

No. 26-30203

In the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

STATE OF LOUISIANA, by and through its Attorney General, LIZ MURRILL;
ROSALIE MARKEZICH,
Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION, ET AL.,
Defendants-Appellees,

v.

GENBIOPRO, INC.; DANCO LABORATORIES, L.L.C.,
Intervenors-Appellees / Cross-Appellants.

*On Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Louisiana,
No. 25-cv-1491, Hon. David C. Joseph*

**BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE
NATIONAL HISPANIC CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE AND
DOUGLASS LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE
SUPPORTING PLAINTIFFS-APPELLANTS**

MATHEW D. STAVER
Counsel of Record
HORATIO G. MIHET
DANIEL J. PIEDRA
LIBERTY COUNSEL
P.O. Box 540774
Orlando, FL 32854
(407) 875-1776
court@lc.org

Counsel for Amici

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT OF INTERESTED PERSONS

In accordance with Fifth Circuit Rule 29.2, the undersigned counsel certifies that the persons and entities listed below have an interest in the outcome of this case. These representations are made so that the judges of this Court may evaluate possible disqualification or recusal.

Amici

National Hispanic Christian Leadership Foundation
Douglass Leadership Institute

Amici's Counsel

Mathew D. Staver
Horatio G. Mihet
Daniel J. Piedra
LIBERTY COUNSEL
P.O. Box 540774
Orlando, FL 32854

Dated: June 22, 2026

/s/ Mathew D. Staver
Mathew D. Staver

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Amici National Hispanic Christian Leadership Foundation and the Douglass Leadership Institute are nongovernmental corporate entities that have no parent corporations, and no publicly held corporations hold 10% or more of their stock.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| TABLE OF AUTHORITIES..... | v |
| INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE..... | 1 |
| SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT..... | 2 |
| ARGUMENT | 4 |
| I. The Population Council, the patent holder for mifepristone, has longstanding ties to eugenics..... | 4 |
| A. The Population Council’s goal is to halt the growth of humanity..... | 5 |
| B. The Population Council’s eugenic roots..... | 6 |
| C. The Population Council’s acquisition of mifepristone..... | 11 |
| II. The Abortion and Birth Control Movements are rooted in Social Darwinism and the elimination of “undesirable” people. | 14 |
| A. The Abortion Movement was developed alongside the Eugenics Movement..... | 15 |
| B. The Eugenic Era lives on through the Abortion Movement..... | 19 |
| C. The Eugenics Movement’s racist roots..... | 20 |
| D. Modern abortion policy promotes the eradication of preborn children with Down syndrome and other disabilities..... | 29 |
| III. The federal government’s own “expert” in this case chillingly echoes the eugenicist aims of abortion..... | 34 |
| CONCLUSION..... | 36 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| | Page(s) |
|--|---------|
| Cases | |
| <i>All. for Hippocratic Med. v. U.S. Food & Drug Admin.</i> , 78 F.4th 210 (5th Cir. 2023)..... | 2 |
| <i>Box v. Planned Parenthood of Ind. & Ky., Inc.</i> , 139 S. Ct. 1780 (2019). | passim |
| <i>Buck v. Bell</i> , 274 U.S. 200 (1927) | 17 |
| <i>Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Org.</i> , 597 U.S. 215 (2022) | 1 |
| <i>Food & Drug Admin. v. All. for Hippocratic Med.</i> , 602 U.S. 367 (2024) | 2 |
| <i>Missouri v. U.S. Food & Drug Admin.</i> , No. 2:22-cv-00223-Z (N.D. Tex.)..... | 29 |
| <i>Preterm-Cleveland v. McCloud</i> , 994 F.3d 512 (6th Cir. 2021) | 19 |
| <i>Smith v. Wayne</i> , 231 Mich. 409 (1925) | 17 |
| Statutes | |
| Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, Pub. L. No. 101-336, 104 Stat. 327 | 33 |
| Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004, Pub. L. No 108-446, 118 Stat. 2647..... | 34 |
| Other Authorities | |
| <i>Abortion Pill Maker Revealed</i> , CBS News (Oct. 13, 2000) | 13 |
| Adam Cohen, <i>Imbeciles: The Supreme Court, American Eugenics, and the Sterilization of Carrie Buck</i> (2016) | 15, 18 |
| American College of Obstetricians & Gynecologists, <i>Practice Bulletin 162: Prenatal Diagnostic Testing for Genetic Disorders</i> (May 2016) .. | 31 |

| | |
|--|----|
| American Medical Association, House of Delegates Proceedings, Annual Convention 1967..... | 30 |
| Bernard Berelson, <i>Beyond Family Planning</i> , 38 STUD. FAM. PLAN. (Feb. 1969)..... | 11 |
| Brian G. Skotko, <i>Prenatally Diagnosed Down Syndrome: Mothers Who Continued Their Pregnancies Evaluate Their Health Care Providers</i> , 192 AM. J. OF OBSTETRICS & GYNECOLOGY 670 (Nov. 2004)..... | 33 |
| Carole Novielli, <i>The Population Council, Which Brought the Abortion Pill to the U.S., Has a Shocking History That’s Nothing to Celebrate</i> , LiveAction (Nov. 14, 2017) | 7 |
| Caroline Mansfield et al., <i>European Concerted Action, Termination Rates After Prenatal Diagnosis of Down Syndrome, Spina Bifida, Anencephaly, and Turner and Klinefelter Syndromes: A Systematic Literature Review</i> , 19 PRENATAL DIAGNOSIS 808(1999) | 31 |
| Corinna Lain, <i>Three Supreme Court “Failures” and a Story of Supreme Court Success</i> , 69 VANDERBILT L. REV. 1040 (2019) | 20 |
| Ctrs. For Disease Control & Prevention, Morbidity & Mortality Wkly. Rep., <i>Abortion Surveillance — United States, 2018</i> | 26 |
| Dave Maclean, <i>Iceland Close to Becoming First Country Where No Down’s Syndrome Children Are Born</i> , Independent (Aug. 16, 2017).. | 32 |
| David Beito & Linda Royster Beito, <i>Black Maverick: T.R.M. Howard’s Fight For Civil Rights and Economic Power</i> (2009) | 24 |
| Denise DiPierri, <i>RU 486, Mifepristone: A Review of a Controversial Drug</i> , 19 NURSE PRACTITIONER, no. 6 (1994) | 12 |
| Donald Critchlow, <i>Intended Consequences: Birth Control, Abortion, and the Federal Government in Modern America</i> (1999)..... | 23 |
| Dorothy Roberts, <i>Killing The Black Body: Race, Reproduction, and The Meaning Of Liberty</i> (1997) | 21 |
| Emily Bazelon, <i>The Place of Women on the Court</i> , N.Y. Times Magazine (July 7, 2009)..... | 20 |
| Frederick Osborn, <i>Characteristics and Differential Fertility of American Population Groups</i> , 12 SOC. FORCES 1 (1933)..... | 8 |

