

Call to Action

**Treatise on Abortion:
The medical & constitutional basis of the personhood
of the unborn American citizen**

By,

Caroline Chesnutt, RN/BSN

June 15, 2019

With sincere respect and humility,

Caroline Chesnutt

Caroline L. Chesnutt, RN/BSN, A critical care nurse and deeply concerned citizen.

©2019 by Caroline L. Chesnutt, all rights other than those expressly relinquished below are reserved:

Free to Distribute and Sell

This copy may be emailed to anyone. Any unaltered copy of this work may be downloaded, translated into any language, copied, printed and/or distributed in whole or in part, digitally or in print, without any fee or further permission from the publisher.

Distributed copies or parts of copies must contain this page. Quotations need only provide appropriate credit to the author and the website CAROLINECHESNUTT.COM. Download this pamphlet for free at BIBLEBOOKS.CO.

Carolineinnashville@gmail.com

CALL TO ACTION: TREATISE ON ABORTION

This is not a religious document. It is for American citizens of every race and every faith. It finds its foundation on science, law, reason, and on the document upon which our great nation was built, the Declaration of Independence:

“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness.” – Thomas Jefferson, the Declaration of Independence, Second Continental Congress, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1776

For nearly 50 years, the American people have been systematically deceived and suffered much loss under the ruling of an unjust law. As a result, millions of Americans have been silently slaughtered. Upon the writing of this document, at least 61,368,572 innocent American citizens have been quietly put to death since the institution of *Roe v. Wade* in 1973.

The collective loss to this great nation of these natural-born citizens, citizens who otherwise would have contributed much to our society - culturally, artistically, scientifically, educationally, economically, and otherwise - is inestimable. Mankind will never know the talent of which we were deprived. This treatise is an attempt to prove these facts to be true.

While the Declaration of Independence is not law, it represents the heart, mind, and intentions of the founding fathers, by setting forth the ideas and principles behind a just and fair government. These principles were central to the writing of the constitution and represent the heart of the American people. The spirit of the Decla-

ration of Independence is the spirit which birthed this great nation, and the spirit which will carry it forward. It should therefore be hailed as one of the pillars of our public policy.

Rights

Thomas Jefferson refers to men as being “created equal.” With that creation, they were thus “endowed by their Creator” with the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. According to this Declaration, these inalienable rights were endowed upon men when they were “created.”

The moment a child is born, it is evident his or her body is fully formed with all eleven organ systems functioning and lacking nothing. There is nothing left to be created. However, modern science confirms that the formation of a child occurs long before birth; as does the “creation” which Thomas Jefferson affirmed. Therefore, during the stages of development inside and not outside the womb, a person was created. Thus, these rights were endowed upon them by their Creator while in the womb and not at birth. According to Thomas Jefferson, when a life is “created,” it is then endowed with these rights.

Furthermore, these rights were not granted to a person by the authority of the United States, but by the authority of their Creator. “Personhood” can never be bestowed by another person who is only of equal value. It must be established by a higher power. Personhood is valid and true, whether or not the Government, or the doctor, or the mother chooses to recognize it.

If these inalienable rights were endowed by the Creator before a person is born, does this Government or anyone else have the authority to decide when and where and to whom these rights may

be applied? Does this Government also have the authority to strip them of these rights and rob them of a chance at life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?

By definition, these inalienable rights cannot be repealed by human laws or customs of any particular culture or government. Yet this Government has repealed them.

In addition, our Declaration ascertains that the sole purpose of the institution of the Government is to secure these rights; and furthermore, when any form of Government fails to do so, and thus becomes destructive to these ends, it is the right and the duty of the people to alter or abolish said Government, laying it's new foundations on the principles as to them shall seem most likely to secure the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to all its citizens. With the enforcement of *Roe v. Wade*, all three of these rights have been stripped from 61,368,572 Americans citizens.

Thomas Jefferson, by stating that human rights were endowed by the Creator, who created all men equally in the womb, thus granted the status of "personhood" to all children, born and unborn.

