



Written by [James Murphy](#) on October 14, 2024

# Missouri to Consider Legalizing Abortion With Amendment 3

Kamala Harris and other far-left activists have dubbed the 2024 general election the “abortion election,” with pro-abortion forces looking to regain ground lost when *Roe v. Wade* was overturned by the Supreme Court in 2022. In Missouri, the issue is literally on the ballot, as voters in the Show Me State consider Amendment 3, which would establish a right to make decisions about what is euphemistically called “reproductive healthcare.”



In reality, it’s all about decriminalizing abortion in the state. Missouri is among the states that banned the ghoulish procedure in 2022 when the Supreme Court decided [Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization](#), effectively returning the legality of abortion to the states. As of now, abortion is illegal in Missouri except for certain extreme circumstances. A “yes” vote would make the procedure legal; a “no” vote maintains the status quo.

Rawf8/iStock/Getty Images Plus

## Opponents of Amendment 3

The fur is flying fast and furious between the pro-life and pro-abortion forces, with each side claiming the other is filling voters full of misinformation. In an open [letter](#) to constituents, Governor Michael Parson and his wife, Teresa, made the case that much of the movement is coming from out of state interests:

Pro-abortion groups have spent nearly \$20 million to promote this extreme pro-abortion amendment and change our Missouri Constitution. Nearly 75 percent of financial support can be traced to out-of-state donors, including funds linked to George Soros, Michael Bloomberg, and Planned Parenthood. The language of this amendment was written by lawyers and pro-abortion activist groups, and limits Missourians’ and their elected representatives’ ability to deliberate on health and safety standards for women and children.

Parson says the vague language in the amendment opens up potential for it to be used in transgender treatments as well:

It also opens the door to allow children to get sex change operations without parents’ knowledge in our state.



Written by [James Murphy](#) on October 14, 2024

---

## Legalizing More Than Abortion?

The governor and his wife strongly urge a “no” vote. Proponents of the amendment accuse Parson of using transgender fears as a smoke screen, since transgender procedures are far less palatable to voters than abortions are.

Anita Manion, an assistant professor of political science at the University of Missouri-St. Louis, [explained](#):

There’s nothing in Amendment 3 that talks about transgender care, but they’re saying other reproductive rights must mean that there can be this radical transgender agenda. Part of that is, they think that this is the issue they have more support from Americans on, than they do on abortion.

Billboards in Missouri urge a “no” vote. One reads, “No Tax Paid Transgender Surgery,” while another reads, “Amendment 3 Could Allow Gender Transition for Kids.”

Officially, [the ballot reads](#):

Do you want to amend the Missouri Constitution to:

- establish a right to make decisions about reproductive health care, including abortion and contraceptives, with any governmental interference of that right presumed invalid;
- remove Missouri’s ban on abortion;
- allow regulation of reproductive health care to improve or maintain the health of the patient;
- require the government not to discriminate, in government programs, funding, and other activities, against persons providing or obtaining reproductive health care; and
- allow abortion to be restricted or banned after Fetal Viability except to protect the life or health of the woman?

While there is no explicit mention of transgender procedures in the amendment, the requirement the government not “discriminate, in government programs, funding, and other activities, against persons providing or obtaining reproductive health care” is troublesome. A slick attorney could argue that since a transgender procedure generally sterilizes the patient, it could be considered “reproductive health care.”

The right for a baby to be born should be enough of a reason to vote “no” on this vaguely worded pro-abortion amendment. But if people believe it opens the door to sex-change operations for children (which it might), the “no” side has a better shot of winning. Perhaps the “yes” side’s own euphemism could be their undoing.



## Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

### What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.