| | |
|---|----------|
| Frederick Osborn, <i>Qualitative Aspects of Population Control: Eugenics and Euthenics</i> , 25 L. & CONTEMP. PROBS. 406 (1960) | 8 |
| G.A. RES. 66/149, ¶ 3 (Dec. 19, 2011) | 29 |
| Jaime L. Natoli et al., <i>Prenatal Diagnosis of Down Syndrome: A Systematic Review of Termination Rates (1995-2011)</i> , 32:2 PRENATAL DIAGNOSIS 142 (2012) | 32 |
| James Sherley, <i>Preborn Black Lives Matter, Too</i> , Wash. Times (Aug. 2, 2020) | 25 |
| James Studnicki et al., <i>Perceiving and Addressing the Pervasive Racial Disparity in Abortion</i> , Health Servs. Research & Managerial Epidemiology(2020) | 24 |
| Jeffrey Sutton, <i>51 Imperfect Solutions: States and the Making of American Constitutional Law</i> (2018) | 16 |
| John D. Rockefeller III, <i>On the Origins of the Population Council</i> , 3 POP. & DEV. REV. 493 (1977)..... | 5, 6, 13 |
| John J. Donohue & Steven D. Levitt, <i>The Impact of Legalized Abortion on Crime Over the Last Two Decades</i> (Nat’l Bureau of Econ. Rsch., Working Paper No. 25863, 2019) | 35 |
| John J. Donohue III & Steven D. Levitt, <i>The Impact of Legalized Abortion On Crime</i> , 116 Q. J. OF ECON. 379 (2001) | 35 |
| Julian Quinones & Arijeta Lajka, “What Kind of Society Do You Want to Live in?”: <i>Inside the Country Where Down Syndrome is Disappearing</i> , CBS News (Aug. 14, 2017) | 31 |
| Margaret Sanger Papers Project, Newsletter #28, <i>Birth Control or Race Control? Sanger and the Negro Project</i> (2001)..... | 21 |
| Margaret Sanger, <i>An Autobiography</i> (1938) | 22 |
| Margaret Sanger, <i>Apostle of Birth Control Sees Cause Gaining Here</i> , N.Y. Times, Apr. 8, 1923..... | 22 |
| Margaret Sanger, <i>Birth Control and Racial Betterment</i> , BIRTH CONTROL REV., Feb. 1919..... | 19 |

| | |
|--|---------|
| Margaret Sanger, <i>My Way to Peace</i> , Address to the New History Society (Jan. 17, 1932) | 28 |
| Margaret Sanger, <i>Pivot of Civilization</i> (1922)..... | 19 |
| Margaret Sanger, <i>The Eugenic Value of Birth Control Propaganda</i> , BIRTH CONTROL REV., Oct. 1921 | 16 |
| Margaret Sanger, <i>The Function of Sterilization</i> , BIRTH CONTROL REV., Oct. 1926..... | 16 |
| Mark Crutcher et al., Life Dynamics, Inc., <i>Racial Targeting and Population Control</i> 22 (2011) | 27, 28 |
| Mary Ziegler, Reinventing Eugenics: Reproductive Choice and Law Reform After World War II, 14 Cardozo J.L. & Gender 319 (2008)..... | passim |
| Mary Ziegler, <i>Roe’s Race: The Supreme Court, Population Control, and Reproductive Justice</i> , 25 YALE J.L. & FEMINISM 1 (2013)..... | 22 |
| Matthew Connelly, <i>Fatal Misconception: The Struggle to Control World Population</i> (2008) | 5, 6, 7 |
| Maya Manian, <i>Coerced Sterilization of Mexican-American Women: The Story of Madrigal v. Quilligan</i> , in REPROD. RIGHTS & JUSTICE STORIES 97 (Melissa Murray et al. eds., 2019)..... | 21 |
| Mia Steupert & Tessa Cox, Charlotte Lozier Inst., <i>Abortion Reporting: Mississippi</i> (2022) (March 15, 2024) | 26 |
| Minutes of a Meeting of the Rockefeller Council Executive Board (May 9, 1966) | 10 |
| Nancy Gibbs, <i>The Pill Arrives</i> , CNN (Oct. 2, 2000)..... | 12 |
| Paul A. Lombardo, “ <i>The American Breed</i> ”: <i>Nazi Eugenics and the Origins of the Pioneer Fund</i> , 65 ALB. L. REV. 743 (2002) | 7 |
| Paul Lombardo, <i>Disability, Eugenics, and the Culture Wars</i> , 2 ST. LOUIS U. J. HEALTH L. & POL’Y 57 (2008) | 16, 20 |
| Paul Lombardo, Three Generations, No Imbeciles: Eugenics, The Supreme Court, and Buck v. Bell (2008) | 18 |
| Peter Quinn, <i>Race Cleansing In America</i> , 54 AM. HERITAGE 2 (2003) ... | 18 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Research Proposal, “Problems of Bearing and Rearing Children in High-Fertility, Low-Income, Low Education American Families,” (1960)... | 10 |
| Robert O’Harrow Jr., <i>Drug’s U.S. Marketer Remains Elusive</i> , The Washington Post (Oct. 11, 2000)..... | 13 |
| Stephanie Ramer et al., Ctrs. for Disease Control & Prevention, <i>Abortion Surveillance—United States, 2022</i> (Nov. 28, 2024)..... | 25 |
| Susan Donaldson James, <i>Down Syndrome Births are Down in the U.S.</i> , ABC News (Oct. 30, 2009)..... | 32 |
| Susan Enouen, Life Issues Inst., <i>New Research Shows Planned Parenthood Targets Minority Neighborhoods</i> , Life Issues Connector (Oct. 2012) | 26 |
| Susan Enouen, <i>Research Shows Planned Parenthood Expands Targeting Minorities as it Spurns Racist Founder</i> , Townhall (Sep. 23, 2020) | 27 |
| U.S. Census Bureau, <i>Annual Estimates of the Resident Population by Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin</i> (2024) | 25 |
| Victoria Nourse, <i>Buck v. Bell: A Constitutional Tragedy from a Lost World</i> , 39 PEPP. L. REV. 101 (2011)..... | 18 |

INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE¹

Amici National Hispanic Christian Leadership Conference and the Douglass Leadership Institute are diverse, nonprofit faith organizations that represent or minister to Hispanic and African American communities. They speak on behalf of more than 70,000 Hispanic and African American churches and tens of millions of African Americans and Hispanics across the United States. Amici have a strong interest in exposing the racist and eugenic history of the abortion movement, which has had catastrophic consequences on minority communities.

