

I've read the testimonies of women who have had sexual-assault pregnancies and either carried to term or had abortions.¹⁰ What these women are saying is a lot different than what most people assume. Those who had abortions are saying it made their problems worse, while those who gave birth are saying that was the best choice. Before the government gets involved in the business of funding abortions for rape victims, I would like to invite these women to testify about their real experiences. The government shouldn't rush in and get involved on the basis of preconceptions or political agendas. Let's find out from the women who have really been there what is helpful and what is harmful.

MEDIA: Some abortion doctors say they won't be able to afford to do abortions if they face the kind of liability you're talking about. If women can't get abortions from doctors, won't that lead us back to the dangers of back-alley abortions?

CANDIDATE: Abortionists will only stop doing abortions if it turns out that abortion is far more dangerous than they have been telling us. Proper liability will lead to proper care and screening. This will help protect women.

It is insane to suggest that in order to prevent illegal abortions we should allow dangerous legal abortions. One of the main reasons the Supreme Court legalized abortion was so that medical doctors would protect women from having ill-informed, dangerous abortions.¹⁷

If doctors simply do abortions for anyone who hands them money, without regard to whether or not the dangers outweigh the benefits, that's no better than was done when abortion was illegal. In fact, it's worse, because now women are being misled by these abortionists into believing that legalized abortion is safer than it really is.

The way to prevent illegal abortions is to also allow women to sue those who perform, attempt, or in any way aid or abet illegal abortions for reckless endangerment.¹⁶ If anyone gets involved in promoting dangerous illegal abortions, they should fear not only criminal prosecution, but also bankruptcy

when they are sued by the women and families they hurt.

REFERENCES CITED

1. Reardon DC, Longbons T. Effects of Pressure to Abort on Women's Emotional Responses and Mental Health. *Cureus*. 2023;15(1):e34456. doi:10.7759/cureus.34456
2. Reardon DC, Rafferty KA, Longbons T, Reardon DC, Rafferty KA, Longbons T. The Effects of Abortion Decision Rightness and Decision Type on Women's Satisfaction and Mental Health. *Cureus*. 2023;15(5). doi:10.7759/CUREUS.38882
3. Reardon DC. The abortion and mental health controversy: A comprehensive literature review of common ground agreements, disagreements, actionable recommendations, and research opportunities. *SAGE Open Med*. 2018;6:205031211880762. doi:10.1177/2050312118807624
4. Burke T, Reardon DC. *Forbidden Grief: The Unspoken Pain of Abortion*. Acorn Books; 2007.
5. Elliot Institute. *Forced Abortion in America: A Special Report.*; 2004. <https://afterabortion.org/new-elliott-institute-report-exposed-americas-forced-abortion-crisis/>
6. Hilberman E, Victimology KM-, 1977 undefined. Sixty battered women. *psycnet.apa.org* E Hilberman, K Munson *Victimology, 1977*•*psycnet.apa.org*. Accessed August 3, 2023. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1979-08640-001>
7. Cheng D, Horon IL. Intimate-partner homicide among pregnant and postpartum women. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2010;115(6):1181-1186. Accessed July 16, 2015. <http://www.scopus.com/inward/record.url?eid=2-s2.0-77953016903&partnerID=tZOtx3y1>
8. Horon IL, Cheng D, Chang J, Berg CJ. Underreporting of maternal deaths on death certificates and the magnitude of the problem of maternal mortality. *Am J Public Health*. 2005;95(3):478-482. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2004.040063
9. Krulewitch CJ, Pierre-Louis ML, De Leon-Gomez R, Guy R, Green R. Hidden from view: Violent deaths among pregnant women in the district of Columbia, 1988-1996. *J Midwifery Women's Heal*. 2001;46(1):4-10. doi:10.1016/S1526-9523(00)00096-9
10. Reardon D, Makimma J, Sobie A, eds. *Victims and Victors: Speaking Out About Their Pregnancies, Abortions, and Children Resulting from Sexual Assault*. Acorn Books; 2000.
11. Fergusson DM, Horwood LJ, Boden JM. Does abortion reduce the mental health risks of unwanted or unintended pregnancy? A re-appraisal of the evidence. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry*. 2013;47(9):819-827. doi:10.1177/0004867413484597
12. Elliot Institute. *Post-Abortion Awareness Survey.*; 2008. <https://afterabortion.org/post-abortion-awareness-survey/>
13. Weddington JR. Letter to President-To-Be Clinton, Jan 6 1992. In: Rasco C, ed. *OA/Box OA7455, File Folder: RU-486*. Clinton Library; 1992:54-58. <https://clinton.presidentiallibraries.us/files/original/f8977047aefa0c1f90a24665cabf>

95bc.pdf

14. Reardon DC, Harrison D, Skop I, Cirucci CA, Studnicki J. *Overlooked Dangers of Mifepristone, the FDA's Reduced REMS, and Self-Managed Abortion Policies: Unwanted Abortions, Unnecessary Abortions, Unsafe Abortions.*; 2021. <https://lozierinstitute.org/overlooked-dangers-of-mifepristone-the-fdas-reduced-rems-and-self-managed-abortion-policies-unwanted-abortions-unnecessary-abortions-unsafe-abortions/>
15. Messall R. The long road of eugenics: from Rockefeller to Roe v. Wade. *Hum Life Rev.* 2004;30(4):33-74. Accessed September 23, 2021. <https://humanlifereview.com/the-long-road-of-eugenics-from-rockefeller-to-roe-v-wade/>
16. Reardon DC. *Making Abortion Rare: A Healing Strategy for a Divided Nation.* Acorn Books; 1996.
17. Reardon DC. Abortion decisions and the duty to screen: clinical, ethical, and legal implications of predictive risk factors of post-abortion maladjustment. *J Contemp Health Law Policy.* 2003;20(1):33-114.