

From: Christians for Personhood <CP@spiritcom.net>
To:
Date: 11/30/2018 2:46:23 PM
Subject: In Law, No Exceptions to Human Personhood

\ri600Christians for Personhood (CP)
Columbia, South Carolina
November 30, 2018

Personhood Report :

In Law, No Exceptions to Human Personhood

This 11/30/2018 update to be posted online here ([Christians for Personhood blog](#))

In both Webster's Dictionary and Black's Law Dictionary used by attorneys,
the first definition for "Person" is: "A human being."

[Black's Law Dictionary \(2009\): Person = "A Human Being"](#)

"person. ... 1. A human being. - Also termed natural person. "
<http://christianlifeandliberty.net/2013-12-09-Blacks-Law-Dictionary-Person-3.pdf>

So **Is** or **Is Not** the developing preborn baby in the womb of a human mother, "A human being." ?

Yes, of course. The answer is obvious:



living unborn baby at eight weeks

<http://clinicquotes.com/abortion-at-8-weeks-pictures/>

Any "Exceptions" to Personhood, and we no longer have Personhood, we no longer have a Personhood Bill.

Either a child in the womb is a human being beginning at fertilization and therefore a person, or they are not.

There are no "Exceptions" to Human Personhood.

The Black's Law Dictionary and the Webster's Dictionary first definition of a "Person", is "A Human Being" !!!

Personhood Legislation was first introduced in the South Carolina General Assembly in February 1998 ([H.4558](#) , [S.1060](#)), and has been active every year since, including in the previous 2017-2018 SC Legislative Session:

2017-2018 Personhood Bills in the SC State Legislature: [S.217](#) , [H.3530](#)

[History of Personhood Legislation in South Carolina \(1998 - 2018 \)](#)

<http://christianlifeandliberty.net/2018-11-29-History-of-Personhood-Legislation-in-South-Carolina-1998-2018.pdf>

So February 2018 marked 20 years in which Personhood legislation has been active in the SC State Legislature.

During the 20 years from 1998 to 2018, a SC Personhood Bill passed the full SC House of Representatives **ONE TIME**, on [April 14, 2005](#), albeit with a fatal flaw so-called "morning-after-pill" rape "exception" [amendment](#) which was unfortunately added on the floor of the SC House of Representatives, after the bill ([H .3213](#) - 52 co-sponsors) had passed both the Constitutional Laws Subcommittee and the full House Judiciary Committee, without amendment. There can be no "exceptions" to recognizing the "Personhood" of all human beings at fertilization (conception), or we no longer have Personhood [See also [Footnote #54](#) of 1973 Roe v. Wade [Opinion](#)].

Re: Roe v Wade, [Footnote #54](#) - "Life of the Mother"

United States Supreme Court

ROE v. WADE, (1973)

No. 70-18

Argued: December 13, 1971 [Re-argued October 11, 1972]

Decided: January 22, 1973

[Note: Oral Reargument which focused on the "Personhood" of the preborn human being (aka "fetus") took place October 11, 1972

- Audio [here](#) (approx 64 minutes), Transcript [here](#)]

<http://caselaw.findlaw.com/us-supreme-court/410/113.html>

Roe v Wade, Footnote #54 - Re: "Life of the Mother"

<http://caselaw.findlaw.com/us-supreme-court/410/113.html#f54>

[[Footnote 54](#)]

"When Texas urges that a fetus is entitled to Fourteenth Amendment protection as a person, it faces a dilemma.

Neither in Texas nor in any other State are all abortions prohibited. Despite broad proscription, an exception

always exists. The exception contained [\[410 U.S. 113, 158\]](#) in Art. 1196, for an abortion procured or attempted

by medical advice for the purpose of saving the life of the mother, is typical. **But if the fetus is a person who**

is not to be deprived of life without due process of law, and if the mother's condition is the sole determinant,

does not the Texas exception appear to be out of line with the Amendment's command?" [emphasis added]

There are other inconsistencies between Fourteenth Amendment status and the typical abortion statute. It has already

been pointed out, n. 49, supra, that in Texas the woman is not a principal or an accomplice **with respect to an abortion**

upon her. **If the fetus is a person, why is the woman not a principal or an accomplice?** Further, the penalty for

criminal abortion specified by Art. 1195 is significantly less than the maximum penalty for murder prescribed by Art. 1257

of the Texas Penal Code. If the fetus is a person, may the penalties be different? [emphasis added]

E-mail below sent out January 28, 2018:

Posted on [Christians for Personhood](#) blog here:

[Personhood Report: In Law, No Exceptions to Human Personhood](#)
January 30, 2018

Date: Sun, 28 Jan 2018
From: Christians for Personhood
Subject: In Law, No Exceptions to Human Personhood

[Christians for Personhood \(CP \)](#)
Columbia, South Carolina
January 28, 2018

Personhood Report :

In Law, No Exceptions to Human Personhood

In both Webster's Dictionary and Black's Law Dictionary used by attorneys,
the first definition for "Person" is: "A human being."

[Black's Law Dictionary \(2009\): Person = "A Human Being"](#)

"person. ... 1. A human being. - Also termed natural person. "
<http://christianlifeandliberty.net/2013-12-09-Blacks-Law-Dictionary-Person-3.pdf>

So **Is** or **Is Not** the developing preborn baby in the womb of a human mother,
"A human being." ?