The Supreme Court has previously recognized Amici's perspective on the racist roots of the modern abortion movement. *See Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Org.*, 597 U.S. 215, 255 n.41 (2022) (citing Brief for African American Organization et al. as *Amici Curiae*). In furtherance of their commitment to exposing the dark history of abortion in America, and to protect vulnerable communities from genocidal social policies, Amici have a strong interest in challenging the FDA's chemical abortion

¹ Pursuant to FRAP 29(a)(2), counsel for Amici certify that all parties have consented to the filing of this brief. Counsel further certify that no party authored this brief in whole or in part, and no such counsel or party contributed money to prepare or submit this brief.

regimen and approval of mifepristone. In light of Amici’s background and experience in this sensitive area, their perspective is unlikely to be represented by the litigants or other parties.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

This Court should reverse the portions of the district court’s order denying Louisiana’s request for a § 705 stay of the 2023 REMS, which would reinstate prior protections against mifepristone’s serious side effects, including the in-person dispensing requirement that the FDA removed when it authorized the drug to be dispensed by mail. As this Court has previously observed, by relaxing mifepristone’s safety restrictions, the FDA “failed to address several important concerns about whether the drug would be safe for the women who use it.” *All. for Hippocratic Med. v. U.S. Food & Drug Admin.*, 78 F.4th 210, 256 (5th Cir. 2023), *rev’d and remanded sub nom. Food & Drug Admin. v. All. for Hippocratic Med.*, 602 U.S. 367 (2024).

This case is not merely about standing. Nor is it just about whether the FDA’s actions violated federal law. This case also raises the question of *why* a dangerous abortifacient is owned by the Population Council, an organization founded by eugenicists with a nefarious history of

promoting population control. As we discuss below, the answer is clear: The Population Council’s advocacy for the easy availability of mifepristone—despite the drug’s serious health risks—derives from the same eugenic ideology that motivated the Council’s founding. Put simply, mifepristone has become “a tool of modern-day eugenics.” *Box v. Planned Parenthood of Indiana & Kentucky, Inc.*, 139 S. Ct. 1780, 1783 (2019) (Thomas, J., concurring).

The public interest favors a stay. Authorizing the unstudied, unsupervised distribution of an abortifacient that disproportionately eliminates minority and disabled preborn children, and whose patent-holder was founded to suppress “undesirable” populations, does not advance the public interest—it delivers a eugenicist agenda through the postman.

The Court should reverse the district court’s denial of preliminary relief and grant a § 705 stay of the 2023 REMS.

ARGUMENT

I. The Population Council, the patent holder for mifepristone, has longstanding ties to eugenics.

Imagine, if you will, an organization that was founded by an elite cabal of eugenicists to reduce the global population. As part of its plot, this organization acquired the patent for a cheap and effective drug that can easily abort millions of unborn lives. Years later, “medication abortions” account for the majority of all abortions in the United States. Such a story seems lifted straight out of a pulp apocalyptic thriller, but sadly it is true: The holder of the patent to mifepristone, the Population Council, has deep ties to the eugenics movement.

An overview of the Population Council’s history sheds light on how the eugenic crusade to eradicate undesirable populations through abortion and birth control continues through this century—under the guise of “reproductive health” and “family planning.” *Cf.* Mary Ziegler, *Reinventing Eugenics: Reproductive Choice and Law Reform After World War II*, 14 *CARDOZO J.L. & GENDER* 319, 331 (2008) (noting how the Population Council’s “evolution offers a powerful example of how pro-eugenic groups redefined themselves and their programs in order to ensure their political survival”).

A. The Population Council’s goal is to halt the growth of humanity.

The Population Council “was formed partly by leaders of the eugenic legal reform movement who intended to create a new kind of organization in response to post-war politics: an organization that would prevent overall population growth and preserve the ‘quality’ of the population.” Ziegler, 14 *CARDOZO J.L. & GENDER* at 331 (quoting John D. Rockefeller III, *On the Origins of the Population Council*, 3 *POP. & DEV. REV.* 493, 493 (1977)).

The Council’s inception can be traced back to “a conference on population problems” convened in June 1952 by John D. Rockefeller III. Rockefeller, 3 *POP. & DEV. REV.* at 494–96. Over the course of three days in Williamsburg, Virginia, thirty individuals—including the director of Planned Parenthood Federation of America and various figures associated with eugenics—discussed the need to reduce the global population. See Matthew Connelly, *Fatal Misconception: The Struggle to Control World Population* 156 (2008). The conference participants universally expressed concern about “the prospect of rapid population growth” and the need for “optimum population.” Rockefeller, 3 *POP. & DEV. REV.* at 494, 496. Some speakers advocated as “necessary” the

reduction of the “rate of population growth.” *Id.* at 494. Others noted with approval the “rapid drop in fertility resulting from the urbanization of the American negro population.” *Id.* at 495. Also discussed was the “problem of ‘quality’”: that “[m]odern civilization had reduced the operation of natural selection by saving more ‘weak’ lives and enabling them to reproduce.” *Id.* at 496.

The consensus from the conference was that priority should be given “to the reduction of fertility.” Rockefeller, 3 POP. & DEV. REV. at 496. “Many types of action were suggested which might aid in the reduction of fertility,” Rockefeller noted, including “birth control” and “*more convenient methods.*” *Id.*(emphasis added). To further the aims of the conference, Rockefeller officially established the Population Council by providing a personal grant of \$100,000—nearly \$1.2 million in today’s dollars—and assuming the role of its inaugural president. *See Connelly, Fatal Misconception* at 155–159.

B. The Population Council’s eugenic roots.

A “significant number” of the Population Council’s founding members “maintained their ties with the eugenic movement.” Ziegler, 14 CARDOZO J.L. & GENDER at 331. “Not surprisingly, these members

continued to endorse eugenic goals, but they now characterized those goals as matters of population control.” *Id.* For example, Rockefeller’s successor as president of the Population Council, Frederick Osborn, was secretary of the American Eugenics Society and signatory to Margaret Sanger’s “Citizens Committee for Planned Parenthood.” Carole Novielli, *The Population Council, Which Brought the Abortion Pill to the U.S., Has a Shocking History That’s Nothing to Celebrate*, LiveAction (Nov. 14, 2017).² Under Osborn’s leadership, the Population Council made regular grants to the American Eugenics Society. See Connelly, *Fatal Misconception* at 160. And like many eugenicists of his era, “Osborn did not hesitate to endorse compulsory eugenic sterilization of the mentally ill or restrictions on immigration, and to voice caution against miscegenation.” Paul A. Lombardo, “*The American Breed*”: *Nazi Eugenics and the Origins of the Pioneer Fund*, 65 ALB. L. REV. 743, 801 (2002).

Following Osborn’s presidency at the Population Council was another leader from the American Eugenics Society, Frank Notestein.

² Available at <https://www.liveaction.org/news/population-council-founded-eugenicists-promoting-abortion-turns-65/> (last visited June 19, 2026).

