

WILLIAM PRYOR ON ABORTION

Highlights:

- William Pryor opposed Roe v. Wade.
 - Pryor said he stood by those comments when he was up for a position on the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals.
 - Pryor said Roe v. Wade “led to a morally wrong result.”
 - Pryor said Roe v. Wade was unsupported by the Constitution.
 - Pryor said that the Supreme Court created a right to an abortion “out of thin air.”
 - Pryor said Roe v. Wade created “a constitutional right to murder an unborn child.”
- William Pryor used the pejorative “abortionists” nearly two dozen times in a case allowing Georgia’s six-week abortion ban to go into immediate effect.

2003: Pryor Called Roe v. Wade “The Worst Abomination In The History Of Constitutional Law”

2003: WHEN UP FOR A POSITION ON THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE 11TH CIRCUIT, PRYOR TOLD SENATORS THAT HE STOOD BY HIS COMMENTS THAT ROE V. WADE WAS “THE WORST ABOMINATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL LAW”

2003: When Asked If He Still Believed Roe v. Wade Was “The Worst Abomination In The History Of Constitutional Law,” Pryor Responded “I Do.” According to the Senate Judiciary Committee concerning the nomination of William Pryor to the 11th Circuit, “[Senator Schumer] Now, you have said on occasion, on several occasions, that Roe v. Wade is quote, ‘the worst abomination in the history of constitutional law.’ Do you believe that as of right now? [Mr. Pryor] I do.” [Senate Judiciary Committee, [6/11/03](#)]

2003: Pryor Said That Planned Parenthood v. Casey “Preserved The Worst Abomination Of Constitutional Law In Our History.” According to the Senate Judiciary Committee concerning the nomination of William Pryor to the 11th Circuit, “[Senator Specter] First I would ask you if this quote is accurate. I have seen a quote or two not accurate. ‘In the 1992 case of Planned Parenthood v. Casey the Court preserved the worst abomination of constitutional law in our history,’ close quote. Is that an accurate quotation of yours? [Mr. Pryor] Yes. [Senator Specter] Is that one which would fall into the category that Senator Hatch has commented on, you wish you had not made? [Mr. Pryor] No, I stand by that comment.” [Senate Judiciary Committee, [6/11/03](#)]

PRYOR SAID ROE V. WADE “LED TO A MORALLY WRONG RESULT”

2003: Pryor Said Roe v. Wade “Led To A Morally Wrong Result.” According to the Senate Judiciary Committee concerning the nomination of William Pryor to the 11th Circuit, “[Mr. Pryor] Well, I believe that not only is the case unsupported by the text and structure of the Constitution, but it had led to a morally wrong result. It has led to the slaughter of millions of innocent unborn children. That's my personal belief.” [Senate Judiciary Committee, [6/11/03](#)]

PRYOR SAID ROE V. WADE WAS UNSUPPORTED BY THE CONSTITUTION

2003: Pryor Said Roe v. Wade Was “Unsupported By The Text And Structure Of The Constitution.” According to the Senate Judiciary Committee concerning the nomination of William Pryor to the 11th Circuit, “[Mr. Pryor] Well, I believe that not only is the case unsupported by the text and structure of the Constitution, but it had led to a morally wrong result. It has led to the slaughter of millions of innocent unborn children. That's my personal belief.” [Senate Judiciary Committee, [6/11/03](#)]

Pryor Said The Supreme Court Created A Right To An Abortion “Out Of Thin Air”

Pryor Said The Supreme Court Created A Right To An Abortion “Out Of Thin Air.” According to McClatchy, “A more incendiary choice, by far, would be Judge William H. Pryor Jr., 54, of the 11th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. Pryor once denounced the Supreme Court’s 1973 Roe v. Wade decision upholding the right to an abortion as the creation ‘out of thin air of a constitutional right to murder an unborn child’ and as ‘the worst abomination in the history of constitutional law.’” [McClatchy, [1/29/17](#)]

Pryor Called Roe v. Wade “A Constitutional Right To Murder An Unborn Child”

Pryor Said The Supreme Court “Ripped Out The Life Of Millions Of Unborn Children” With Roe v. Wade

