

# Stop Legal Infanticide by Christmas (SLIC)

SLIC@Saltshaker.US

*SLIC and www.Saltshaker.US are ministries of The Partnership Machine, Inc.*

**SLIC Volunteers needed NOW!** The Project Overview:

**Survey every candidate for state and national office: who will co-sponsor a Joint Resolution that acknowledges that “legal abortion” legally “collapsed” in 2004?** (This is one of 5 SLIC strategies)

The proposed Joint Resolution builds on “Laci and Conner’s Law”, the federal law that defines all unborn children as human beings, enabling murderers of pregnant women to be charged with double murders. This precisely meets the condition given in *Roe v. Wade* for the “collapse” of legal abortion. The law asserts that it “does not permit prosecution” for abortions chosen by the mother. This provision would prevent the “collapse” of Roe, Congressmen were assured, although a few remained rightly and eloquently skeptical. Without that assurance, it surely would not have passed. But 10 million corpses later, it is time to recognize that provision does not preserve Roe, but merely points out the obvious fact that Roe’s “collapse” does not, by itself, permit prosecution of abortion. It merely returns to states the choice whether to pass laws against abortion. It is those laws which would “permit prosecution” of abortion.

By April, every state website should have lists of state and national candidates. Candidates get dozens of surveys from interest groups, whose results are distributed to group members. This is an opportunity not only to identify co-sponsors of this Joint Resolution next January, which is our direct goal, but to get thousands of lawmakers to begin thinking about it right away, and give feedback, and any corrections or additions which will make it stronger. The consensus that emerges from this vetting process holds the potential to end legal infanticide before Christmas, before the first Joint Resolution can be introduced!

## Volunteer duties:

1. Pick a state to survey candidates. Find a friend or two to help. Save up about \$200 for postage.
2. Call the Secretary Of State office (or scour the website) to determine the following:  
\_\_\_\_\_ The date candidates will be listed on the SOS website (after their filing deadline, which means after they file their petitions signed by a certain number of eligible voters, which they must do to get on the ballot)  
\_\_\_\_\_ Will that list include email addresses?  
\_\_\_\_\_ The last day (estimate) of your state legislature’s session.  
\_\_\_\_\_ The day your legislature will resume, after the November election.  
\_\_\_\_\_ The day bills or joint resolutions may be introduced by lawmakers.  
\_\_\_\_\_ The “funnel”, or deadline after which it is too late to introduce new resolutions.
3. Print the needed number of surveys and postcards and get ready to stuff in envelopes.
4. When candidates’ addresses are posted, address, stamp, and stuff envelopes.
5. Shortly after the session ends, mail survey to all candidates in your state.
6. Week 3: report responses to the SLIC website, (which will be a wiki, like Wikipedia, where members may edit and add to articles), thank those who responded by email, and followup by email with those who did not respond with another copy of the survey. Week 5: try again to communicate with those who didn’t respond; by letter, email, or phone. Report responses to the SLIC website.
7. Responses may include not only yes or no, but detailed objections, and suggested corrections or additions. Interact with candidates as appropriate, and report your interaction on the SLIC website. If there is anything you don’t know how to answer, use the website to ask others for suggestions.

Dear Candidate:

Thank you for caring enough about America to not just watch other people on TV doing something to keep her together, but to do what you can yourself!

The following Model Joint Resolution is a project of Stop Legal Infanticide by Christmas ([www.Saltshaker.US/SLIC](http://www.Saltshaker.US/SLIC)), which is a ministry of The Partnership Machine, Inc. ([www.Saltshaker.US](http://www.Saltshaker.US))

Please respond to the following questions, and return in the enclosed envelope OR email to [\(yourstate\)@SLIC.US](mailto:(yourstate)@SLIC.US). Responses will be posted at [www.wiki.Saltshaker.US](http://www.wiki.Saltshaker.US).

1. Will you co-sponsor the SLIC Model joint resolution as is? \_\_\_\_\_

2. Can you suggest ways to improve it?

3. If you can't support it as is, what changes to it would gain your support?

4. Will you help us by explaining any objections you have to it?

5. Please share any advice on how to get this passed, such as who to contact, who might want to help lead this initiative, and how much you are willing to be involved.

# SLIC Model Joint Resolution

*Whereas*, Federal law has protected unborn children as human beings since April 1, 2004, stating: “**‘unborn child’ means a child in utero, and the term ‘child in utero’ or ‘child, who is in utero’ means a member of the species Homo Sapiens, at any stage of development, who is carried in the womb.**” (18 U.S.C. § 1841(d)) and criminalizes “intentionally killing or attempting to kill a human being” (18 U.S.C. § 1841(a)(c) – popularly known as “Laci and Conner’s Law”). “Child,” “Homo sapiens”, “who,” (not “what” or “which”) “carried in the womb” are all words which apply solely to human beings. This definition of the unborn as human beings is absolute, applying to all unborn children, even those not directly protected by this law. And

*Whereas*, *Roe v. Wade* 410 U.S. 113 (1973) equates the time an unborn child becomes “human” with the time the child becomes a “person”, to wit: “These disciplines variously approached the question in terms of the point at which the embryo or fetus became ‘formed’ or recognizably human, or in terms of when a ‘person’ came into being, that is, infused with a ‘soul’ or ‘animated.’” And