Along with Osborn, Notestein was a pioneer in the study of “differential fertility,” the belief that unfit, poor, and unintelligent people were more fertile than fit people. See, e.g., Frederick Osborn, *Characteristics and Differential Fertility of American Population Groups*, 12 SOC. FORCES 1, 4 (1933).

In the late 1950s, Notestein, Osborn, and other Council members revived the theory of differential fertility to promote the Council’s eugenic goals. They argued that if everyone agreed on the need for population control, then the focus should be on limiting the growth of highly fertile individuals—that is, the unfit or undesirable. According to Osborn, these people were “the socially inadequate—those families who are perennially on relief rolls, the constant problem of the social worker.” Frederick Osborn, *Qualitative Aspects of Population Control: Eugenics and Euthenics*, 25 L. & CONTEMP. PROBS. 406, 423 (1960).

In other words, the Population Council’s resident eugenicists believed that “if an overall reduction in world and domestic population growth inevitably improved the quality of population, those interested in eugenics could achieve the same goals by studying and campaigning for

less controversial population control reforms.” Ziegler, 14 CARDOZO J.L. & GENDER at 335.

Unsurprisingly, as the Population Council sought to reduce reproduction rates among “high fertility groups,” its “research interests and policy proposals displayed a more overt racial bias.” Ziegler, 14 CARDOZO J.L. & GENDER at 335. For instance, during the early 1960s, the Council began supporting research aimed at lowering growth rates in both urban and rural African American communities. See *id.* As Professor Ziegler observed, the shift in research focus reflected two emerging perspectives within the Council: “First, the new research suggested that it would be desirable to reduce the size of the African-American population.” *Id.* “Second, the research focus demonstrated that a growing number of Council members believed that the ‘socially inadequate’ were rarely white.” *Id.*

The Population Council’s eugenic aim to reduce the population of minorities is further evident in the Council’s close sponsorship of the work of Donald Bogue, a demographer and member of the University of Chicago’s Population Research and Training Center. See Research Proposal, “Problems of Bearing and Rearing Children in High-Fertility,

Low-Income, Low Education American Families,” (1960) (Research Proposal) in The Rockefeller Archive, Rockefeller University, Population Council Papers, Box 46, Folder 653. Bogue argued that minorities “continued to make wrong choices with respect to family planning because they were incompetent, unmotivated, or influenced by their own or their family’s culture.” Ziegler, 14 *CARDOZO J.L. & GENDER* at 336–37. That being so, Bogue called for “a program that used all measures short of force in order to assure that members of high fertility groups made the right choices.” *Id.*

After 1960, Bogue received most of his funding from the Population Council, *see* Research Proposal, and by the mid-1960s, the Council’s Executive Board followed his recommendations in prioritizing funding contraceptive programs in minority communities, *see* Minutes of a Meeting of the Rockefeller Council Executive Board (May 9, 1966) in The Rockefeller Archive, Rockefeller University, Population Council Papers, Box 56, Folder 903.

In 1969, Bernard Berelson, the Population Council’s fourth president, wrote an article called “Beyond Family Planning” in the Council’s *Studies in Family Planning* journal. Berelson sought to review

various proposals that address the “problem” of population growth, and he discussed “programs or policies more or less responsibly suggested,” such as adding “fertility control agents” to urban water supplies, temporary sterilization of young women using “time-capsule contraceptives,” and mandatory sterilization for men with three or more children. Bernard Berelson, *Beyond Family Planning*, 38 *STUD. FAM. PLAN.* 1–3 (Feb. 1969). Chillingly, Berelson observed that it is “worth noting” that “more extreme or controversial proposals tend to legitimate more moderate advances, by *shifting the boundaries of discourse.*” *Id.* at 12 (emphasis added). As we have seen since its founding, the Population Council has “shift[ed] the boundaries of discourse,” *id.*, from the openly eugenic aims of its founding members such as Frederick Osborn and Frank Notestein to other guises, such as “population control” and “reproductive choice.”

C. The Population Council’s acquisition of mifepristone.

After decades of funding population control studies and programs, the Population Council finally found a most effective avenue to achieve its eugenic aims: RU-486, commonly known as mifepristone.

Mifepristone is a synthetic steroid that blocks the hormone progesterone. It works by binding to progesterone receptors in the uterine lining and preventing progesterone from maintaining the pregnancy. Without progesterone's support, the uterine lining breaks down (a process called necrosis), which causes the embryo to be expelled. *See generally* Denise DiPierri, *RU 486, Mifepristone: A Review of a Controversial Drug*, 19 NURSE PRACTITIONER, no. 6, at 59 (1994).

The abortifacient was developed by the French company Roussel-Uclaf, which sought to sell the rights to an American firm. Fearing a political backlash and because of safety concerns, however, no American company was willing to buy the pill. So in May 1994, Roussel-Uclaf donated the patent rights to RU-486 to the Population Council. *See* Nancy Gibbs, *The Pill Arrives*, CNN (Oct. 2, 2000).³ Seeing that a cheap and widespread abortifacient drug would further its mission, the Population Council conducted clinical trials, secured FDA approval in 2000, and identified a manufacturer. *See id.*

³ Available at <https://www.cnn.com/ALLPOLITICS/time/2000/10/09/pill.html> (last visited June 19, 2026).

During the FDA approval process, the Population Council transferred the rights to produce and distribute RU-486 to Intervenor Danco Laboratories, a “secretive and obscure” entity formed in 1995 in the Cayman Islands, in return for undisclosed royalties. Robert O’Harrow Jr., *Drug’s U.S. Marketer Remains Elusive*, Wash. Post (Oct. 11, 2000).⁴ Danco then contracted with the Chinese firm Hua Lian Pharmaceutical Co. to manufacture the compounds for RU-486. This arrangement was reportedly facilitated by the Rockefeller Foundation. *Abortion Pill Maker Revealed*, CBS News (Oct. 13, 2000).⁵

In the final analysis, the Population Council has a long history of providing funding, research, and advocacy to legitimize and expand access to abortion as a means to reduce minority birth rates and preserve the “quality” of the population. Rockefeller, *supra*, 3 POP. & DEV. REV. at 493. Allowing the unlawful distribution of mifepristone by mail would

⁴ Available at <https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/2000/10/12/drugs-us-marketer-remains-elusive/8b7b732b-0f23-4c96-9051-714cd3d9f6f8/> (last visited June 19, 2026).

⁵ Available at <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/abortion-pill-maker-revealed/> (last visited June 19, 2026).

enable the Population Council's ongoing experiments on reducing birth rates and eliminating "undesirable" persons.

II. The Abortion and Birth Control Movements are rooted in Social Darwinism and the elimination of "undesirable" people.

To understand how mifepristone has been deployed as a eugenic drug, it is necessary to recount the history of the American abortion and birth control movements as a front for the eugenics agenda. When the veil is drawn aside, the framing of abortion as a fundamental reproductive right is exposed as a guise for the eugenics movement's ultimate goal of removing "undesirable" people. Indeed, presenting abortion as a matter of "my body, my choice" simply conceals the underlying motive of widespread abortion: shaping the composition of society through the selective elimination of "undesirable" preborn persons.

