

I would like to thank the House Human Services Committee for reading my testimony. On writing this I am 39 weeks 6 days pregnant and while I would really like to be at this hearing, I'm sure you can understand why I am providing written testimony instead.

I am going to start my testimony with a definition. I will be referring to the "Law of Non-Contradiction" and, so we are all on the same page, it is defined as "contradictory propositions cannot both be true." This law is the basis for linear and logical thought and is essential when considering the ideas which are expressed in a constitution.

Proposal 5 seeks to include a definition of "personal reproductive liberty" in Vermont's constitution, stating "that the people are guaranteed the liberty and dignity to determine their own life's course." The premise of this amendment is to protect "reproductive liberty" against any reversal of Roe v. Wade, but it is also being touted as a way to solidify protections for H.57 allowing for abortion through all terms of pregnancy to the moment of birth. It is essential that assumptions about a baby's birth be examined under the Law of Non-Contradiction. So if one baby can be aborted at 39 weeks and 6 days because it hasn't been born yet but another can be born a person at 28 weeks because its mother has serious health issues, which one is a person? Does this pass the Law of Non-Contradiction litmus test? A baby born at 28 weeks cannot be a person if a baby at 39 weeks 6 days gestation is not.

During the Holocaust a whole subset of the population was dehumanized by those in charge when they had the opportunity to act on logic and reason and instead chose to act in contradiction to logic and reason. They could see that Jewish people were persons, and yet they dehumanized them and justified their actions. There is not a single person in this building that would not recognize a baby born at 28 weeks as a person, but 28 out of the 30 of our senators voted in favor of Proposal 5 which implicitly said to all onlookers that a baby has to be born to be a person. This is illogical and does not pass the Law of Non-Contradiction litmus test. It cannot be murder to kill a baby of 28 weeks gestation outside of its mother's womb and not murder to kill a baby who is still inside its mother's womb at 39 weeks 6 days.

I wish I could be standing here looking every one of you in the eye so I could ask you if you believe it to be intellectually honest to dehumanize an entire subclass of people, the unborn, for the contradictory claim that a person must have the right to murder so as to have "reproductive liberty." Let us not follow in the footsteps of Hitler and think it different because we are calling it "liberty." I challenge every one of you who has ever held an infant to look the person next to you in the eye and tell them honestly that you don't believe a baby in the womb, who can live outside the womb on their own, is not a person and that you think it's right and just to take that life in the name of "liberty." That to me sounds illogical and like tyranny, like the belief of a psychotic dictator who less than 100 years ago dehumanized an entire subset of people and justified their murders. If that's the stance you believe you are willing to take, I think you should spend some time looking in the mirror and honestly debating with yourself whether what's good for Hitler is good for you.

Thank you,
Wysteria Jackson – Lowell, Vermont