Religious Abortion Rights

**Biblical abortions.**
Abortion is a religious exercise pursuant of the First Amendment. In Numbers 5:21-22 women consumed a drink to terminate a pregnancy. The drink caused a woman's thigh to rot, thereby causing an abortion/miscarriage. By dating the book of Numbers (*1445-1405 BC est.*) we can clearly see that abortions have been a religious exercise for 3,469 years. Other historical evidence shows religious abortions practiced for a period of 5,179 years since the time of Lamech (*before the flood of Noah*).

**According to religious law (***Fourth Amendment; privacy***).**

- The fetus is considered as a woman's thigh [*that is, as part of its mother's body*].
- A fetus is not an independent being; it's a part of the body of the person carrying it. The Bible specifically tells us that a 'person' is merely a husk of genetic material until it breathes life (*air*) to receive a soul. Why make the point? Because a right is a possession, and a right is only retained by a person for as long as it does not interfere with the rights of others outside of its jurisdiction (*authority/home*). The living soul has rights, the husk does not. The husk is not only nourished by its host and is conjoined thereunto; but it's not an independent entity or an individual life form [even with a heartbeat] until it is separated, breathes air, receives a soul (*from the breath of life/Spirit of God*), and/or moves out of the house (*biblical parental jurisdiction*). See human-animal hybrids (*embryos*).
- Abortions are permitted to save the mother's life.
- Abortions are permitted to relieve the impregnated mother from "great emotional pain."
- Abortions are permitted in situations where carrying the fetus to term would cause "woe" and "great pain."

Source: "The Jewish Torah of Reproductive Justice".

An unborn fetus in Jewish law is not considered a person (Heb. nefesh, lit. "soul") until it has been born. (*breathes air and becomes a soul; Genesis 2:7*)

Source: "The Fetus in Jewish Law".

**Abortion according to Scripture.**
'Prolife' is not a Christian ideology. The first reported abortions were performed in the Bible. Therefore, abortions are a religious exercise pursuant of the First Amendment. The first scripture detailing abortion as a religious practice is found in the book of Numbers. In Numbers 5:15-28 (*KJV*), it was shown that God did not wish, want, or desire a woman to bear an illegitimate child by a man who was not her husband. Likewise, the same applies to a teenage girl bearing the child of a boyfriend who is not her husband, a woman bearing a child by rape or incest (*defiled*), and/or any person bearing an illegitimate child they're not prepared to raise. The issue of abortion has remained unchanged in both testaments of the Bible. In the "Tales and Maxims from the Midrash", by Rev. Samuel Rapaport 1907, chapter Genesis Rabba; it's written that "In the early time of creation, in the time of Lemech (*3156 B.C.*), a medicine was known, the taking of which prevented a woman's conception.--Gen. Rabba 23. [additional content omitted]

Factually, we all know that Christianity evolved from Judaism and that our Bibles were originally written by the Jews of biblical Israel. Odd that Catholic's, Protestant's, and other religious conservatives would take such a bold stance against the Word of God. God' clergy are rouge, behaving as if they don't even know the Scriptures on a vast number of issues, not just abortion. But God is not indifferent on this matter; abortions do not fall into the realm of adiaphora. Both the genetic planted seed, and the physical and mental health of the mother are all elements of concern. In the modern era we're well acquainted with heredity and genetic traits, so why would we force the violent evil seed of that which is vile to be born into our world/to plague society and/or cause "great emotional pain" to the bearer? [additional content omitted]

**Abortion across religious practices**

Christianity (*as protected under the First Amendments*) originates from Judaism. Accordioning to prophecy Chrestian (*original*), Christian and/or some correct unknow term was intended to be the new name of Judaism. But no, we're not all Jewish. In fact, core doctrines show distinct differences between Judaism, Catholicism, Protestantism, and the Orthodoxy. All are unequal. Beliefs are based on different interpretations of scripture. Yet all must adhere to scripture "if" the practice is to be recognized as a religious freedom qualifying for federal protections under the U.S. Constitution. Likewise, abortions are also protected by State Constitutions in support of Religious Freedoms pursuant of the First Amendment.

Again, it makes no sense for catholic and protestant religious leaders to oppose abortions contrary to scripture. In both testaments of the Catholic and Protestant Bibles, God condemns those teaching contrary to His Will. In the Old Testament this particular demographic was to be stoned to death, but in the New Testament, the Bible commands us to rebuke, correct, shun, and mark them because they're false prophets, the "man of sin" and/or the "son of perdition". Nevertheless, under the leadership of these people politicians have been influenced, the conservative religious right has stacked the courts, laws have been passed to stifle financing, procedural hurdles have been put in place, [abortions] clinics have been burned down or vandalized, staff members have been stalked and terrorized. Even the clinics' doctors have been killed in the name of a savior who gave His life that others might live (*this bloodlust is not divine*). A savior forgiving the very sins that this new Christian sicarii (*dagger men*) could not. Therefore, they will neither be forgiven (*Luke 6:27 KJV*). They judge others, making riling accusations against them, and bear false witness for acts that weren't even sins. [*ref; Prov 1:16, 4:16 & Is 59:7 KJV*]

There are 24 books in the Hebrew Tanakh (*Bible*), 73 books in the Catholic Bible, and 66 books in the Protestant Bible. The book of Numbers and the scriptures confirming abortions is written in all three. At first glance the Bible only seems to condone abortions in matters of infidelity, nevertheless, some politicians don't want to allow abortions under any circumstance. Do they know better than God? Some opponents of abortion try to restrict the biblical practice of Numbers 5:20-22 to married persons, but this is only because they don't understand biblical Law. Abortions are viewed with the same gravity, weight, and scrutiny as circumcision because there were many factors of impurity/infestation that would prohibit and forbid a person from entering into the congregation of God.