Both the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution share the fundamental belief that "sovereignty resides with the citizens." The founding fathers reckoned the rights of humanity and citizenship to begin in the womb irrespective of whether or not one adheres to the idea of a "Creator." By whatever means life begins, via creation, evolution, reincarnation, or otherwise, they clearly considered it to be before birth.

The Rights of Women

It cannot be overstated that women must have reproductive rights. They must have the right to choose to do with their own bodies whatever they deem best. Women should always have the right to choose how, when, and if they desire to reproduce, and should never lose the ability to exert their reproductive rights nor the freedom to choose what will be done with their own bodies.

However, in the case of pregnancy (with the exception of rape), the reproductive rights of the woman have already been freely exercised. Even in the case of rape, the woman still has the right to obtain contraception to prevent both conception and implantation at any time from five to fifteen days after penetration. In every case, she retains the rights to her own body; but the infant which grows in her womb is not her body. It has a separate body entirely as well as separate rights.

The unborn child within her body has a separate brain, heart, lungs, limbs, organs, bones, tissues, DNA, and vascular system. At ten weeks gestation, every system which makes up the human body is present, alive, and functioning, separate from (though dependent upon) the mother.

Every woman has absolute rights to her own body. However, during a late term abortion, when the arms and legs are ripped off; when the head is crushed with the forceps; when the spinal cord is cut out of the back of the neck: Are those arms her arms? Are the legs her legs? Is the decapitated head her skull? Clearly not.

The body parts which were dismembered and removed piece by piece did not belong to her body, nor did she feel the pain of that dismemberment. It was another body entirely separate from her own which was violently dismembered. Therefore, she has not the right to butcher another body which is clearly not her own.

If a woman refuses to allow this foreign body to live within her body, does she still have the right to mutilate that body before its removal? To deliver the body piece by piece rather than whole? If what she bears is no more than tissue, then why must it be destroyed before being removed?

Due to the advancements of modern medicine, infants have survived outside the womb and lived to adulthood as early as 21 weeks and 5 days. Most Doctors define the age of viability as 24 weeks gestation, which is only the second trimester. At this point, if the child was delivered in one piece rather than dismembered, he or she would likely survive, and would be afforded all the rights of an American citizen.

If the unborn American citizen, fully formed yet not fully developed, could live independent from the woman at 24 weeks gestation, if only he were to be removed in one piece, who then has the right to dismember his body? Who has the right to deprive him of a chance at life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?

Heartbeat

At what point does life begin? We ask that question for the purpose of answering this question: Have we taken an innocent life? Some say life begins at conception. Some say life begins with viability. Some say life begins at birth... or even after birth. Most refuse to answer the question, because it is condemning.

Nevertheless, it must be answered. Science and modern medicine both affirm that life ends with the last heartbeat. Would it not be reasonable to assume at the very least, that life begins with the first heartbeat? The heart of an unborn child begins to beat at five weeks gestation.

Those in opposition to this view claim it is “just a collection of tissue.” True. But it is human tissue, is it not? And it is living tissue, is it not? And it has a heartbeat, does it not? When the dismembered body parts are sent to labs to be researched, are the scientists studying the bones and the tissues of a dog or a horse? By the most elementary definitions of science, one cannot argue this plain fact: it is living human tissue.

Whether that collection of tissue lives inside or outside of the womb does not change the fact that it is human, and it is alive. This unborn American citizen, this collection of living human tissue has one head, one brain, one heart, two arms, two legs, two eyes, eleven organ systems, and every other attribute which science tells us makes up the human body.

Your own body is also a collection of “living human tissue,” and there is nothing your body possesses which the body of the unborn American citizen does not possess... except of course, for these three things:

....the right to life, the right to liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

This question must be readdressed by the United States Government; not for political gain, but for the sake of 61,386,572 Americans who have already lost their lives. It is of utmost importance to congress and to every governing body who is responsible for carrying out the doctrines of our nation and for ensuring the rights of every American citizen, born and unborn. While congress waffles on this issue, hundreds of thousands of lives are lost each year.

Right to Life v. Right to Privacy

Roe v. Wade ruled in favor of abortion based on the 14th Amendment of the US Constitution, under the guise of implied “right to privacy.” This same amendment was written for the purpose of protecting life, a right which was explicitly stated. Prior to the implementation of Roe v. Wade, the unborn American citizen was protected by the 14th amendment and granted the right to life.

