

Protecting abortion access is essential to health, freedom, and morality in our state and across the country. I am in a relationship with someone with a uterus. If she was pregnant and wanted an abortion, even given how close we are, I would find it unthinkable to deny her that. Denying abortion to folks I have never met and have no relationship to would be the height of arrogance.

The wellbeing of mothers cannot be maintained if necessary medical procedures often labeled as abortion are barred. Abortion is a termination of a pregnancy. That pregnancy may be viable or it may not be. In many cases it is not viable and would only bring harm if carried to term or allowed to reach its damaging conclusion. In some cases there is no chance of there being a child as a result. Those who would argue that this resolution is immoral on the grounds of killing babies lack knowledge of how humans reproduce. Those who do understand how pregnancies work and how they can go wrong, such as medical professionals, will agree with this resolution that abortion is an essential part of reproductive health care.

The most possible freedom is to let the individual decide what is best for themselves when presented with all necessary information regarding their possible choices. For this reason abortion must be protected because it allows the pregnant person to decide what is best for them to do with their body. No legal body, group of people, or other person should make the decision for the pregnant person. Any law that could be passed to restrict abortion access would be the state or country making a decision for the pregnant person and would be tyranny, not freedom. Obviously any person who wishes not to have any abortion procedure for religious reasons or otherwise regardless of the risks that may result should be allowed to do so. This freedom does not require the same action from others.

After birth there is a child to be cared for. Times are difficult and children need to be as well cared for as possible. Taking on the responsibility of raising a child is not something to be taken lightly and not something that should happen accidentally. Raising a child before the parents are ready will severely hamper the development of the child as their parents sacrifice their work lives for their parenting roles. This reduces the economic stability of the parents and stresses the parents which in turn stresses the child and reduces their opportunities as they grow. With this in mind it is best for a child to be born into a family who is economically stable and sure they want that child. This is what freedom and bodily autonomy brings and what restrictions on bodily autonomy take away.

“Live free or Die” is our state motto and I am proud of it. It is a forceful statement that carries with it the sentiment of those who fought and died so that others may have and possess the freedom to live and believe as we see fit. The full statement uttered by John Stark in 1809 was “*Live free or die: Death is not the worst of evils.*”. A life without freedom is a life lived in bondage and fear and that is what would be given to all citizens of New Hampshire if anything were passed to infringe upon their bodily autonomy such as a restriction on abortion access.

I, as well as many voters and lawmakers, do not have a uterus. It would be easy to say “This does not affect me so I do not care”. For the rest of the population infringement upon abortion access would directly affect them. This is a matter of oppression or freedom. As such taking a neutral stance is to allow evils greater than death to potentially gain a foothold in our state. Neutrality is to side with the oppressors.

I am proud of my state, I am proud of this resolution, and I am proud of all who support it as I do.

Humbly, Alex Williams  
In support of New Hampshire House Concurrent Resolution 7