

Overview

Matt Gunderson is an anti-abortion extremist who is backed by dangerous, anti-choice groups that want to ban abortion, even in cases of rape or incest.

Message #1

Matt Gunderson is supported by extremists who want to ban abortion in California. Gunderson opposed guaranteeing access to abortion and contraception in the state constitution and has been endorsed by dangerous anti-abortion organizations like the California Pro-Life Council which supports a total ban on abortion without exceptions for rape or incest.

Matt Gunderson is supported by extremists who want to ban abortion in California.

The California ProLife PAC Endorsed Gunderson For State Senate. According to the California ProLife Council and Right of Life Federation's Website, California Pro-Life endorsed Gunderson for California State Senate in 2022. [California ProLife Council And Right To Life Federation, 2022 California ProLife PAC Recommendations accessed [4/29/24](#)]

- **The California ProLife PAC Was The California Affiliate Of The National Right To Life Committee.** “Welcome to the California ProLife Council, the California affiliate of the National Right to Life Committee since 1971. CPLC is a non-profit, non-partisan, non-sectarian grassroots organization dedicated to restoring legal protection for vulnerable individual lives, particularly those at risk of abortion, infanticide, and euthanasia.” [California ProLife PAC, accessed [4/29/24](#)]
- **NRLC Promoted Model Legislation That Banned Abortion Without Exceptions For Rape Or Incest.** “The 10-year-old Ohio girl who crossed state lines to receive an abortion in Indiana should have carried her pregnancy to term and would be required to do so under a model law written for state legislatures considering more restrictive abortion measures, according to the general counsel for the National Right to Life. Jim Bopp, an Indiana lawyer who authored the model legislation in advance of the Supreme Court's decision overturning Roe v. Wade, told POLITICO on Thursday that his law only provides exceptions when the pregnant person's life is in danger. [...] ‘Unless her life was at danger, there is no exception for rape,’ Bopp said. ‘The bill does propose exceptions for rape and incest, in my model, because that is a pro-life position, but it's not our ideal position. We don't think, as heartwrenching as those circumstances are, we don't think we should devalue the life of the baby because of the sins of the father.’” [Politico, [7/14/22](#)]
- **NRLC Leadership: 10-Year-Old Rape Survivor Should Have Been Required To Give Birth.** “Jim Bopp, an Indiana lawyer who authored the model legislation in advance of the Supreme Court's decision overturning Roe v. Wade, told POLITICO on Thursday that his law only provides exceptions when the pregnant person's life is in danger. ‘She would have had the baby, and as many women who have had babies as a result of rape, we would hope that she would understand the reason and ultimately the benefit of having the child,’ Bopp said in a phone interview on Thursday. The story of the 10-year old rape victim forced to leave her home state to terminate a pregnancy has sparked a national conversation over the consequences of the Supreme Court's decision to overturn Roe v. Wade and how far some states are willing to go to prohibit abortions.” [Politico, [7/14/22](#)]
- **The National Right To Life Committee Masterminded Model Legislation That Would Have Forced A 10-Year-Old Rape Victim To Give Birth, Then Defended It.** “The 10-year-old Ohio girl who crossed state lines to receive an abortion in Indiana should have carried her pregnancy to term and would be required to do so under a model law written for state legislatures considering more restrictive abortion measures, according to the general counsel for the National Right to Life. Jim Bopp, an Indiana lawyer who authored the model legislation

in advance of the Supreme Court’s decision overturning Roe v. Wade, told POLITICO on Thursday that his law only provides exceptions when the pregnant person’s life is in danger. ‘She would have had the baby, and as many women who have had babies as a result of rape, we would hope that she would understand the reason and ultimately the benefit of having the child,’ Bopp said in a phone interview on Thursday.” [Politico, [7/14/22](#)]

Gunderson opposed guaranteeing access to abortion and contraception in the state constitution...

Proposition 1 Guaranteed The Right To An Abortion In California’s Constitution. “California will codify its progressive abortion protections in its state Constitution after voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition 1, a measure placed on the ballot in the aftermath of the U.S. Supreme Court’s decision to overturn Roe vs. Wade. With its passage Tuesday, the state’s Constitution will expressly guarantee a person’s ‘fundamental right to choose to have an abortion and their fundamental right to choose or refuse contraceptives.’” [Los Angeles Times, [11/8/22](#)]

Proposition 1 Passed With 61% Support In California’s 49th Congressional District. [California Secretary Of State, Congressional Districts for State Ballot Measures, page 5, accessed [4/29/24](#)]

| 2022 Proposition 1, Constitutional Right To Reproductive Freedom In CA-49 | | |
|---|------------|-----------------|
| Vote | Vote Total | Vote Percentage |
| Yes | 175,573 | 61% |
| No | 112,243 | 39% |

[California Secretary Of State, Congressional Districts for State Ballot Measures, page 5, accessed [4/29/24](#)]

AUDIO: Gunderson Said That Proposition One Opened “Pandora’s Box To Late-Term Abortions.”