*Whereas*, *Roe v. Wade* spells out the conditions for *Roe’s* own “collapse”, to wit: “[Texas argues] that the ‘fetus’ is a person. **If this suggestion of personhood is established, the [legal-abortion] case, of course, collapses, for the right to life would then be guaranteed specifically by the [Constitution]...** [but] the unborn have never been recognized in the law as persons in the whole sense.” And

*Whereas*, 18 U.S.C. § 1841(c) does not “permit the prosecution of any person for...an abortion for which the consent of the pregnant woman...has been obtained...” And

*Whereas*, there is no inconsistency between the “collapse” of *Roe* caused by 18 U.S.C. § 1841(d) and the fact that 18 U.S.C. § 1841(c) does not “permit the prosecution” of elective abortions, since the repeal of *Roe’s* ban on states criminalizing abortion does not criminalize abortion. *Roe’s* collapse merely returns the choice to states whether to “permit prosecution” of abortion by enacting their own laws against it. The “collapse” of *Roe* does not outlaw abortion; it frees states to outlaw abortion. Outlawing abortion is clearly a process with two distinct steps, and 18 U.S.C. § 1841 clearly takes only the first, without hindering the second. And

*Whereas*, the authority of U.S. law is superior to the authority of the U.S. Supreme Court, in the sense that up until such time as courts declare laws unconstitutional, courts must conform their rulings to them. No court has declared 18 U.S.C. § 1841 unconstitutional. To so find would require the Court to positively affirm that human life does not begin until birth, a position which no legal authority has ever taken, even though a number of the highest legal authorities have taken the position that human life begins at conception (See Missouri #1.205, R.S.Mo.1986, Louisiana LSA-R.S. 40:1299,35.0, Nebraska 28-325. R.R.S. 1943, besides various proclamations of Presidents and Governors). And

*Whereas*, “(I)f the law recognizes that a fetus is a legal person from the moment of conception.....then the law must recognize and protect the rights of that person on a legal basis with the rights of the adult pregnant woman. If our laws recognize that, then there can be no right to choose, because, logically, terminating a pregnancy even in its earliest stages would be killing a fully legal person.” (Mr. Nadler, opposing the law, *UNBORN VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE ACT OF 2003* 150 Cong. Rec. H637-05, \*H640). And

*Whereas*, [the consequence of 18 U.S.C. § 1841 is that] “....unborn children whether viable or not, will be considered as human beings, and therefore, whole as persons as victims of crime.... [Laci’s Law’s] extension of legal personhood to a[n] [unborn child] is entirely unprecedented in the history of federal law... . [The Supreme Court] could be forced to do what it has avoided for over thirty years: determine the ultimate value of the life interest and decide when that life begins.” (Amanda Bruchs, *Clash of Competing Interests: Can the Unborn Victims of Violence Act and Over Thirty Years of Settled Abortion Law Co-Exist Peacefully?*, 55 Syracuse L. Rev. 133 (2004). See also: Wilmering, R.R., Note, *Federalism, The Commerce Clause* 80 Tns . L\_J. 1989 (2005); Speizer, E., *Recent Developments in Reproduction Health Law...*41 Cal. W.L. Rev. 507 (2005); Kole, T. and Kadetsky, L., *Recent Developments*, 39 Harvard Journal Legislation 215

(2002)]]. And

**Whereas**, there is no conflict between 18 U.S.C. § 1841 and 18 U.S.C. §248 (FACE, Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances, 1992). 18 U.S.C. §248 merely prevents individuals from saving the lives of the unborn; it asserts no jurisdiction over states, to prevent states from protecting the unborn in compliance with 18 U.S.C. § 1841;

**Therefore, be it resolved, that:**

Legal Abortion technically and legally “collapsed” on April Fool’s Day, 2004. 18 U.S.C. § 1841 precisely meets the conditions laid out in Roe’s “collapse” clause. 18 U.S.C. § 1841 is a doe in estrus, and Roe’s “collapse” clause is a 20 point buck; AND

This state has no further legal obligation to refrain from criminalizing abortion, or to support or protect abortion in any way; AND

After 18. U.S.C. §1841 it is impossible to treat ex-utero and intra-utero children differently without violating the XIV Amendment rights of one or the other: therefore this state is legally obligated to protect unborn children with the same criminal laws that protect born children; AND

Criminal laws against abortion by this state, or a Personhood Amendment in this state defining the unborn as “persons”, or amending this state’s Necessity Defense law to clarify that abortion is a “harm” to which it applies and “imminence” means “nearness in time to the closing of the window of opportunity to prevent harm”, are not bold, legally dubious attempts by one state to rewrite the legal landscape for the entire nation, but will merely bring state law into conformity with federal law; AND

Any federal court which attempts to block this state’s effort to bring its laws into conformity with these federal laws will, in so doing, violate Roe v. Wade.

(For additional arguments and cases see the pro se brief filed by Scott Roeder in his court record: “Legal brief”, at “Scott Roeder Resources”, at [www.Saltshaker.US](http://www.Saltshaker.US).)

(To mailer: suggestion to save a little time and money: Print 2 sheets, one with the questions and the back side blank, the other with the Joint Resolution back to back. Fold together with the blank side out. Put the small stamped return envelope inside them. Don’t use an outer envelope, but hold together with round mailing tabs.)