



Not since 1972 when the pro-abortion referendum Proposal B attempted to make legal abortion in Michigan up to the 20th week of pregnancy have we faced such a challenge to protect the lives of unborn babies! **Proposal 3**, intended to amend the state constitution to legalize abortion up to viability (and late-term in the third trimester for reasons of “health,”) is too confusing, too dangerous, and too extreme. The wording of the 100-word summary that voters will see on the ballot does not reflect the true and dangerous components of the actual proposal amendment. The expression: “the devil is in the details” is more true than voters realize. See page 2 for a fuller explanation of this dangerous referendum. We need every pro-lifer in the Kalamazoo area to not only vote but to share the message of Prop 3’s reckless contents to neighbors and relatives. If people become educated about how radical this referendum is then we can win! If voters remain in the dark...OR only rely on reading the 100 words on their ballot, they will be voting with their eyes closed. They must be educated. And you can be the source of their information. Check out our website ([kazoortl.org](http://kazoortl.org)) and our videos (Pro-Life Week or New News under Information) or Right to Life of Michigan ([rtl.org](http://rtl.org)) for more information.

November 8’s midterm election is far more than Prop 3. Voters will be electing members of Congress (House and Senate) as well as state representatives and senators in Lansing. Will pro-abortion Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi lose her top spot and be replaced by a new pro-life Speaker? Voters will decide. Americans will also determine the future of the U.S. Senate as one-third of all seats are on the ballot. In Michigan voters will be deciding who will be the next governor, secretary of state, and attorney general. Currently, these three positions are now occupied by radical pro-abortion Democrats. They need to be defeated! At all cost we need to make sure that our state lawmakers (House and Senate) retain their pro-life majorities. There are two seats on the State Supreme Court that are on the ballot as well as other judicial races, and county commission contests.

---

## **Jean Talanda elected as new president of Kalamazoo Right to Life**

At our recent annual business meeting, Board member Jean Talanda was elected as the new president of Kalamazoo Right to Life. Jean’s pro-life pedigree with the pro-life movement is strong. Her mother Dorothy joined Dr. Joe Kincaid in founding this group in late 1969. She served on the Board of KRTL until the early 1990s, and as our president from 1978 to 1984 and again from 1990 to 1993. Jean continues the Talanda tradition of displaying pro-life leadership and organizational skills. An added bonus is that she excels in understanding and using social media to enlarge our platform and to make our website better than ever. Welcome Jean in her new role.

## VOTE PRO-LIFE On NOVEMBER 8 Tudor Dixon tops the GOP Ticket to Defeat Pro-Abortion Gov. Whitmer

Right to Life of Michigan PAC has endorsed the following candidates for the November 8, 2022 mid-term election. At the top of the list is our candidate to defeat pro-abortion governor Gretchen Whitmer. RLM-PAC has endorsed **Tudor Dixon** (R) for governor. For the other two top state offices, **Matt DePerno** (R) is the endorsed candidate for Attorney General, and **Kristina Karamo** (R) is the endorsed candidate for Secretary of State. For US Congress, incumbent **Bill Huizenga** (R) is the endorsed candidate for the House of Representatives Michigan 4th District. Here in Michigan, **Aric Nesbitt** (R) is the incumbent candidate for the 20th State Senate District. **Thomas Albert** (R) who was “term-limited” in his current state House seat is the endorsed candidate of the State Senate 18th District which includes parts of Kalamazoo County. For the 42nd State House District the endorsed candidate is incumbent **Matt Hall** (R). For Kalamazoo County Commission the two endorsed pro-life candidates are **Jeff Heppler** (R) in the 7th District, and **Wendy Mazer** (R) in the 8th District. For the judicial races, in the 9th Circuit Court the endorsed candidate is **Rebecca D’Angelo**. For Kalamazoo County Probate Court judge, the endorsed incumbent is **Scott Pierangeli**. For the Michigan Supreme Court the endorsed candidates are incumbent **Brian Zahra** and **Paul Hudson**.

This is a very important election. These solidly pro-life candidates, whether veterans or newcomers need your support and vote.



