Anti-Choice Movement Doubles Down on “Pro-Science” Narratives and Disinformation

Background
The anti-choice movement has a history of ignoring science and medical expertise in pursuit of its dangerous agenda. In the lead-up to and during oral arguments in Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization, anti-choice organizations went one step further, doubling down on a disinformation campaign falsely presenting their movement as “pro-science.”

Susan B. Anthony List launched a $2.5 million advertising campaign centered around deceptive arguments that Roe v. Wade is based on “outdated” science and abortion laws must be “modernized.” The group’s “research” arm, Charlotte Lozier Institute, and Live Action, another extreme anti-choice group, published websites claiming to present “scientific facts” to support bans on abortion. These claims about “science” are a transparent effort by the anti-choice movement to erase the pregnant person from conversations about abortion and obscure their efforts to maintain control over women and pregnant people.

Key False and Misleading Claims
Anti-choice groups regularly amplify false and misleading messaging around fetal development. Most prominently, they have continued to promote disinformation claiming that embryos have a “beating heart” at 6-weeks gestation even though medical experts have repeatedly established that this is scientifically inaccurate. They have recently been working to present disputed claims about fetal development as事实 in spite of medical consensus on the issue.

Anti-choice activists regularly claim that modern science “proves” that life begins at conception. Not only does this narrative de-center the pregnant person, but also it exposes efforts to establish so-called fetal personhood rights. This would lead to bans on virtually all abortion care and have broad-ranging implications, potentially limiting access to birth control and IVF.

Though medication abortion is a safe and effective way of ending an early pregnancy, with FDA approval for over 20 years, anti-choice organizations continue to falsely claim that medication abortion poses a danger to patients by promoting their own skewed “research.” They also make baseless and dangerous claims that medication abortion can be “reversed.” Expert groups such as American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists have established that medication abortion “reversal” lacks methodologically-sound evidence and is an unethical and experimental practice.

Cloaked Science & Fake “Experts”
The anti-choice movement spent decades building a disinformation infrastructure, including biased “news” and “research” organizations and fake “experts,” to amplify and legitimize anti-choice propaganda. The Charlotte Lozier Institute and the American Association of Pro-Life Obstetricians and Gynecologists (AAPLOG), for example, provide a facade of legitimacy to anti-choice claims and policies, despite such policies being denounced by leading medical groups such as the American Medical Association (AMA).

These organizations often use what disinformation experts refer to as cloaked science, or “the use of scientific jargon...” to cloak or hide a political, ideological, or financial agenda within the appearance of
legitimate scientific research.” They cherry-pick data from studies they did not author to make false and misleading claims about the safety of abortion and the science of pregnancy and regularly rely on discredited “experts” to make false claims about abortion.

Counter Messaging Against Anti-Choice Claims Around Science

Anti-choice claims about science are either explicitly inaccurate, misleading, made in bad faith, or all of the above. When communicating about or responding to these claims, it is critical to NOT accept their premise. Instead, shift the conversation and reclaim a narrative centered on medical consensus and compassion.

We recommend:

- **Recentering the pregnant person:** Anti-choice claims about “science” serve the movement’s core strategy to erase pregnant people. We must always refocus the conversation on empathy for pregnant people’s unique and complex lived experiences.
- **Questioning their credibility:** Anti-choice activists are not a credible source of information about “science.” They have a long history of spreading medically-inaccurate information about pregnancy and abortion. The lack of regard for science and medicine goes beyond abortion, as leading anti-choice activists fanned the flames of fear about mask mandates and vaccines throughout the pandemic.
- **Calling out anti-choice motivations:** The movement’s ultimate goal is to ban all abortion care. Narratives about “science” are intended to make the movement’s extreme positions and policies more palatable to the overwhelming majority of people in the U.S. who support upholding Roe and maintaining legal abortion.

Responding to and pivoting from anti-choice claims and disinformation around science:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claim</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“New scientific findings about fetal development and viability justify abortion bans.”</td>
<td>Every pregnancy is unique and complex. One-size-fits-all restrictions and abortion bans will only hurt pregnant people making personal medical decisions and doctors who want to provide the best care for their patients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“We need to modernize our laws to reflect the science.”</td>
<td>Taking away people’s freedom to make decisions about their bodies and lives is not modernizing—it’s taking us all backward. The anti-choice movement wants to reverse 50 years of precedent and ban all abortion care. They know they are not in the majority and will say anything to obscure their extreme agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The pro-life movement is on the side of science.”</td>
<td>The anti-choice movement has spent decades spreading medically inaccurate and often dangerous information about pregnancy and abortion care. Leading medical groups like the American Medical Association have made it clear that abortion bans are not only unscientific but harmful.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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