As seen by the Population Council's history and research interests, by emphasizing "reproductive freedom," the eugenics agenda is advanced under the guise of promoting women's autonomy without overtly acknowledging the abortion movement's historical connection to population control. Granted, not all abortion advocates share these

motives, but the history of the abortion and birth control movements raises legitimate concerns about their undeniable links to the eugenics movement.

A. The Abortion Movement was developed alongside the Eugenics Movement.

Modern abortion advocacy arose out of the birth control movement, which was “developed alongside the American eugenics movement.” *Box*, 139 S. Ct. at 1783 (Thomas, J., concurring). Coined in the 1880s by Francis Galton, a British scientist and cousin of Charles Darwin, “eugenics” is “the science of improving stock through all influences that tend in however remote a degree to give to the more suitable races or strains of blood a better chance of prevailing speedily over the less suitable than they otherwise would have.” *Id.* at 1784. Put simply, the goal of the eugenics movement was to eliminate “unfit” and “undesirable” people—those with mental and physical disabilities as well as certain races.

By the 1920s, the eugenics movement was *en vogue* among progressives, academics, and the medical community. See Adam Cohen, *Imbeciles: The Supreme Court, American Eugenics, and the Sterilization of Carrie Buck* 2 (2016). “Many leading figures of the day—Theodore

Roosevelt, John D. Rockefeller, Mrs. Mary Harriman, David Starr Jordan (a biologist and the first president of Stanford University), to name some—were fervent eugenicists, putting their money, their power, their time, and their research behind the effort.” Jeffrey Sutton, *51 Imperfect Solutions: States and the Making of American Constitutional Law* 87 (2018).

Margaret Sanger, Planned Parenthood’s founder, was one of the most outspoken members of the American eugenics movement. Sanger argued that eugenics was “the most adequate and thorough avenue to the solution of racial, political and social problems.” Margaret Sanger, *The Eugenic Value of Birth Control Propaganda*, BIRTH CONTROL REV., Oct. 1921, at 5. She accordingly praised sterilization as the “remedy” to the problem of “an increasing rate of morons.” Margaret Sanger, *The Function of Sterilization*, BIRTH CONTROL REV., Oct. 1926, at 299.

In the first two decades of the twentieth century, the eugenic movement altered the legal landscape. Between 1907 and 1922, a dozen states passed eugenic sterilization laws. See Paul Lombardo, *Disability, Eugenics, and the Culture Wars*, 2 ST. LOUIS U. J. HEALTH L. & POL’Y 57, 61 n.33 (2008) (listing 12 states that enacted involuntary sterilization

statutes). And one court upheld eugenic sterilization as a valid exercise of the state's police power "based on the growing belief that, due to the alarming increase in the number of degenerates, criminals, feebleminded, and insane, our race is facing the greatest peril of all time." *Smith v. Wayne*, 231 Mich. 409, 425 (1925).

In *Buck v. Bell*, 274 U.S. 200 (1927), the Supreme Court "threw its prestige behind the eugenics movement." *Box*, 139 S. Ct. at 1786 (Thomas, J., concurring). There the Court approved the compulsory sterilization of an allegedly "feeble minded" woman who had been falsely adjudged "the probable potential parent of socially inadequate offspring." 274 U.S. at 205, 207. In a short opinion, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., joined by seven other Justices, "offered a full-throated defense of forced sterilization," *Box*, 139 S. Ct. at 1786 (Thomas, J., concurring), as a means to "prevent" society from being "swamped with incompetence," *Buck*, 274 U.S. at 207. According to the Supreme Court:

It is better for all the world, if instead of waiting to execute degenerate offspring for crime, or to let them starve for their imbecility, society can prevent those who are manifestly unfit from continuing their kind. The principle that sustains compulsory vaccination is broad enough to cover cutting the Fallopian tubes. *Three generations of imbeciles are enough.*

Id. (citation omitted) (emphasis added).

The *Buck* decision had a profound impact on the eugenics movement. See Sutton, *51 Imperfect Solutions*, at 117 (“As an advertisement for eugenics, *Buck v. Bell* worked.”). Within five years, 28 states had adopted compulsory sterilization laws; and between 1907 and 1983, more than 60,000 people were involuntarily sterilized. See Cohen, *supra*, at 299–300, 319; see generally Peter Quinn, *Race Cleansing In America*, 54 AM. HERITAGE 2–3 (2003).

Never overruled, the *Buck* decision is also a dark stain on the Supreme Court, which has resulted in the forced sterilization of helpless human beings made in the image and likeness of God. See Cohen, at 13 (observing that *Buck* “delivered a clarion call to Americans to identify those among them who should not be allowed to reproduce—and to sterilize them in large numbers”).⁶

⁶ Cf. Paul Lombardo, *Three Generations, No Imbeciles: Eugenics, The Supreme Court, and Buck v. Bell* xiii (2008) (“The *Buck* case represents one of the low points in Supreme Court history—on a par with *Plessy v. Ferguson*, which announced the now-discredited legal doctrine of ‘separate but equal,’ and the *Korematsu* case, which permitted the internment of Japanese citizens during World War II.”); Victoria Nourse, *Buck v. Bell: A Constitutional Tragedy from a Lost World*, 39 PEPP. L. REV. 101, 101 (2011) (“A mere five paragraphs long, *Buck v. Bell* could represent the highest ratio of injustice per word ever signed on to by eight Supreme Court Justices, progressive and conservative alike.”).

B. The Eugenic Era lives on through the Abortion Movement.

The Eugenics Movement fell out of fashion after World War II with the fall of Nazi Germany, *see* Sutton, at 87, but “[t]ragically, ... the practice continues today with modern-day abortions,” *Preterm-Cleveland v. McCloud*, 994 F.3d 512, 540 (6th Cir. 2021) (Griffin, J., concurring). Indeed, “[f]rom the beginning, birth control and abortion were promoted as means of effectuating eugenics.” *Box*, 139 S. Ct. at 1787 (Thomas, J., concurring); *id.* at 1789 (“Support for abortion can ... be found throughout the literature on eugenics.”).

For example, Margaret Sanger argued that birth control “is really the greatest and most truly eugenic method” of “human generation,” and “its adoption as part of the program of Eugenics would immediately give a concrete and realistic power to that science.” Margaret Sanger, *Pivot of Civilization* 189 (1922). Sanger further argued that “eugenists and others who are laboring for racial betterment” could not “succeed” unless they “first clear[ed] the way for Birth Control.” Margaret Sanger, *Birth Control and Racial Betterment*, BIRTH CONTROL REV., Feb. 1919, at 11.

