

A terrible, horrible, no good, very bad Supreme Court decision

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) Harry Litman

Source Los Angeles Times

Date June 26, 2022

URL <https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2022-06-26/roe-vs-wade-dobbs-supreme-court-samuel-alito>

Quote

“ "What is distinctive about abortion," Alito writes, is that it results in the termination of a "potential life." And so it does. That is the core difficulty that makes abortion doctrine so vexing — both the individual and society have vital interests at stake. But Alito's leap from that truism to the conclusion that the right to abortion merits no constitutional protection rests on an embarrassing flaw in legal reasoning. It is a non-sequitur to say that the existence of a state or societal interest in fetal life means there is no individual interest in whether to bring a fetus to term. A countervailing state interest says exactly nothing about the existence of an individual right.

”

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=A_terrible,_horrible,_no_good,_very_bad_Supreme_Court_decision&oldid=33614"

This page was last edited on July 20, 2022, at 15:16.

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