

The Abortion Sacrament

How Democrats Turned Dead Children Into a Political Platform

The Democrat position on abortion has evolved from "safe, legal, and rare" to "shout your abortion" with terrifying speed. What was once framed as a tragic necessity has become a positive good — a sacrament of liberation, a rite of passage, a moral imperative celebrated with hashtags and fundraisers.

This transformation happened because the Democrats discovered that abortion is the perfect political issue: it can never be resolved, it generates infinite passion, and it makes the other side seem unthinkable. The last thing Democrats want is to make abortion unnecessary. They need it. Without abortion fearmongering, the Democrat Party would have difficulty winning any elections. So, America gets big-spending, high taxes, suffocating regulations, high crime, open borders, lousy education, expensive healthcare, racial division, government program fraud, gender confusion, etc. — largely because voters pull the lever for Democrats based solely on the abortion issue. And the irony is that there is only a minuscule fraction of the population that will ever actually need an abortion.

The Evolution of a Lie

Let's trace the trajectory, because the distance between where Democrats started and where they've ended up reveals everything.

Bill Clinton: "Abortion should be safe, legal, and rare." The framing was that abortion was regrettable — a necessary evil that should be minimized through contraception, education, and support for mothers.

That language is now considered offensive. "Rare" implies there's something wrong with abortion. The modern Democrat position is that abortion is healthcare, no different from a root canal or a mammogram. There is nothing to minimize. There is nothing to regret. There is only access to be expanded and stigma to be crushed.

What changed? Not the biology. Not the ethics. The politics. Democrats realized that "rare" was a concession — an admission that abortion was something to be avoided. That admission weakened the moral case for unrestricted access. So, they dropped it. Now abortion is not merely permitted. It is celebrated. Women are encouraged to "shout your abortion" — to publicly declare pride in having ended the life of their unborn child.

This is not a political evolution. It is a spiritual corruption dressed in the language of empowerment.

Roe, Doe, and the Legal Fiction

Doe v. Bolton, decided the same day as *Roe v. Wade* in 1973, is the case nobody talks about but everyone should.

Roe established the trimester framework: first trimester, states can't regulate abortion at all. Second trimester, states can regulate for maternal health. Third trimester, states can ban abortion except when necessary to preserve the life or health of the mother.

Doe defined "health" so broadly that it rendered the third-trimester restriction meaningless. Under *Doe*, "health" includes "all factors — physical, emotional, psychological, familial, and the woman's age — relevant to the well-being of the patient." That's not a health exception. That's an abortion-on-demand exception dressed in medical language. Any woman can claim emotional or psychological distress. Any pregnancy can be terminated at any point for any reason, because "health" covers everything.

The *Roe* framework was a dead letter from the moment it was written. *Doe* ensured that. Together, they created a regime more permissive than virtually any other country on Earth — a regime that allowed abortion for any reason at any stage of pregnancy, funded by taxpayers, with no meaningful restrictions allowed.

And Democrats defended this regime as "settled law" for fifty years while pretending it was moderate.

The Born-Alive Question

The born-alive issue is where the mask comes off completely. There is no ambiguity here. There is no gray area. A baby born alive after a failed abortion is a living human child. The question is whether that child should receive medical care — or be left to die.

Democrats have repeatedly voted against laws requiring medical care for infants born alive after failed abortions. Not once. Repeatedly. In Congress. In state legislatures. They have argued that requiring care for a born-alive infant places an undue burden on abortion access. They have argued that the decision should be between the woman and her doctor — even when the decision is whether a living, breathing, born infant receives medical attention or is left alone to die.

This is not about bodily autonomy. The baby is no longer inside anyone's body. This is about whether a human being who has been born has a right to medical care. Democrats have answered: no, not if that human being was unwanted in the womb.

The techniques used in late-term abortions make born-alive scenarios rare — the procedures are designed to ensure the fetus does not survive. But the rare cases where a baby does survive expose the logic of the position. If abortion is an absolute right, then the death of the child is the intended outcome. A living child is a complication. A failure. Something to be managed.

This is the position Democrats have chosen. They could have said: of course a born-alive infant should receive care, that's not even a question. They didn't. They chose the position that maximizes abortion access at the expense of born children. That's not a compromise. That's a moral abyss.