Yes, of course. The answer is obvious:




living unborn baby at eight weeks

<http://clinicquotes.com/abortion-at-8-weeks-pictures/>

This page [below] shows pictures of abortion at 7 weeks.
First, here are some pictures of living unborn babies at 7 weeks:



<http://clinicquotes.com/abortion-at-7-weeks/>



Any "Exceptions" to Personhood, and we no longer have Personhood, we no longer have a Personhood Bill.

Either a child in the womb is a human being and therefore a person, or they are not. There are no "Exceptions" to Human Personhood.

The Black's Law Dictionary and the Webster's Dictionary first definition of a "Person", is "A Human Being" !!!

Personhood Legislation was first introduced in the South Carolina General Assembly in February 1998 ([H.4558](#) , [S.1060](#)), and has been active every year since, including in the current 2017-2018 SC Legislative Session:

2017-2018 Personhood Bills in the SC State Legislature: [S.217](#) , [H.3530](#)

[History of Personhood Legislation in South Carolina \(1998 - 2016 \)](#)

<http://christianlifeandliberty.net/2016-11-12-History-of-Personhood-Legislation-in-South-Carolina-1998-2016.pdf>

So February 2018 will mark 20 years in which Personhood legislation has been active in the SC State Legislature.

During the 19 years from 1998 to 2017, a SC Personhood Bill passed the full SC House of Representatives **ONE TIME**, on [April 14, 2005](#), albeit with a fatal flaw so-called "morning-after-pill" rape "exception" **amendment** which was unfortunately added on the floor of the SC House of Representatives, after the bill ([H .3213](#) - 52 co-sponsors) had passed both the Constitutional Laws Subcommittee and the full House Judiciary Committee, without amendment. There can be no "exceptions" to recognizing the "Personhood" of all human beings at fertilization (conception), or we no longer have Personhood [See also [Footnote #54](#) of 1973 Roe v. Wade [Opinion](#)].

Re: Roe v Wade, [Footnote #54](#) - "Life of the Mother"

United States Supreme Court

ROE v. WADE, (1973)

No. 70-18

Argued: December 13, 1971 [Re-argued October 11, 1972]

Decided: January 22, 1973

[Note: Oral Reargument which focused on the "Personhood" of the preborn human being (aka "fetus") took place October 11, 1972

- Audio [here](#) (approx 64 minutes), Transcript [here](#)]

<http://caselaw.findlaw.com/us-supreme-court/410/113.html>

Roe v Wade, Footnote #54 - Re: "Life of the Mother"

<http://caselaw.findlaw.com/us-supreme-court/410/113.html#f54>

[[Footnote 54](#)]

"When Texas urges that a fetus is entitled to Fourteenth Amendment protection as a person, it faces a dilemma.

Neither in Texas nor in any other State are all abortions prohibited. Despite broad proscription, an exception

always exists. The exception contained [\[410 U.S. 113, 158\]](#) in Art. 1196, for an abortion procured or attempted

by medical advice for the purpose of saving the life of the mother, is typical. **But if the**

fetus is a person who

is not to be deprived of life without due process of law, and if the mother's condition is the sole determinant,

does not the Texas exception appear to be out of line with the Amendment's command?"

[emphasis added]

There are other inconsistencies between Fourteenth Amendment status and the typical abortion statute. It has already

been pointed out, n. 49, supra, that in Texas the woman is not a principal or an accomplice **with respect to an abortion**

upon her. **If the fetus is a person, why is the woman not a principal or an accomplice?** Further, the penalty for

criminal abortion specified by Art. 1195 is significantly less than the maximum penalty for murder prescribed by Art. 1257

of the Texas Penal Code. If the fetus is a person, may the penalties be different? [emphasis added]

E-mail below sent out January 27, 2018:

Date: Sat, 27 Jan 2018
From: Christians for Personhood
Subject: No Exceptions to Personhood

Christians for Personhood (CP)
Columbia, South Carolina
January 27, 2018

Personhood Report:

No Exceptions to Personhood

No Exceptions

Dr. Patrick Johnston, Abortion and Healthcare

<https://youtu.be/7uQn6Z0A7eg>

Video – 6:18

Dr. Patrick Johnston discusses why doctors might proscribe abortion in cases where the life or health of the mother is in danger.

Pro-Life Without Exception

[Video documentary of multiple testimonies]

<https://youtu.be/zwazODITOBk>

Video – 58:33

Is abortion helpful in cases of rape or incest?

What about fetal deformity?

What about threats to the life or health of the mother?

Hear the stories of those who have actually been involved in these difficult circumstances.

South Carolina Senate Judiciary Subcommittee Hearing on
SC Personhood Bill [S.457](#) - March 13, 2014

[Dr. Patrick Johnston, Director, Assn. of Pro-Life Physicians,
Statement S.457 Senate Judiciary Subcomm. Hearing](#)
March 13, 2014

"Abortion – the direct killing of the preborn child – is never necessary to save the mother's life."

[Written statement of Dr. Patrick Johnston introduced during testimony by Dr. Henry Jordan before SC Senate Judiciary Subcommittee at public hearing on SC Personhood Bill [S.457](#) on March 13, 2014 – [video](#) (begin 8:00)]

Life of the Mother "Exception" by American Right to Life
<http://americanrtl.org/life-of-the-mother-exception>

Are There Rare Cases When an Abortion Is Justified?
– By Dr. Patrick Johnston, D.O., Dir., Assn. of Pro-Life Physicians
<http://prolifephysicians.org/app/?p=59>

To unsubscribe, send "Unsubscribe" to:
Christians for Personhood