

As a woman, the anti-choice movement is asserting their offensive belief that I have fewer rights than a corpse. You see, even a corpse has the right to decide what happens to it. If I am dying and learn of another human who will surely die without MY kidney – a kidney that I will certainly not need when I am dead – surgeons cannot take my kidney after I have died, even though I am certainly not using it and the kidney is necessary for the other person to live. I STILL HAVE A RIGHT TO DECIDE HOW MY BODY IS USED.

But anti-choice proponents will have you believe that, once my uterus houses a cluster of particular cells, I no longer have the rights granted to a corpse. They contend that the government should require me to house those cells in my uterus in order to save the (eventual) life of the cells therein. But why? Why is that cluster of cells more important in the eyes of the law than that human that needs my kidney? Proponents might try to make the argument that the difference is one of morality – it was MY CHOICE to engage in activities that would lead to pregnancy (even though that is not necessarily true, either). But is it? Perhaps the person who needs my kidney spent years as an alcoholic, abusing his own kidney. Or maybe they are in renal failure through no fault of their own. Do either of those scenarios impact my own right to bodily autonomy? Absolutely not! Morality is NOT a consideration!

No one in their right minds considers a cluster of cells a human, not even people who claim they do! Ask any woman who has experienced a miscarriage. The government has NO RIGHT to decide what happens with and within my own body! When you begin to legislate otherwise, you are opening a door I am not sure anyone is prepared for!

HCR 5019 cannot be allowed to pass in a country that values autonomy and personal liberties! I strongly urge your opposition.

Sincerely,

Erin K Fraise

15419 S Summertree Ln

Olathe, KS 66062