

Mic Drop Question For Musk After He Funded Ads Comparing Trump And RBG On Abortion

Clara Spera, Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg's granddaughter, has a pointed question for Elon Musk, who was revealed as the sole funder of a PAC devoted to spreading misleading ads muddying Trump's abortion stance.



By Alan Herrera

Clara Spera, the granddaughter of the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, has a pointed question for Elon Musk, who was revealed as the sole funder of a PAC devoted to spreading misleading ads muddying President-elect Donald Trump's abortion stance.

Musk allocated \$20.5 million to fund a campaign of digital ads, mailers, and text messages, falsely claiming that Ginsburg would have supported Trump's stance on abortion.

People's Response To Merriam-Webster's 2024 Word Of The Year Just Proved Their Point

Nancy Mace Rages After Nobody Will Print Her Transphobic Holiday Wrapping Paper Design



@thejenniwren.teamlh.social/Bluesky

Trump, who appointed three conservative Supreme Court justices instrumental in the 2022 decision to overturn *Roe v. Wade*, often touted his role in reshaping the Court and misleadingly claimed that returning abortion decisions to state legislatures was a widely popular move. However, Ginsburg, a champion of reproductive rights, would never have endorsed such views.

Despite this, RBG PAC launched with Musk's financial backing, carefully timing its spending so his status as the sole donor wouldn't be revealed until 30 days after the election, in Thursday's federal campaign finance report deadline.

In an interview with USA Today's Chris Brennan, Spera—a Harvard Law School lecturer who also helps lead the Abortion Access Legal Defense Fund—shared her and her mother's reaction to Musk's covert funding of the deceptive ads: "Oh, that makes sense." They also questioned whether earlier disclosure of Musk's involvement might have changed the campaign's impact.

Then, she posed a striking question to Musk:

"If you believe so strongly in Donald Trump, why do you have to mislead and lie to people to get them to vote for him?"

RBG PAC's campaign was designed to muddy the waters and distort the truth. It exploited Justice Ginsburg's well-known critique that Roe v. Wade might have been more firmly grounded in the Constitution's 14th Amendment Equal Protection Clause rather than its implied right to privacy.

However, this did not alter Ginsburg's unwavering and outspoken support for abortion access as a constitutionally protected right. Spera remarked that Musk's effort to mislead people about her grandmother's stance on abortion highlighted how seriously he and the Trump campaign viewed the issue—and how far they were willing to go to manipulate public perception.

Spera added of Musk:

"He's not particularly outspoken about abortion or reproductive rights, generally. So it's interesting that this was where he chose to put so much money, demonstrating that he recognized how important reproductive rights were to this election."

Musk is facing significant criticism.

Musk is already in legal trouble for his actions during Trump's campaign.

Three proposed class-action lawsuits have been filed against him alleging that his political action committee, America PAC, engaged in fraudulent practices. The lawsuits claim the PAC misled voters by promising a random \$1 million cash prize, even though the winners were allegedly predetermined.

Musk established America PAC in October to back Trump's successful presidential campaign. The PAC reportedly targeted Trump supporters in battleground states, encouraging them to share personal information and sign an online petition advocating for "free speech and the right to bear arms" in exchange for a chance to win the prize.

Between October 19 and Election Day on November 5, Musk's America PAC distributed over \$16 million to more than a dozen recipients. However, what appeared to be a chance-based giveaway drew legal scrutiny. Philadelphia District Attorney Larry Krasner filed a complaint, accusing Musk of running an illegal lottery scheme.

Musk's attorneys previously successfully argued in court that the payouts were not part of a lottery, as winners were not chosen at random but based on their "suitability" to serve as PAC spokespeople. They contended the \$1 million payments were compensation, not prizes, allowing the distributions to continue. In reality, there were no random winners among the recipients.