GUNDERSON: “She supports abortion on demand. She wants no restrictions, and she supports Prop 1, which opens up Pandora’s box to late-term abortions.” [Stay Classy San Diego, State Senate Campaign In District 38 – Matt Gunderson, 36:22, [11/2/22](#)] (AUDIO)

2022: Gunderson Said That He Did Not Support Proposition 1 Because It Stripped Protections By Not Explicitly Banning Late-Term Abortions, “Allowing The Abortion Of A Scientifically Viable Life For Any Reason.” “Q: What is your position on Proposition 1, which would establish the rights for Californians to an abortion and to contraceptives in the state Constitution? A: Let’s start here: I am pro-choice. As the father to four daughters, protecting a woman’s right to choose is very important to me. I’m in support of expanding women’s health clinics, providing more affordable access to contraception, and establishing the right to choose and the right to contraception in the California constitution. What I do not support, and what the vast majority of Californians do not support, is the provision of Proposition 1 that goes beyond protecting the right to choose. [...] By not explicitly limiting late-term abortions, Proposition 1 strips these protections from California law, removing medical input and allowing the abortion of a scientifically viable life for any reason. Allowing these late, third-trimester abortions on demand would heighten risk of complications for the woman seeking the procedure, including permanent reproductive damage and death. For these reasons, I don’t support Proposition 1 as written. If Californians knew the truth behind it, I don’t think they’d support it with this provision either.” [San Diego Union Tribune, [9/14/22](#)]

- **Gunderson Said Abortion Was Legal “Up Until Fetal Viability At About 24-26 Weeks” After Which Abortion Was Prohibited Under Current California Law.** “Q: What is your position on Proposition 1, which would establish the rights for Californians to an abortion and to contraceptives in the state Constitution? A: Let’s start here: I am pro-choice. As the father to four daughters, protecting a woman’s right to choose is very important to me. I’m in support of expanding women’s health clinics, providing more affordable access to contraception, and establishing the right to choose and the right to contraception in the California constitution. What I do not support, and what the vast majority of Californians do not support, is the provision of Proposition 1 that goes beyond protecting the right to choose. In California today, it is legal to have an abortion for any reason up until fetal viability at about 24-26 weeks (six months). After that time, abortion is prohibited unless continuing the pregnancy risks the life of the mother. That means that abortion in

California is currently legal up until a doctor determines that either the fetus is a viable being who could live outside the womb or at any time if the life of the mother is at risk.” [San Diego Union Tribune, [9/14/22](#)]

...and has been endorsed by dangerous anti-abortion organizations like the California Pro-Life Council which supports a total ban on abortion without exceptions for rape or incest.

The California ProLife PAC Endorsed Gunderson For State Senate. According to the California ProLife Council and Right of Life Federation’s Website, California Pro-Life endorsed Gunderson for California State Senate in 2022. [California ProLife Council And Right To Life Federation, 2022 California ProLife PAC Recommendations accessed [4/29/24](#)]

