

## **The Case for Life and Against Pro-Abortion Disinformation**

BY Karen Cross

In election after election, polling reveals that being pro-life gives a candidate a distinct advantage among voters. Since 1980, every pro-life presidential candidate has shown a significant net gain among voters who place primary emphasis on abortion in deciding for whom to vote. In fact, a 2004 Wirthlin Worldwide poll found that pro-life George W. Bush netted a 9% advantage on the abortion issue over pro-abortion Sen. John Kerry.

In a typical national race, pro-lifers can deliver at least a 3% to 4% net advantage to the pro-life candidate. That can be, and has been, decisive.

After witnessing 25 years of pro-life successes nationwide, pro-abortion candidates are awakening to the truth that this is not happening by chance. One option would be to come over to our side. Unfortunately, some pro-abortion candidates are just becoming more devious than ever.

As evidenced by a number of recent developments, they are using desperate tactics, hoping to hoodwink voters with misinformation, even going so far as to call themselves “pro-life,” when in fact they have solid pro-abortion views and voting records.

Last year, during a recent teleconference, freshman Sen. Ken Salazar (D-Co.) said, “I consider myself to be a pro-life Democrat.” Yet, in the same interview, he claimed that the decision to have an abortion “ought to be left between a woman and her god.”

During his 2004 campaign, Salazar received \$1,000 from Warren Hern, a notorious Colorado abortionist known for developing abortion methods used in the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth months of pregnancy. When given a chance to vote pro-life, Salazar voted to nullify the pro-life Mexico City Policy.

In November 2005, pro-abortion Democrat Tim Kaine prevailed in a hotly contested race for governor of Virginia. It is a testimony to how shrewdly he hid his abortion views that following his election, he was inaccurately characterized by the Denver Post “as a religious, Democratic governor ... who opposes abortion rights.” In truth, Kaine opposes the authentic ban on partial-birth abortion and supports Roe v. Wade, the 1973 U.S. Supreme Court decision that legalized abortion for any reason into the sixth month and for “health” reasons—defined to include emotional “health”—during the final months.

Under Roe, more than 47 million defenseless babies have been aborted—nearly 3,600 each day, 365 days a year.

Is it really possible to “personally oppose abortion,” support Roe, and still claim to be “pro-life”? Of course not!

For years, candidates have hidden behind the “I am personally opposed to abortion but” rhetoric. Even pro-abortion Sen. John Kerry (D-Mass.) claimed to be personally opposed to abortion, although in more than 20 years in the Senate, he voted at least 80 times in favor of abortion.

Having figured out that publicly supporting abortion is not a winning position, pro-abortion candidates have moved verbally beyond being “personally opposed” to abortion to saying they are “pro-life,” even though they support pro-abortion policies day in and day out. Perhaps such cynicism and dishonesty explains why so many Americans are turned off by electoral politics.

Furthermore, organizations are springing up around the country to redefine the pro-life position to include, as one put it, “a wide array of issues concerning human dignity: supporting the right of workers to a just wage, decent working conditions and the right to organize without reprisal; ensuring adequate and affordable health care ... .” Their focus ignores the fundamental right to be born—a right without which no other right can be exercised. We must not allow “pro-life” to be repackaged by candidates and political parties who are pro-abortion to their core.

There seems to be a concerted effort to water down what it means to be pro-life. In letter sent to constituents, Congresswoman Rosa DeLauro (D-Ct.), who has a solid pro-abortion voting record, wrote, “Focusing on a few issues alone risks a moral selectivity that weakens the Church’s moral authority,” and that “we all want our church to be a moral force in the broadest sense ... to advance our common goals” and “promoting the common good.” Abortion is merely one of “a few issues” to which voters should pay minimal attention.

Democratic Party National Chairman Howard Dean gave a classic example of this spinning last year in an appearance on MSNBC’s Hardball. Host Chris Matthews could not get Dean to concede the obvious.

MATTHEWS: The Democrats, your party, is a pro-choice party?

DEAN: No. My party respects everybody’s views, but my party firmly believes that the government should stay out of people’s personal lives.

Matthews asked him the same question several times, ending with this:

MATTHEWS: Why do you hesitate from the phrase pro-choice?

DEAN: Because I think it’s often misused. If you’re pro-choice, it implies you’re not pro-life. That’s not true ...

MATTHEWS: Do you believe in abortion rights?

DEAN: I believe that the government should stay out of the personal lives of families and women. They should stay out of our lives. That’s what I believe.

MATTHEWS: I find it interesting that you have hesitated to say what the party has always stood for, which is a pro-choice position.

Judging by the verbal maneuvers of Governor-elect Kaine, Congresswoman DeLauro, and Chairman Dean, we will hear more of this in the months to come. It is imperative that pro-lifers know the truth before we get to the ballot box, before the opportunity to vote occurs. In the meantime, we at National Right to Life PAC will continue to provide accurate facts to American voters.

We know that ultimately, truth will prevail. It must.