The Gruesome Reality

Late-term abortion is not a medical procedure like any other. It is the deliberate destruction of a viable human being capable of feeling pain.

Dilation and evacuation — the standard second-trimester procedure — involves dismembering the fetus inside the womb and removing it piece by piece. Intact dilation and extraction — the procedure that even its defenders struggle to describe in public — involves partially delivering the fetus feet-first, then collapsing the skull and removing the body.

These are not "clumps of cells." These are human beings with beating hearts, developing brains, and the capacity to feel pain. By twenty weeks, a fetus has all the neurological structures necessary for pain perception. By twenty-four weeks, a fetus can survive outside the womb with medical support. And Democrats have fought to protect the right to end that life — to dismember that body — up to and including the moment of birth.

The language is designed to obscure this reality. "Reproductive healthcare." "Termination of pregnancy." "Uterine contents." The clinical vocabulary exists to distance the speaker from what is actually happening: the deliberate killing of a human child.

The Pregnancy Incentive

Here is the uncomfortable truth that Democrats will never acknowledge: their policy platform incentivizes the very thing they claim to want to prevent.

Comprehensive sex education that normalizes teenage sexual activity. Easy access to contraception without parental knowledge. Abortion as a backup plan when contraception fails. The removal of stigma from out-of-wedlock pregnancy. Welfare policies that make single motherhood economically viable. The destruction of the nuclear family as a cultural ideal.

Every piece of this platform reduces the perceived cost of risky sexual behavior — particularly for teenagers and young adults. When pregnancy can be terminated quietly and without parental knowledge, the most significant natural consequence of sex is removed. When single motherhood is subsidized, the incentive to form stable two-parent households is reduced. When abortion is celebrated as empowerment, the gravity of the decision evaporates.

The result is predictable and predicted: more sex, more pregnancies, more abortions. Not despite Democrat policies. Because of them.

Democrats need a steady supply of women seeking abortions because those women are reliable Democrat voters. The fear of losing abortion access is the single most effective turnout mechanism the party has — more powerful than economic anxiety, more powerful than healthcare, more powerful than any material concern. A woman who has had an abortion, or fears she might need one, will crawl over broken glass to vote against the party that might take that option away.

This is the gift. Create the conditions that generate demand for abortion. Then position yourself as the only defender of the solution to the problem you created. Then use the fear of losing that solution to drive voter turnout forever.

The Refusal to Compromise

If Democrats actually wanted to reduce the number of abortions — to make the procedure "rare" as Clinton once said — they would work with the pro-life side on policies that both sides claim to support.

Contraception access. Democrats defend it vigorously — through legislative proposals, through healthcare mandates, through Planned Parenthood funding. Pro-lifers who want to reduce unintended pregnancies have no objection to contraception access. This should be the easiest bipartisan win in American politics. But Democrats insist on contraception access on their own terms, as a standalone progressive policy, never as part of a broader compromise that includes any abortion restriction.

Paid family leave. Democrats have proposed it, campaigned on it, and voted for it repeatedly. Pro-lifers say they want to support mothers. Build a coalition and pass a bill. But when the trade is "paid leave in exchange for a 15-week federal limit," Democrats walk. The goal isn't reducing abortion — it's preserving unrestricted access.

Adoption reform. Make it easier, faster, and cheaper to adopt. Both sides claim to support this. There's genuine bipartisan interest. Where's the legislation? It never becomes a priority, because reducing the demand for abortion is not actually a priority.

Crisis pregnancy centers. Fund them. Support them. Make them ubiquitous so that no woman feels abortion is her only option. Democrats have actively worked against pregnancy resource centers — portraying them as deceptive, pushing to defund them, passing local ordinances to restrict their operations. The pro-life movement has spent fifty years building these centers and providing material support to women in crisis pregnancies. The pro-choice

movement has spent fifty years fighting to keep abortion legal and expanding access — and treating the alternative infrastructure as a threat.

Democrats have shown plenty of interest in contraception and paid leave. What they refuse to do is let that interest lead to any outcome that might reduce the political salience of abortion as a wedge issue. Because every policy that reduces demand for abortion means reduced urgency around abortion rights. Reduced urgency means reduced turnout. Reduced turnout means lost elections.

So, the policies Democrats claim to support stay permanently on the shelf — useful as campaign promises, impossible as legislative compromises. They're not opposed to contraception or paid leave. They're opposed to decoupling those policies from abortion absolutism. And that tells you everything about what the real priority is.