Many eugenicists supported legalizing abortion, and abortion advocates—including future Planned Parenthood President Alan

Guttmacher—endorsed abortion for eugenic reasons. And as the late Justice Ginsburg once observed: “[A]t the time *Roe* was decided, there was concern about population growth and particularly growth in populations that we don’t want to have too many of. So that *Roe* was going to be then set up for Medicaid funding of abortion.” Emily Bazelon, *The Place of Women on the Court*, N.Y. Times Magazine (July 7, 2009).⁷

C. The Eugenics Movement’s racist roots.

Many eugenicists drew “the distinction between the fit and the unfit ... along racial lines.” *Box*, 139 S. Ct. at 1785 (Thomas, J., concurring) (citing examples). See Lombardo, *supra*, 2 ST. LOUIS U. J. HEALTH L. & POL’Y at 76 (noting that Margaret Sanger was open about “voicing her contempt for the poor, disabled and minorities”). The Immigration Act of 1924 “represented a eugenic (and racist and nativist) attempt to protect the integrity of Anglo-American stock.” Corinna Lain, *Three Supreme Court “Failures” and a Story of Supreme Court Success*, 69 VANDERBILT L. REV. 1040 (2019); see also Cohen, *supra*, at 132–35 (discussing role of eugenicists in passing the act). And a disproportionate

⁷ Available at <https://www.nytimes.com/2009/07/12/magazine/12ginsburg-t.html> (last visited June 19, 2026).

number of the sterilized individuals, particularly in the South, were minorities.

For example, in 1955, South Carolina reported that all 23 persons sterilized at the State Hospital over the previous year were Black women. See Dorothy Roberts, *Killing The Black Body: Race, Reproduction, and The Meaning Of Liberty* 90 (1997). In the 1930s and 1940s, the North Carolina Eugenics Commission sterilized nearly 8,000 “mentally deficient persons,” some 5,000 of whom were Black. *Id.* (footnote omitted); see also Maya Manian, *Coerced Sterilization of Mexican-American Women: The Story of Madrigal v. Quilligan*, in REPROD. RIGHTS & JUSTICE STORIES 97, 99 (Melissa Murray et al. eds., 2019) (describing the forced sterilization of Mexican-American women in California into the 1970s).

The links between abortion and racist eugenics are manifold. To begin with, Margaret Sanger focused her eugenic goal to eliminate “the unfit” on minorities. In promoting birth control, Sanger advanced a “Negro Project,” Margaret Sanger Papers Project, Newsletter #28, *Birth Control or Race Control? Sanger and the Negro Project* (2001) (Sanger

Newsletter).⁸ She gave a speech to the Ku Klux Klan. See Margaret Sanger, *An Autobiography* 366 (1938). And she advocated eugenic breeding for “the gradual suppression, elimination and eventual extinction, of defective stocks—those human weeds which threaten the blooming of the finest flowers of American civilization.” Opinion, Margaret Sanger, *Apostle of Birth Control Sees Cause Gaining Here*, N.Y. Times, Apr. 8, 1923, at 11.

Moreover, Sanger personally set up birth-control clinics in minority communities, including a clinic in Harlem in 1930. See Sanger Newsletter; see also Mary Ziegler, *Roe’s Race: The Supreme Court, Population Control, and Reproductive Justice*, 25 YALE J.L. & FEMINISM 1, 13 (2013) (noting that in its early advocacy for birth control, Planned Parenthood “focused on unwanted children and pathological parenting in poor African American communities”). In a personal letter in 1939, Sanger explained her plan to stop Black population growth:

The most successful educational approach to the Negro is through a religious appeal. We do not want word to go out that we want to exterminate the Negro population, and the

⁸ Available at http://www.nyu.edu/projects/sanger/articles/bc_or_race_control (last visited June 19, 2026).

minister is the man who can straighten out that idea if it occurs to any of their more rebellious members.

Sanger Newsletter (citation omitted).

Minority groups have complained for decades that Planned Parenthood targets their communities. For example, a minority field agent complained to former Planned Parenthood president Alan Guttmacher: “Birth control is just a plot just as segregation was a plot to keep blacks down. It is a plot rather than a solution. Instead of working for us and giving us our rights—you reduce us in numbers and do not have to give us anything.” Donald Critchlow, *Intended Consequences: Birth Control, Abortion, and the Federal Government in Modern America* 61 (1999) (quoting a 1966 communication between a Planned Parenthood field consultant to Alan Guttmacher).⁹ African American leaders such as Julius Lester, Dick Gregory, Daniel H. Watts, and H. Rap Brown described abortion as “black genocide” and called on Blacks to eschew

⁹ See also *Box*, 139 S. Ct. at 1790 (Thomas, J., concurring) (noting that some Black groups considered “‘family planning’ as a euphemism for race genocide and believed that black people [were] taking the brunt of the ‘planning’ under Planned Parenthood’s ‘ghetto approach’ to distributing its services” (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

these practices to avoid “race suicide.” Critchlow, *Intended Consequences*, at 142.¹⁰

Beyond anecdotes, the actual data confirms that abortion has devastated communities of color. According to one peer-reviewed study, “black women have been experiencing abortions at a rate nearly four times that of white women for more than 30 years.” James Studnicki et al., *Perceiving and Addressing the Pervasive Racial Disparity in Abortion*, *Health Servs. Research & Managerial Epidemiology* (2020).¹¹ Dr. James Sherley, one of the study’s authors, commented: “Abortion is the hushed killer of Black life that has silenced millions of George Floyds before they even took their first breath of air. Yet, in this remarkable moment of social reform history, the lives of Black preborn children have been

¹⁰ Accord David Beito & Linda Royster Beito, *Black Maverick: T.R.M. Howard’s Fight For Civil Rights and Economic Power* 215 (2009) (noting that some African American civil rights leaders “fretted about the racist implications of abortion”).

¹¹ Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7436774/pdf/10.1177_233392820949743.pdf (last visited June 19, 2026).

forgotten.” Opinion, James Sherley, *Preborn Black Lives Matter, Too*, Wash. Times (Aug. 2, 2020).¹²

According to the Centers for Disease Control’s most recent data, African American women accounted for 39.5% of all reported abortions in 2022, even though they comprise 14% of women in the United States. Stephanie Ramer et al., Ctrs. for Disease Control & Prevention, *Abortion Surveillance—United States, 2022* (Nov. 28, 2024); U.S. Census Bureau, *Annual Estimates of the Resident Population by Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin* (2024). Black women also had the highest abortion rate (24.4 abortions per 1,000 women aged 15–44 years) and ratio (429 abortions per 1,000 live births).

Further, abortion-induced deaths of the unborn in the African American community are 69 times higher than HIV deaths, 31 times higher than (all other) homicides, 3.6 times higher than cancer-related deaths, and 3.5 times higher than deaths caused by heart disease. Ctrs.

