

On the anniversary of Roe v. Wade, a constitutional question emerges: Are women still 'people'?

The printable version is no longer supported and may have rendering errors. Please update your browser bookmarks and please use the default browser print function instead.

This is an opinion item.

Author(s) Katie Watson
Source Chicago Tribune
Date January 21, 2022
URL <https://www.chicagotribune.com/opinion/commentary/ct-opinion-roe-v-wade-dobbs-jackson-abortion-rights-20220121-edqzvpsp7rhttnsszmvzowx4w4-story.html>

Quote “ In its analysis of original intent, the Roe court concluded that the use of the word “person” in the Constitution applies only after birth, in part because none of its 16 uses “has any possible prenatal application.” If the Dobbs court rules that it is not unconstitutional for legislatures to “pick” fetuses over women before fetuses can live independently (“viability”), it will be ruling that “No, women are not full people under the Constitution.” ”

Add or change this opinion item's references

This item argues against the position Supreme Court was correct in its ruling on the topic Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization.

Retrieved from
"https://discoursedb.org/w/index.php?title=On_the_anniversary_of_Roe_v._Wade,_a_constitutional_question_emerges:_Are_women_still_'people'%3F&oldid=33616"

This page was last edited on July 20, 2022, at 15:47.

All text is available under the terms of the GNU Free Documentation License.