Pryor Denounced Roe v. Wade As “A Constitutional Right To Murder An Unborn Child.” According to McClatchy, “A more incendiary choice, by far, would be Judge William H. Pryor Jr., 54, of the 11th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. Pryor once denounced the Supreme Court’s 1973 Roe v. Wade decision upholding the right to an abortion as the creation ‘out of thin air of a constitutional right to murder an unborn child’ and as ‘the worst abomination in the history of constitutional law.’” [McClatchy, [1/29/17](#)]

Pryor Sad The Seven Justices Who Ruled In Favor Of Roe v. Wade “Ripped The Constitution And Ripped Out The Life Of Millions Of Unborn Children.” According to the Daily Beast, ‘Pryor didn’t back off from his past remark that Roe v. Wade was ‘the worst abomination in the history of constitutional law.’ Nor did he disavow his shocking statement that ‘I will never forget Jan. 22, 1973, the day seven members of our highest court ripped the Constitution and ripped out the life of millions of unborn children.’” [Daily Beast, [8/11/16](#)]

Pryor Used The Pejorative “Abortionists” Nearly Two Dozen Times In A Case Allowing Georgia’s Six-Week Abortion Ban To Go Into Immediate Effect

PRYOR REFERRED TO PLAINTIFFS AS “ABORTIONISTS” 21 TIMES IN A RULING

2022: Pryor Called The Plaintiffs In An Abortion Case “Abortionists” 21 Times In A Ruling Allowing Georgia’s Six-Week Abortion Ban To Take Immediate Effect. According to Bloomberg Law, “One word dominated the backlash to Wednesday’s opinion from the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit allowing Georgia’s abortion ban to take immediate effect. ‘The court used a derogatory term throughout the opinion—not just once or twice,’ said Andrea Young, attorney and executive director for the ACLU of Georgia, which represents those challenging the ban. ‘I found it to be really shocking and unprofessional.’ Chief Judge William Pryor Jr. repeatedly used the word ‘abortionists’—21 times in a 16-page opinion—instead of the terms ‘plaintiffs’ or ‘appellees,’ as they were identified in the case caption, or the name of the lead plaintiff, SisterSong Women of Color Reproductive Justice Collective. SisterSong is a nonprofit advocacy organization that does not provide any medical services. The other plaintiffs included: the Feminist Women’s Health Center, Planned Parenthood Southeast, the Atlanta Comprehensive Wellness Clinic, Atlanta Women’s Medical Center and more.” [Bloomberg Law, [7/21/22](#)]

Using The Term “Abortionists” To Describe The Plaintiffs Was Considered Pejorative, Disrespectful, And Unprofessional By Some Legal Scholars

Some Legal Scholars Said Using The Term “Abortionists” In That Way Was Pejorative, Disrespectful, And Unprofessional. According to Bloomberg Law, “Justice Samuel Alito’s majority opinion used the word abortionist to describe those performing or inducing an abortion. But Pryor used the word for all the plaintiffs, saying, ‘We vacate the injunction, reverse the judgment in favor of the abortionists, and remand with instructions to enter judgment in favor of the state officials.’ While the dictionary definition of the term is technically ‘a person who performs an abortion,’ it’s used differently in practice, said Eric Segall, a law professor at Georgia State University. The word has traditionally been employed by one side of the abortion debate— anti-abortion advocates, who attached a negative connotation to it. ‘Abortionist’ is part of the whole idea that there’s an industry out there that are just people doing abortions and only doing it to make money. That’s just not true. It’s not accurate. It’s false,’ he said. ‘It suggests this is something that’s not part of the medical care for women, and abortion is medical care.’ Segall said the term is pejorative and disrespectful toward pro-choice advocates. ‘It is a

shout-out to the cultural warriors who have been fighting against abortion for years,' Segall said. 'It's a dog whistle to that side, and I think judges should avoid dog whistles. O'Connor and Brennan and Kennedy and many others in deciding these kinds of cases tried to avoid that kind of signaling to their own constituencies.' Ross Guberman, author of judicial writing book 'Point Taken,' said the backlash over Pryor's use of 'abortionist' shows there's no such thing as neutral opinion-writing. 'Consciously or not, judges reveal much about their mindset in how they refer to the parties, characterize disputed facts, and frame counterarguments,' Guberman said on Twitter. 'Judges refer to parties by their names or roles in an appeal (ie 'plaintiffs') no matter what they think of the merits of their arguments. But not William Pryor. Completely unprofessional,' Corey Rayburn Yung, a professor at the University of Kansas School of Law, said on Twitter." [Bloomberg Law, [7/21/22](#)]