

Valerie Elverton Dixon

February 17, 2012

State Rape

Let us be clear about this.

The bill that passed the Virginia House requiring women who want an abortion to have an invasive procedure called transvaginal ultra sound whether or not her doctor recommends it and whether or not she wants it is rape.

http://hosted2.ap.org/PAWIC/APUSnews/Article_2012-02-14-US-Virginia-Abortions/id-e464a595c8f64182a615cc46b58ddeb

<http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/26315908/#46391123>

Rape is a violation of a person's bodily integrity. It is not a sex act. It is an act of coercive power. It is a violation.

Those of us who argue in favor of a woman's right to choose an abortion and to choose whether or not she will use artificial contraception take these positions because we want to establish and to maintain the rights of a woman over her own body. We do not make these arguments because we are enamored with abortion. I say that such rights are reserved to individual women under the 10th amendment to the Constitution of the United States. I have written about this elsewhere.

http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/on-faith/post/the-legal-personhood-of-women/2011/11/08/gIqAMZjH2M_blog.html

The problem of abortion is so difficult because it is a clash of moral concerns—the concern for unborn life and the concern of the right of a woman to decide what happens inside her body. The proposed Virginia law is an example why the state ought not to have the right to tell a woman what to do with her body. If the state can force a woman to carry a pregnancy to term, it can force her to undergo an invasive procedure against her will.

I suppose those who support such a law will argue that a woman is not forced to have an abortion in the state of Virginia and thus would not have to undergo this procedure. What this argument fails to take into consideration is that some abortions are therapeutic. Sometimes a woman may suffer from a heart condition or from other ailments that makes pregnancy a life-threatening condition. The reasons for her abortion however are none of the state's business. It ought to be a matter between a woman, and her doctor.

However, even if her situation is not life-threatening, a woman is a human being, who deserves human dignity. The social contract of the United States as expressed in the fourth amendment of the Constitution of the United States says: "The right of people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated." I do not see how this law is not a violation of the personal security of a woman.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights also guarantees life, liberty and security of person. According to the Declaration of Independence governments exist to secure rights, not to take them away. The reason the social contract puts limits on state power is because the government of law is coercive power. If one breaks the law, the state has the power to take away one's property, liberty, or

life. If the State of Virginia passes a law that requires a woman to have an invasive procedure, this would be the coercive power of the state in essence invading a woman's body. I say again this is rape.

Jesus taught his followers: "IN EVERYTHING do to others what you would have them do to you." Who among us would have the state force us to have something inserted into our bodies against our will? This is something that not only the citizens of Virginia ought to protest, but this is something every human being ought to stand against.

For those of us who think that abortion is a tragedy, we ought to show radical love and support to women and to their families. Such is the governance of love, and it is more powerful than the coercive governance of law.