Questions for Reflection and Discussion:

1. Is the pro-life movement a better fit for political liberalism or political conservatism?

2. Should the pro-life movement be a narrowly focused, single-issue campaign to restrict abortion through law, or should it instead be a broadly-based campaign for a wide variety of human life causes? What do you think are the pros and cons of each strategy? Why do you think that the pro-life movement began as a more broadly-based campaign, but then narrowed to become a single-issue cause?

3. If pro-lifers are forced to choose between a political program that would enact more legal restrictions on abortion or a political program that would possibly reduce the abortion rate to a greater extent (while still keeping abortion legal), which should they choose? Why do you think Sargent and Eunice Shriver made the choice they did? Why do you think other pro-lifers of the mid-1970s decided that this choice was incompatible with a pro-life philosophy?

4. What are the different assumptions between pro-life Democrats and pro-life Republicans today?

5. What do you think are the main causes of the decline in the abortion rate over the past few decades? What do you think are some of the reasons why the percentage of abortions obtained by poor women has dramatically increased, even while the total number of abortions has declined? What do you think are the best strategies to further reduce the number of abortions?