In all other cases, the right to privacy (implied or otherwise) would be suspended when the right to life was threatened. For example, policemen will break down a door without hesitation if they have evidenced the life of a child is in danger within. There would be public outrage if the police knowingly and willingly allowed a child to die in order to protect the privacy of another citizen. How can a just nation categorically remove the “right to life” from an innocent American child in favor of granting the “right to privacy” to an adult?

The ruling of Roe has granted women implied “right to privacy” while simultaneously stripping the child of verified “right to life,” a right which he did possess prior to 1973. Once a person possesses the right to life, who has the authority to remove that right without just cause? Can any law be just which removes the “right to life” from one in favor of granting the “right to privacy” to another?

Unborn Victims of Violence Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-212)

The unborn victims of violence act of 2004 is a federal law which recognizes an embryo or fetus in utero as a legal victim if they are injured or killed during the commission of any of over 60

listed federal crimes of violence. This law defines "child in utero" as "a member of the species Homo sapiens, at any stage of development, who is carried in the womb."

Any reasonable person would interpret this definition of the unborn child as "human" and thus deserving of human rights. This is a federal criminal law which has also been recognized by 38 states. Therefore, concerning federal crimes of violence, the majority of the states of our Union have effectively granted the status of "personhood" to the unborn American citizen at any stage of development.

Under this law, people have been tried and convicted of double homicide due to the "personhood" status of the unborn American citizen who is then protected by the 14th Amendment. Can the law remain just when it grants full personhood status to one unborn American citizen and not to others? In both cases, the victim suffers violence and death, regardless of the identity of the perpetrator.

Incarcerated Pregnant Women

It is uncommon that a woman would stand on death-row, and even more rare, though not unheard of, for a woman awaiting execution, to be pregnant. However, under the current rule of law, if a pregnant woman is convicted and sentenced to execution, she cannot be executed while she carries a child in her womb.

If what the woman bears in her body is nothing more than a clump of tissue, why not execute her? If the mother has forfeited her right to life, how is it that the right to life of the child she bears is protected? Why does the unborn citizen of the female felon fall under the protection of the law?

According to 18 US Code § 3596B (Implementation of a sentence of death), a woman cannot be executed while pregnant. This is true at the federal and state levels. The United States Criminal Justice System effectually grants the status of “personhood” to all unborn American children of female inmates at any stage of development; thus they are protected by the 14th Amendment. How can the law justify the protection of unborn children of female felons and not grant the same rights to all unborn American citizens?

Prenatal / Fetal Surgery

Thirty years ago, the first fetal surgery was performed at the University of California, San Francisco in 1978. Since then, this frontier field of medicine has been rapidly advancing. Pediatric surgeons are now able to successfully perform a wide variety of complicated fetal surgeries; including, but not limited to, lower urinary tract obstruction, mediastinal teratoma, neck mass removal, pulmonary agenesis, sacrococcygeal teratoma, spina bifida, twin reversed arterial perfusion sequence, and twin-twin transfusion syndrome. Do our fine surgeons perform these high-risk, incredibly complex, expensive surgeries on something that amounts to no more than a collection of cells or a clump of tissue?

Furthermore, they routinely administer sedation and pain control medications to the unborn infant prior to surgery. Why would this be necessary if the fetus in question was not human and could feel no pain? Why do unborn American children undergoing surgery receive pain medicine and sedation and those undergoing abortions and dismemberment receive none? Do we lack enough pity to administer pain medications or sedation to the dying?

While undergoing these surgeries, the unborn child is not viewed as a mass of lifeless tissue which happens to be occupying the woman's uterus. By all accounts, he is considered to be a tiny, living patient, with his own set of lungs, heart, bones, brain, and body parts, completely separate from the mother.

In many cases, the child within the womb is completely removed from the mother in order for the surgery to be performed, and then returned to her for the completion of gestation. In the medical community, these children are considered to be "born twice."