The Judicial Hostage Crisis

For decades, Democrats used *Roe v. Wade* as a judicial hostage. Every Supreme Court nomination became a referendum on abortion. Every judicial confirmation hearing turned on whether the nominee would "protect" *Roe*. The message to voters was explicit: elect us, or the Court will overturn *Roe* and women will die in back alleys.

Then *Dobbs* happened. *Roe* fell. And the sky did not fall with it.

Abortion policy returned to the states — which is where it always belonged under the Constitution. Some states restricted it. Some states expanded it. Some states passed referendums. The democratic process that was supposed to be impossible turned out to work exactly as designed. Women did not die in back alleys. The Republic did not collapse.

And Democrats lost their most powerful electoral weapon.

The response was not to accept the democratic resolution of a democratic question. The response was to demand federal legislation codifying *Roe* — and going far beyond *Roe* — to strip states of the power to regulate abortion in any meaningful way. The position that was defended for fifty years as "settled law" requiring judicial deference was revealed as a policy preference requiring total victory. They don't want the people to decide. They want their side to win, permanently, by any means necessary.

The Sacrament

Abortion has become something more than a medical procedure or a legal right in Democrat politics. It has become a sacrament.

The language is liturgical. "Reproductive justice." "Bodily autonomy." "My body, my choice." These are not policy arguments. They are articles of faith. To question them is heresy. To oppose them is evil. There is no middle ground, no compromise, no conversation.

The rituals are liturgical. The Women's March. The Planned Parenthood fundraiser. The "shout your abortion" social media post. The pink hat. The clinic escort. The protest outside the Supreme Court. These are not political activities. They are expressions of identity and belonging — the way church attendance is for the religious.

And like any sacrament, abortion confers grace. The woman who has an abortion is not merely exercising a right. She is performing an act of liberation. She is casting off the patriarchy. She is asserting control over her body and her destiny. The abortion is not a tragedy to be mourned. It is a triumph to be celebrated.

This is why the "rare" language had to go. You don't want your sacraments to be rare. You want them to be accessible, available, and honored.

The Honest Conversation

If Democrats were serious about abortion as a difficult moral question rather than a political weapon, they would say something like this:

"Abortion is the taking of a human life at an early stage of development. It is sometimes the least bad option in a set of terrible options. We should work to make it unnecessary — through contraception, through support for mothers, through adoption reform, through cultural change that values life and family. When it happens, it should be early, safe, and rare. And we should be honest about what it is rather than hiding behind clinical language that obscures the reality of the act."

They will never say this. Because saying this would acknowledge that the pro-life position has moral weight. It would acknowledge that the unborn child is something more than a clump of cells. It would acknowledge that abortion is a tragedy, not a triumph. And it would open the door to compromise — to working with the other side on policies that reduce the demand for abortion rather than simply expanding access to it.

Democrats cannot afford that door to open. Because once it opens, the issue loses its power. The fear diminishes. The turnout drops. The donations slow. The whole edifice of abortion politics — fifty years of judicial hostage-taking, electoral fear-mongering, and moral absolutism — collapses.

The Post-Dobbs Reckoning

The fall of *Roe* has forced Democrats into an increasingly extreme position. They can no longer hide behind the Court. They have to say what they actually want. And what they actually want is abortion on demand at any stage of pregnancy, for any reason, funded by taxpayers, with no meaningful restrictions, and with medical care for born-alive infants treated as optional.

That is not a moderate position. It is not a popular position. Outside of progressive enclaves, most Americans support restrictions on late-term abortion. Most Americans support parental notification. Most Americans support conscience protections for medical professionals. Most Americans think a baby born alive after a failed abortion should receive medical care.

Democrats are on the wrong side of every one of these questions. And they know it. So, they don't debate the specifics. They debate the principle. They talk about "choice" and "rights" and "freedom" in the abstract because the concrete reality of what they're defending is politically toxic.

The abortion grift is the purest expression of the Democrat model: identify a vulnerability, build a political identity around it, ensure it never gets resolved, and use the fear of losing it to drive turnout forever. The only difference is that the vulnerability in this case is the death of children.

That's not a policy disagreement. That's a moral crime. And the people who have built their careers on it will have to answer for it eventually — if not in this life, then in the next.