¹² Available at <https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2020/aug/2/preborn-black-lives-matter-too/> (last visited June 19, 2026).

For Disease Control & Prevention, *Morbidity & Mortality Wkly. Rep., Abortion Surveillance—United States, 2018*, at 8.

In Mississippi, 2,286 abortions were reported in 2022, down 40% from 2021. Of those abortions, 77% were performed on Black women, 22% on white women, and 1% on women of an unknown race. *See* Mia Steupert & Tessa Cox, Charlotte Lozier Inst., *Abortion Reporting: Mississippi (2022)* (March 15, 2024).¹³ Indeed, the Charlotte Lozier Institute estimates that the African American abortion rate in Mississippi was 7.2 abortions per 1,000 women ages 15 to 44—five times the abortion rate of 1.6 per 1,000 for white women. *Id.*

The racial disparity in abortions is largely intentional: A study based on 2010 Census data shows that nearly eight out of ten Planned Parenthood abortion clinics are within walking distance of predominantly African American or Hispanic neighborhoods. Susan Enouen, Life Issues Inst., *New Research Shows Planned Parenthood Targets Minority Neighborhoods*, Life Issues Connector (Oct. 2012);¹⁴ *see*

¹³ Available at <https://lozierinstitute.org/abortion-reporting-mississippi-2018/> (last visited June 19, 2026).

¹⁴ Available at <http://www.protectingblacklife.org/pdf/PP-Targets-10-2012.pdf> (last visited June 19, 2026).

also Mark Crutcher et al., Life Dynamics, Inc., *Racial Targeting and Population Control* 22 (2011) (reporting that in every state, “population control centers” are in “zip codes with higher percentages of blacks and/or Hispanics than the state’s overall percentage”).¹⁵

More specifically, Planned Parenthood intentionally located 86% of its abortion facilities in or near minority neighborhoods in the 25 U.S. counties with the most abortions. See Susan Enouen, *Research Shows Planned Parenthood Expands Targeting Minorities as it Spurns Racist Founder*, Townhall (Sep. 23, 2020).¹⁶ These 25 counties contain 19 percent of the U.S. population, including 28% of the African American population and 37% of the Hispanic/Latino population. In 12 of these counties, Blacks and Hispanics/Latinos are more than 50% of the population. In comparison, African Americans are only 12.6% of the U.S. population, and Hispanics and Latinos are 16.3%. Planned Parenthood’s

¹⁵ Available at https://issues4life.org/pdfs/racial_targeting_population_control.pdf (last visited June 19, 2026).

¹⁶ Available at <https://townhall.com/columnists/susanwillkeenouen/2020/09/23/research-shows-planned-parenthood-expands-targeting-minorities-as-it-spurns-racist-founder-n2576680> (last visited June 19, 2026).

largest abortion facility in America is situated in the middle of a Black and Hispanic neighborhood within walking distance of a nearby school.

Given that Planned Parenthood has strategically located abortion clinics near minority neighborhoods, the abortion industry's attempt to deny its eugenic aims cannot withstand objective scrutiny. *See* Crutcher, *supra*, at 4 (noting that “these patterns are routinely considered indicative of racial targeting when it comes to other issues,” such as when civil rights advocates criticize tobacco and alcohol companies for concentrating their retail and marketing efforts disproportionately in minority neighborhoods).

In short, Margaret Sanger believed, as did her Eugenics Era colleagues, that the “unfit” and “feeble-minded” were a menace to society. And in all contexts, these terms were code words for the poor, blacks, and other minorities. Sanger clearly believed that these “undesirable” people should not reproduce and thus advocated for their sterilization. *See generally* Margaret Sanger, *My Way to Peace*, Address to the New History Society (Jan. 17, 1932). Moreover, Sanger's life purpose was to implement eugenic population control, and targeted birth control was her way to achieve it. And as discussed, pro-eugenic organizations like the

Population Council, the patent holder of mifepristone, continue Sanger's shameful legacy to this day.

D. Modern abortion policy promotes the eradication of preborn children with Down syndrome and other disabilities.

Millions across the globe celebrate World Down Syndrome Day, an annual observance on March 21 started by the United Nations in part to “ensur[e] and promot[e] the full realization of all human rights and fundamental freedoms for all persons with disabilities.” *See* G.A. RES. 66/149, ¶ 3 (Dec. 19, 2011). Yet in recent years, due to the “abortion-on-demand” movement and advances in prenatal screening technology, unborn children with Down syndrome and other genetic disabilities are increasingly being destroyed, usually through the use of mifepristone and chemical abortion. *See* Declaration of Jason Lindo ¶ 30 (Lindo Decl.), *Missouri v. U.S. Food & Drug Admin.*, No. 2:22-cv-00223-Z (N.D. Tex.), ECF No. 28-2.

Selective abortion is morally and ethically wrong. Aborting children based on prenatal diagnosis of Down syndrome is undeniably promoting eugenics. It also sends a message to society that individuals with Down syndrome are less valuable and less deserving of life than those without

the condition. This is a dangerous precedent to set, as it leads to a devaluation of human life and an erosion of the rights of individuals with disabilities.¹⁷ Accordingly, there is a strong public policy interest in reinstating the prior safety protections, thereby “preventing abortion from [further] becoming a tool of modern-day eugenics” against the disabled. *Box*, 139 S. Ct. at 1783 (Thomas, J., concurring).

As discussed above, abortion is a disturbingly effective strategy to carry out discriminatory eugenics. As Justice Thomas presciently observed, today’s “[t]echnological advances have only heightened the eugenic potential for abortion, as abortion can now be used to eliminate children with unwanted characteristics, such as a particular sex or disability.” *Box*, 139 S. Ct. at 1784 (Thomas, J., concurring) (citing examples).¹⁸

¹⁷ Sadly, the American Medical Association has endorsed disability selective abortion at least since 1967. *See* American Medical Association, House of Delegates Proceedings, Annual Convention 1967 40, 50 (adopting as policy “an occasional obstetric patient ... would warrant the instituion [sic] of therapeutic abortion ... to prevent the birth of a severely crippled, deformed or abnormal infant”).

¹⁸ Cell-free DNA testing enables genetic screening through a simple blood draw during the first trimester. The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists recommends offering cell-free testing for

Indeed, data from the United States and Europe show that over 92% of parents who learn through prenatal genetic testing that their child has Down syndrome opt to abort the baby. See Caroline Mansfield et al., *European Concerted Action, Termination Rates After Prenatal Diagnosis of Down Syndrome, Spina Bifida, Anencephaly, and Turner and Klinefelter Syndromes: A Systematic Literature Review*, 19 *PRENATAL DIAGNOSIS* 808, 810 (1999). Indeed, Iceland and Denmark have nearly eliminated all children with Down syndrome through selective abortion. Since prenatal screening was introduced in Iceland, “close to 100 percent” of preborn children diagnosed with Down syndrome are aborted. Julian Quinones & Arijeta Lajka, “*What Kind of Society Do You Want to Live in?*”: *Inside the Country Where Down Syndrome is Disappearing*, CBS News (Aug. 14, 2017).¹⁹ The one or two babies with Down syndrome who survive to birth do so because, as one Icelandic doctor disturbingly observed, “we didn’t find them in our screening.” Dave Maclean, *Iceland*

Down syndrome to all pregnant women “as early as possible in pregnancy, ideally at the first obstetric visit.” American College of Obstetricians & Gynecologists, *Practice Bulletin 162: Prenatal Diagnostic Testing for Genetic Disorders* (May 2016).