After the child is removed from the mother during surgery, he is treated as a new-born infant, an individual patient separate from his mother. When he is placed on the operating table outside the mother, does anyone have a right to harm him in any way? Does he not, at that moment, possess all the rights afforded to humanity?

And after being returned to the mother's womb, does he lose all human rights and cease to be considered a child? Does he then become a collection of tissue inside the woman with no value and no rights, until he exits the womb again for a second time? Because this child was "born once" during surgery, thus being granted "personhood" by the authority of the US constitution, would it then be permissible for the mother to abort him? Does he lose the rights of "personhood" simply because he has re-entered the womb? Are the rights of "personhood" - the right to life - so transient as to be solely dependent upon a person's location?

Under the current vague, confused state, and inconsistent application of our laws, this child would lose all human rights upon being returned to the mother.

This unborn American citizen, the tiniest of patients, is considered “human” in every sense of the word by everyone included in the collaborated care effort of the mother and child.

Furthermore, insurance companies routinely cover these expensive procedures. These surgeries, in no way benefit the overall health of the woman. It is only for the health and well-being of the unborn child who is considered by all parties to be well worth the effort, risk, and expense. Do these companies insure a living child or lifeless tissue in a woman’s uterus? By everyone involved in his care, he is esteemed far more valuable than a clump of lifeless tissue.

In pediatric hospitals all across America, the status of “personhood” is routinely granted to unborn American citizens as they become patients who undergo advanced surgeries to save their lives.

“This is not a person”

The most heinous crimes against humanity in modern history were done because a society at large was largely deceived. Somehow, they were able to look at a Jew, to look at an African, to look at a slave and to say: “This is not a person.” The numbers of those atrocities in our history pale in comparison to the number of American citizens who have been brutally aborted and their body parts chopped up to be used for research or pulverized in a garbage disposal.

If you, therefore, choose to withhold the inalienable human rights from unborn American citizens, you are making the same proclamation made by those whom our society now rightly condemns: “This is not a person.”

The tremendous weight of this judgment falls squarely on the shoulders of every American lawmaker and politician holding office anywhere in this nation, without exception. All are accountable both to God and to every American citizen, born and unborn, living and deceased.

Under the current ambiguous law which has no universal standard, “life” is not clearly defined; the human rights of some unborn American citizens are protected while others are not; and justice is made a mockery.

Roe v Wade adds to the confusion of an already vague and inconsistent area of the law, and as a result, the lives of 61,368,572 innocent Americans have been senselessly slaughtered. This is why the question must be addressed today. It is not a political issue. It is not a religious issue. It is an issue of basic human rights... a travesty of justice that will echo for centuries to come.

A judgment ought never to be made by any man prior to a thorough discovery of all evidence. As you read these words, before you make any judgments on this matter, I urge you as well as every governor, congressman, politician, judge, and lawmaker to go and see for yourself.

Go to a clinic; watch a late-term abortion with your naked eyes. Watch the dismemberment of a viable child who would otherwise grow into adulthood. Hold his little head in your palm. Let his tiny hands wrap around your little finger. Watch him writhe in pain as the abortionist jabs scissors into the back of his neck. Look at the color of his eyes. And then decide if you can still say, “This is not a person.”

“Personhood”

- In the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson granted the status of “personhood” to all unborn American citizens “created” in the womb.
- The Unborn Victims of Violence Act of 2004 granted the status of “personhood” to unborn American citizens at any stage of development, who are victims of violence (excepting the violence of abortion).
- Doctors, nurses, and staff in hospitals all across our country have granted the status of “personhood” to the unborn or “twice born” American citizens who become their patients.
- Medical Insurance companies have recognized the inherent value of the unborn American citizen by financing expensive fetal surgeries for the life and health of the child.
- The United States Criminal Justice System has uniformly granted the status of “personhood” to all unborn Americans of incarcerated women at any stage of development.
- Millions of pro-life Americans have granted the status of “personhood” to every unborn American citizen at any stage of development.

This treatise is a plea for the United States Government: (1) to address this issue once and for all by establishing a universal standard of the right to life; and (2) to grant the status of “personhood” to every unborn American citizen at any stage of development from this day forward.