## Why We Oppose Proposal 3; Why You Should Vote NO!

The Supreme Court made two significant decisions in the *Dobbs* ruling of June 24. Of course, the first was the overturning of *Roe v. Wade*, of which we rejoice. *Roe* had been the worst court decision since *Dred Scott* in 1857. *Dred Scott* upheld the institution of slavery and said that black people were inferior humans who possessed no rights. *Roe* stated that the unborn were not persons “in the whole sense” and possessed no rights. The second ingredient in *Dobbs* was that the matter of legislating abortion was going back to the states. So, now in Michigan we face a statewide referendum that will decide if abortion rights will become a permanent part of our state constitution. If we lose this battle on November 8 we will have lost the war. It’s just that simple. Everything we have fought for since the mid-1970s will be overturned by this radical, pro-abortion Proposal 3.

Here are some talking points why the pro-life community rejects this proposal and why it is too extreme and dangerous for Michigan’s women.

1. The 100-word summary that WILL be on your ballot is very misleading and deceptive. It does not explain or delve into the actual wording of the proposed constitutional amendment. It glosses over key points and hides what the amendment actually says...or doesn’t say. Words have precise meanings. If there are omissions, or if the text is so vague that multiple interpretations may be applicable, then chaos ensues. Without precise terminology, a liberal judge may interpret many vague portions of the amendment to the detriment of both unborn baby and mother. We have all heard it said a thousand times: “The devil is in the details.” Indeed, the devil wrote this referendum. I bring this up because many voters will vote based on what they read on the ballot. They will not know (unless they are educated) that the wording on the ballot does not match the wording of the proposed amendment.

2. The ballot wording on Prop 3 says that the proposal establishes a “new individual right to reproductive freedom.” Throughout the summary and the actual amendment the word “individual” is used, thus guaranteeing that both adults AND MINORS are included in this right. With parents out of the picture, the potential for abuse increases. Yes, we know that abortion will be legal in Michigan...but what other problems may arise due to the amendment’s vague and confusing wording. A possible scenario: What if a pregnant teen went into premature labor and delivered her baby. If she was concealing her pregnancy from her parents, she may recklessly decide to kill her baby by tossing the child into a dumpster. This is infanticide. A live birth and now a dead baby. But the baby’s death was the teen’s “pregnancy outcome” [for that very confusing term SEE #4] and it is doubtful that police would be permitted to investigate the crime of child neglect or infanticide.

3. The summary says that “individuals” have the right “to make and carry out all decisions about pregnancy” including abortion and sterilization. Abortion will be permitted up to viability. Viability was 26-28 weeks back in 1973. With advances in neonatal medicine viability has dropped to 22-23 weeks. But pro-abortion scholars and defenders have fixed viability at 24 weeks. All of these are arbitrary benchmarks. Between conception and birth is about 40 weeks and any fixed point in between is as arbitrary as any other. The summary says that the state can regulate abortion after viability “but not prohibit if medically needed to protect a patient’s life or physical or mental health.” The key word is “health.” The Supreme Court in *Doe v. Bolton* [*Roe*’s companion case in 1973] established what “health meant: psychological, emotional, familial, the woman’s age.” Thus, women will be able to get third-trimester abortions for reasons of “health.”

4. The actual proposed amendment (NOT WHAT’S ON THE BALLOT) says that the state cannot penalize or prosecute an individual “based on their actual, potential, perceived, or alleged pregnancy outcomes.” The key term here is “pregnancy outcomes.” Obviously, an abortion is a pregnancy outcome. But the issue becomes very murky with the term “sterilization.” Since the amendment only identifies “individuals” that could include males as well as females. Since women cannot get pregnant by themselves, men are included in “all matters relating to pregnancy.” Thus, men and boys may be permitted to undergo sterilizations without parental consent or knowledge. The whole controversy over puberty-blockers and sex reassignment surgeries may be permitted in this proposal. The wording IS TOO VAGUE AND UNCLEAR.