- **The California ProLife PAC Was The California Affiliate Of The National Right To Life Committee.** “Welcome to the California ProLife Council, the California affiliate of the National Right to Life Committee since 1971. CPLC is a non-profit, non-partisan, non-sectarian grassroots organization dedicated to restoring legal protection for vulnerable individual lives, particularly those at risk of abortion, infanticide, and euthanasia.” [California ProLife PAC, accessed [4/29/24](#)]
- **NRLC Promoted Model Legislation That Banned Abortion Without Exceptions For Rape Or Incest.** “The 10-year-old Ohio girl who crossed state lines to receive an abortion in Indiana should have carried her pregnancy to term and would be required to do so under a model law written for state legislatures considering more restrictive abortion measures, according to the general counsel for the National Right to Life. Jim Bopp, an Indiana lawyer who authored the model legislation in advance of the Supreme Court’s decision overturning Roe v. Wade, told POLITICO on Thursday that his law only provides exceptions when the pregnant person’s life is in danger. [...] ‘Unless her life was at danger, there is no exception for rape,’ Bopp said. ‘The bill does propose exceptions for rape and incest, in my model, because that is a pro-life position, but it’s not our ideal position. We don’t think, as heartwrenching as those circumstances are, we don’t think we should devalue the life of the baby because of the sins of the father.’” [Politico, [7/14/22](#)]
- **NRLC Leadership: 10-Year-Old Rape Survivor Should Have Been Required To Give Birth.** “Jim Bopp, an Indiana lawyer who authored the model legislation in advance of the Supreme Court’s decision overturning Roe v. Wade, told POLITICO on Thursday that his law only provides exceptions when the pregnant person’s life is in danger. ‘She would have had the baby, and as many women who have had babies as a result of rape, we would hope that she would understand the reason and ultimately the benefit of having the child,’ Bopp said in a phone interview on Thursday. The story of the 10-year old rape victim forced to leave her home state to terminate a pregnancy has sparked a national conversation over the consequences of the Supreme Court’s decision to overturn Roe v. Wade and how far some states are willing to go to prohibit abortions.” [Politico, [7/14/22](#)]
- **The National Right To Life Committee Masterminded Model Legislation That Would Have Forced A 10-Year-Old Rape Victim To Give Birth, Then Defended It.** “The 10-year-old Ohio girl who crossed state lines to receive an abortion in Indiana should have carried her pregnancy to term and would be required to do so under a model law written for state legislatures considering more restrictive abortion measures, according to the general counsel for the National Right to Life. Jim Bopp, an Indiana lawyer who authored the model legislation in advance of the Supreme Court’s decision overturning Roe v. Wade, told POLITICO on Thursday that his law only provides exceptions when the pregnant person’s life is in danger. ‘She would have had the baby, and as many women who have had babies as a result of rape, we would hope that she would understand the reason and ultimately the benefit of having the child,’ Bopp said in a phone interview on Thursday.” [Politico, [7/14/22](#)]

2022: Gunderson Was Endorsed By Californians For Life. [Cal Matters, 2022 Voter Guide, accessed [5/21/24](#)]

KEY ENDORSEMENTS

Catherine Blakespear

- California Democratic Party
- California Nurses Association
- California Labor Federation
- California Environmental Voters
- [San Diego Union-Tribune editorial board](#)
- Lt. Gov. Eleni Kounalakis
- Former Assemblymember Lorena Gonzalez
- California YIMBY
- National Women's Political Caucus of California

Matt Gunderson

- California Republican Party
- State Sen. Pat Bates
- Peace Officers Research Association of California
- [Orange County Register editorial board](#)
- Former U.S. Rep. Mimi Walters
- Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn.
- Former San Diego Mayor Kevin Faulconer
- Californians for Life

[Cal Matters, 2022 Voter Guide, accessed [5/21/24](#)]

- **Californians For Life Asked If Abortion Is The Best Response To Rape And Said That “Abortion Will Not Undo The Pain Of And Trauma Of Rape.”** “Of course, we all have tremendous empathy for anyone who has been raped. We can’t think of anything more traumatizing than rape. Our heart goes out to anyone who has been victimized by this horrific act of brutal violence against women. Victims of rape need and deserve our support, help, care, and love. However, out of love, concern, and empathy for the rape victim, we need to thoughtfully and compassionately ask, is abortion really the best response to the horrific trauma of rape? Abortion will not undo the pain of and trauma of rape. Instead, the pain of abortion may add to a woman’s emotional and physical abuse. Abortion, like rape, is a violent, traumatic, destructive act, hurting millions of women for a lifetime.” [Californians for Life, accessed [12/11/23](#)]
- **Californians For Life Said That An Incest Victim’s Pregnancy Could Give Them “The First Real Chance Of Overcoming The Family’s Denial And Escaping From Incest.”** “Again, we need to support the victims of incest, with love and compassion. It is possible that the victim’s pregnancy gives her the first real chance of overcoming the family’s denial and escaping from incest. Her pregnancy provides absolute proof of the crime of incest, while abortion adds to the young girl’s sense of guilt and trauma, further covering up the crime and sending the victim back into an abusive home. Oftentimes, the victims of incest are pressured, forced into abortions by family members who are trying to hide the incestual relationship. We need to stop the abuse, rescue the victim, report the crime, and penalize the perpetrator, rather than do further harm to innocent lives, of both mother and baby.” [Californians for Life, accessed [12/11/23](#)]