Anti-Choice Amicus Briefs Put Long-Standing Disinformation Narratives on Display

Executive Summary
The Supreme Court’s upcoming Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization case is a direct challenge to Roe v. Wade and Planned Parenthood v. Casey, threatening the constitutional right to abortion. Amicus briefs from Susan B. Anthony List, Students for Life, and other leading anti-choice organizations were filed last week. Unsurprisingly, the briefs are rife with disinformation that directly contradicts medical and historical consensus. This is a critical moment for the majority of Americans who support reproductive freedom to call out deceptive anti-choice tactics, debunk their false claims, and speak truth about the importance of safe and accessible abortion care.

Context
Because support for the legal right to abortion was and has remained consistently high—77% of Americans support Roe v. Wade—the anti-choice movement has always relied on disinformation to manipulate public opinion. From anti-choice activist John C. Willke’s infamous Handbook on Abortion (1971), which falsely claimed survivors of rape could not become pregnant, to modern-day propaganda websites like Live Action News, disinformation is the foundation of the anti-choice playbook.

A plurality of the 80 amicus briefs filed by anti-choice activists, politicians, and organizations last week rely on common anti-choice disinformation tropes and sources. The briefs perpetuate three existing disinformation narratives in particular: using fake experts to co-opt science, false claims about “protecting” (cisgender) women, and disingenuous allegations about racism.

Fake “Experts” and Co-Opting Science
The anti-choice movement’s agenda is not supported by medical experts or scientific evidence, yet its activists consistently claim that their extreme positions are backed by “science.” According to NARAL Pro-Choice America’s analysis, there are at least 60 instances of science-related disinformation in briefs submitted this week, including:

- False claims that “science proves” that life begins at conception.
- False claims that scientific advancements mean banning abortion would reflect modern science.
- Reliance on fake “experts” and “research” by anti-choice organizations such as the Charlotte Lozier Institute and the Elliot Institute that masquerade as legitimate sources.

Without scientific consensus on its side, the anti-choice movement relies on its own disinformation and “research” infrastructure. For example, several briefs cite a widely debunked study by anti-choice activist Priscilla Coleman to falsely claim abortion has harmful psychological effects. Others rely on anti-choice “news” sites such as Live Action and LifeNews, the latter of which has been banned from YouTube and Facebook for spreading disinformation about the COVID-19 pandemic and vaccines.

Neither science nor medical expertise back up anti-choice disinformation narratives about abortion care, science, or when life begins. The reality is that every pregnancy is unique and complex. That's why one-size-fits-all bans and restrictions on abortion endanger pregnant people and prevent doctors from providing the best healthcare for their patients.

False Claims about “Protecting” and “Supporting” (Cisgender) Women
In at least 15 of the amicus briefs, anti-choice activists use debunked studies and straw man arguments about advancements in women’s rights to pretend they care about “protecting” and “supporting” women. Leading
anti-choice group Susan B. Anthony List even made the baffling argument that overturning Roe is justified because the number of women legislators has increased since the 1970s. Other fake feminist narratives include:

- False claims about the safety of abortion care, including knowingly repeating the lie that abortion is psychologically harmful, which has been debunked by medical experts for decades.
- False claims that greater access to healthcare and family and medical leave, protections against pregnancy discrimination, and “safe haven” laws mean that pregnant people no longer need to access abortion care.
- False claims that abortion providers prey on women in order to make a profit.

The hypocrisy couldn’t be clearer: Anti-choice activists fight against access to birth control, emergency contraception, and efforts to address the maternal mortality crisis that disproportionately harms Black women and pregnant people. They actively fight for policies that would criminalize and often actively harm women, pregnant people, and abortion providers.

Anti-choice state legislatures have passed or attempted to pass legislation that would criminalize pregnant people who seek an abortion and doctors who provide care. Pregnant people have been arrested and jailed based on punitive laws and fetal “personhood” ideology pushed by the anti-choice movement. The post-Roe world they want will lead to policing, surveillance, interrogation, and incarceration of women and pregnant people—the exact opposite of “protecting” and “supporting” them.

**Disingenuous and Hypocritical Allegations of Racism**

Anti-choice activists have long falsely equated abortion with murder, genocide, and crimes against humanity, ignoring the consensus of the same human rights experts they cite in their amicus briefs. Anti-choice groups repeatedly attempt to falsely frame abortion as discriminatory and a violation of human rights, including:

- Falsely likening abortion to genocide and slavery, including comparing it to the Holocaust and Civil War. At least 14 briefs erroneously compare the Court’s verdict in Roe v. Wade to its decision in Dred Scott v. Sandford (a case that denied equal rights to Black Americans and is widely regarded as one of the Supreme Court’s worst decisions throughout its history).
- Falsely claiming abortion providers “target” Black communities and people of color and arguing abortion constitutes “eugenics.”

These narratives serve anti-choice activists’ efforts to erase the pregnant person from conversations about abortion care. Their false claims about abortion providers “targeting” communities of color ignore the agency of women and pregnant people making the best decisions for themselves and their families. They deliberately pit pregnant people of color against their own communities by falsely implying that their decision to seek abortion care is racist and even genocidal. This is deeply hypocritical given anti-choice activists’ participation in the white supremacist insurrection on January 6 and regular attacks on the Movement for Black Lives.

**Conclusion**

While anti-choice activists have long disagreed about how explicit they should be about their goal to make all abortion “illegal and unthinkable,” their briefs filed in support of Mississippi leave no room for doubt. For the anti-choice movement, Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization is not about allowing for specific restrictions on abortion or “state’s rights,”—it is an outright attempt to end legal abortion in the United States. The anti-choice movement’s attacks on birth control, emergency contraception, and IVF make clear that its agenda of reproductive control has never been limited to abortion care. It’s up to all of us to unite boldly and loudly to drown out disinformation and reflect the majority of Americans’ support for legal abortion and reproductive freedom.