5. The actual amendment says that the state cannot penalize or prosecute “someone for aiding or assisting a pregnant individual in exercising their right...with their voluntary consent.” Since parental consent would be invalidated with point #2, the scenario becomes more perilous and radical. A school counselor, or teacher, or neighbor, or minister, or anyone could transport a pregnant minor to Planned Parenthood where the girl could get an abortion without parental knowledge or consent. The abortion was her “pregnancy outcome” and the parents would not be able to seek legal recourse because the person “assisting” is now protected from any prosecution. The language is TOO VAGUE AND OPEN TO THESE RADICAL POSSIBILITIES. Regarding the issue of parental consent, can anyone name a medical test or procedure, or operation that can be performed on a minor without direct parental consent? A school cannot even administer aspirin to a student without parental consent. But she can get an abortion with the help of another individual without her parents consent. Another horrific possibility: a 13-year old girl could be impregnated by a relative. He could coerce her into consenting that he drive her to Planned Parenthood to have an abortion. Her abortion is her “pregnancy outcome.” The rapist cannot be prosecuted for assisting in that “pregnancy outcome.” And the abortionist has just removed the evidence of the crime! How is that safe for a young girl who has been violently molested?

6. The proposed amendment [NOT THE BALLOT SUMMARY] states that the person who may perform the abortion must be an “attending health care professional.” This sleight of hand has great potential for abuse. Even in the *Roe* decision, Justice Harry Blackmun wrote that the procedure must be performed by “the woman’s attending physician.” The wording in Prop 3 is TOO VAGUE. It goes far beyond *Roe*. Prop 3 does not say “physician” but “health care professional.” The list of non-physician “health care professionals” is long including an audiologist, a marriage and family therapist, an occupational therapist, a psychologist or social worker. Oh, yes, I forgot to include dentist and veterinarian. While Prop 3’s authors dismiss our fears by saying that they mean ob/gyns...the fact remains: the text does not say “physician.” It says: “health care professional.” Words matter!!! WAY TOO VAGUE AND CONFUSING!

7. The final sentence in the summary says that Proposal 3 would “invalidate state laws conflicting with this amendment.” Indeed, every single pro-life law passed since the mid-1970s would be invalidated. What would we lose?

- \* The Abortion Ban of 1846
- \* The Abortion Ban of 1931
- \* Our Ban on Partial-birth Abortion
- \* Our Ban on State-Funded Abortions
- \* Our Parental Consent Law
- \* Our 24-hour Waiting Period Law
- \* Our Informed Consent Law. How is it safe for Michigan’s women to know that the “health care professional” aborting her baby will not be required to inform her of the medical procedure or tell her the risks of the abortion. Said Chief Justice Warren Burger of this issue in his dissent in a 1986 abortion-related decision: “Can anyone doubt that the State could impose a similar requirement with respect to other medical procedures? Can anyone doubt that doctors routinely give similar information concerning risks in countless procedures having far less impact on life and health, both physical and emotional than an abortion, and risk a malpractice lawsuit if they fail to do so?” With Prop 3 our informed consent law would be invalidated.
- \* Our Coercive Abortion Prevention Act
- \* Our Abortion Insurance opt-out Law
- \* Our Clinic Licensing Law. How safe will it be for Michigan’s women knowing that their abortion clinic may not be inspected by health and safety officials for decades?
- \* And the list goes on...

Kalamazoo Right to Life, Inc.  
PO Box 2366  
Kalamazoo, MI 49003

Non-Profit Organization  
U.S. POSTAGE PAID  
KALAMAZOO, MI 49009  
PERMIT NO. 1309

*Address Service Requested*

The pro-abortion folks who sponsored this referendum and drafted the proposed amendment want to make this a simple vote on abortion. Their argument: We had *Roe* for 50 years. We lost our right in *Dobbs*. We just want to go back to the way things were with *Roe*. Abortion is just an easy and safe medical procedure. Women will die without this right! Abortion is health care. However, it's not as simple as that. Proposal 3 far exceeds what *Roe* permitted.

- Non-physicians may be able to perform abortions.
- Minors could get abortions without parental consent.
- Individuals other than parents could help minors with no legal repercussions.
- Abortion will be permitted beyond viability.
- A pregnancy outcome could include infanticide.
- Young men and girls could become sterile through gender-affirming surgeries.
- Women may not even receive basic medical information or of risks about the abortion.

I go back to the matter of words. Words matter. They have meaning. In laws, words need to be precise and clear so that lawyers and judges cannot slip in rouge interpretations. Proposal 3 far exceeds *Roe v. Wade* in being EXTREME, AND CONFUSING, AND DANGEROUS. This is brought to us by the most radical, and extreme, ideologically-driven members of the pro-abortion community. And who is this proposal's number one cheerleader? We know her as Governor Gretchen Whitmer.

**PROPOSAL 3 MUST BE DEFEATED!!**