¹⁹ Available at <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/down-syndrome-iceland/> (last visited June 19, 2026).

Close to Becoming First Country Where No Down's Syndrome Children Are Born, Independent (Aug. 16, 2017).²⁰

Nor is the eugenic application of abortion in the United States merely hypothetical: An estimated 67% of babies with Down syndrome are aborted in our country. *See Box*, 139 S. Ct. at 1783, 1790 (Thomas, J., concurring). Other studies estimate that 80% of women who learn of a Down syndrome diagnosis before 24 weeks abort their baby. Susan Donaldson James, *Down Syndrome Births are Down in the U.S.*, ABC News (Oct. 30, 2009).²¹ Furthermore, a review of nine hospital-based studies shows that over 85% of babies are aborted following a prenatal diagnosis of Down syndrome. Jaime L. Natoli et al., *Prenatal Diagnosis of Down Syndrome: A Systematic Review of Termination Rates (1995-2011)*, 32:2 *PRENATAL DIAGNOSIS* 142, 147 (2012). This review also suggests that higher abortion rates following a Down syndrome diagnosis

²⁰ Available at <https://www.independent.co.uk/lifestyle/health-and-families/iceland-downs-syndrome-no-children-born-first-countryworld-screening-a7895996.html> (last visited June 19, 2026).

²¹ Available at https://abcnews.go.com/Health/w_ParentingResource/down-syndrome-births-dropus-women-abort/story?id=8960803 (last visited June 19, 2026).

“were consistently associated with earlier gestational age,” with one study reporting that 93% of women at 16 weeks or less into their pregnancy aborted their babies compared to 85% at 17 weeks or greater. *See id.* at 149.

Even more alarming, an anonymous survey of nearly 500 physicians who had delivered prenatal diagnoses revealed that 13% of the providers emphasized the negative aspects of Down syndrome so that patients would favor terminating the pregnancy, and 10% actively “urge” parents to terminate the pregnancy. Brian G. Skotko, *Prenatally Diagnosed Down Syndrome: Mothers Who Continued Their Pregnancies Evaluate Their Health Care Providers*, 192 AM. J. OF OBSTETRICS & GYNECOLOGY 670, 670–71 (Nov. 2004).

In short, the eugenic use of abortion in America is not an overblown conspiracy theory promoted by pro-life activists—it is actually happening. Reinstating mifepristone’s safety protections thus “prevent[s] abortion from becoming a tool of modern-day eugenics.” *Box*, 139 S. Ct. at 1783 (Thomas, J., concurring). And it would align with federal policy protecting people with disabilities. *See generally* Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, Pub. L. No. 101-336, 104 Stat. 327; Individuals

with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004, Pub. L. No. 108-446, 118 Stat. 2647.

III. The federal government’s own “expert” in this case chillingly echoes the eugenicist aims of abortion.

Amici do not base their concerns on mere hypotheticals or conspiratorial theories. In fact, the Court need not look further than this litigation, to a declaration submitted by the FDA from Dr. Jason Lindo, an economics professor at Texas A&M University whose research interests include the economic effects of abortion policies. *See Lindo Decl.*, at 2.

In his declaration, Dr. Lindo makes speculative claims about the outcomes of not having chemical abortions, particularly focusing on the expected challenges for children born to those unable to obtain abortions. He direly declares, under oath, that children who are not aborted may face difficulties in school, have “more behavioral and social issues,” lower education levels, poorer health, and “an increased likelihood of criminal involvement.” *Lindo Decl.* ¶ 20. Dr. Lindo strongly suggests that, based on these expectations, abortion is preferable to allowing the child to live. Put simply, the FDA—a *federal agency*—submitted a supporting

declaration that claims that children should be aborted because they are more likely to be *unfit* for school, for adulthood, and for society.

As discussed above, Dr. Lindo's perspective is not new: It is rooted in the eugenics movement and consistent with contemporary scholarship. See, e.g., John J. Donohue & Steven D. Levitt, *The Impact of Legalized Abortion On Crime*, 116 Q. J. OF ECON. 379 (2001) (arguing that "legalized abortion has contributed significantly to recent crime reductions"); John J. Donohue & Steven D. Levitt, *The Impact of Legalized Abortion on Crime Over the Last Two Decades* (Nat'l Bureau of Econ. Rsch., Working Paper No. 25863, 2019) (estimating that "crime fell roughly 20% between 1997 and 2014 due to legalized abortion" and that the "cumulative impact of legalized abortion on crime is roughly 45%").

Again, it is hard not to observe the racist undertones of such theories, given that the abortion rate is higher among black and Hispanic women. In any event, potential difficulties in a child's future should not justify aborting that child. Yet Dr. Lindo's declaration reflects that prevailing sentiment among so-called experts that mifepristone may be used as "a disturbingly effective tool for implementing the discriminatory

preferences that undergird eugenics.” *Box, supra*, 139 S. Ct. at 1790 (Thomas, J., concurring) (citing examples).

CONCLUSION

The public interest is not served by a regulation that turns the mail into an instrument of a eugenicist agenda. The Court therefore should reverse the district court’s denial of preliminary relief and grant a § 705 stay of the 2023 REMS.

Dated: June 22, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Mathew D. Staver

MATHEW D. STAVER

Counsel of Record

HORATIO G. MIHET

DANIEL J. PIEDRA

LIBERTY COUNSEL

P.O. Box 540774

Orlando, FL 32854

(407) 875-1776

court@lc.org

Counsel for Amici

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on June 22, 2026, I filed the foregoing brief with the Court's CM/ECF system, which will automatically send an electronic notice of filing to all counsel of record.

/s/ Mathew D. Staver

Mathew D. Staver

Counsel for Amici

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

Pursuant to Fifth Circuit Rule 32.3, the undersigned certifies that this motion complies with:

(1) the type-volume limitations of Federal Rule of Appellate Procedures 29(a)(5) because it contains 6,493 words; and

(2) the typeface requirements of Rule 32(a)(5) and the type-style requirements of Rule 32(a)(6) because it has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface (14-point Century Schoolbook) using Microsoft Word (the same program used to calculate the word count).

/s/ Mathew D. Staver

Mathew D. Staver

Counsel for Amici