- Forbidden unions (*married or unmarried; Deut 23:2*), mingled people (*sinful ways, not primarily race; but rape, incest, promiscuity and an inclination toward sin*), and the

undisciplined (*those without chastisement/undesired Heb 12:8*). Resultantly we see historical evidence that Israel divorced and abandoned foreign wives and children (*Ezra 10:3*), including those of sexual immorality distastefully called 'mamzers' (*John 8:41*).

- These were important matters of faith because Jehovah deemed the fruit of the womb as a reward; it was not intended to be a burden or a curse. With that, we even learn that Abraham had two sons (*Gal 4:22*), two nations in the womb (*Gen 25:23*), but God hated one and loved the other (*Rom 9:13; the biblical definition of hate is not what you think it is*). but God only established His covenant with one and not the other (*Gen 17:18-19*).
- Even the lessons of Lot and his daughters cautions us against the birthing of pagan (*ways of the world*) children (*illegitimate*). Ergo, Lot and his seed is not listed in the genealogy of Christ (*from Adam to Jesus*).

⁅additional content omitted⁆

In furtherance, the state is not a religious institution, therefore it cannot limit abortions to adultery only. All biblical reasons/causes are applicable. See Halakha and the Kentucky abortion lawsuit involving three Jewish women (*Jessica Kalb, Lisa Sobel, and Sarah Baron*), filed in the Jefferson Circuit Court, Louisville, KY. Court judge, Mitch Perry, ruled (*7/ 22*) that there is "a substantial likelihood" that Kentucky's new abortion laws violate "the rights to privacy and self-determination" protected by Kentucky's constitution. Also see Halakha (*Halakhah; the Way; the totality of laws and ordinances evolved since biblical times that regulate religious observances and daily life*) according to the Bible the way or the path is the true meaning of biblical faith (*Is 35:8, John 14:4 & 6,*) before faith was interpreted as belief/pistis (*Strong's number G4102*) by non-Jewish persons/Greek philosophers. Not all Christians subscribe to theology. Theology is a religious theory about God which is no different than the theory of Atlantis and/or the theory of evolution. Resultantly, "*Jews do not consider life to begin at conception; this religious belief is forced on them by the government*," and/or state church. "*Kentucky's laws are Christian in origin and design and impugn the faith of Jewish Kentuckians*." According to the Midrash Bereishit Rabbah 34:10, life begins "from the moment the fetus emerges from the womb" *(breathes air and becomes a living soul; Genesis 2:7*).

Fifty-five of the most popular versions of the Bible show biblical abortions in Numbers 5:20-22, but no one teaches it. The problem with all religions is that the witch doctor/the religious medium often imposes his or her will on the populous under the guise of a deity. However, in this case, the will of God can be found written in scripture and it clearly speaks for itself.

- 29 versions use the word thigh.
- 8 versions use the word uterus.
- 4 miscarriage (induced abortion).

*1609 The Catholic Public Domain Bible*
*Numbers 5: 20 But if you have turned away from your husband, and also have been defiled, and have lain together with another man, 21 these curses shall be thrown upon you: May the Lord turn you into a curse and an example among all his people. May he cause your thigh to rot, and may your abdomen swell up and burst out. 22 May the cursed waters enter into your stomach, and may your womb swell and your thigh rot.' And the woman shall respond: 'Amen, amen.'*

*New International Version*
*Numbers 5: 20 But if you have gone astray while married to your husband and you have made yourself impure by having sexual relations with a man other than your husband"— 21 here the priest is to put the woman under this curse—"may the LORD cause you to become a curse[a] among your people when he makes your womb miscarry and your abdomen swell. 22 May this water that brings a curse enter your body so that your abdomen swells or your womb miscarries."*

*King James Version*
*Numbers 5: 20 But if thou hast gone aside to another instead of thy husband, and if thou be defiled, and some man have lain with thee beside thine husband: 21 Then the priest shall charge the woman with an oath of cursing, and the priest shall say unto the woman, The LORD make thee a curse and an oath among thy people, when the LORD doth make thy thigh to rot, and thy belly to swell; 22 And this water that causeth the curse shall go into thy bowels, to make thy belly to swell, and thy thigh to rot: And the woman shall say, Amen, amen.*

**State Church & the Dobbs Act**.
The Dobbs Act may be in violation of both religious clauses of the First Amendment (*the Establishment Clause and the Free Exercise Clause*).

**How?**
I've already shown that abortion prohibitions and/or restrictions violate Free Exercise. If it's true that elected and appointed officials, ex-president Trump, Leonard Leo, and the GOP stacked the courts with conservative justices with the intent to reverse Roe v. Wade (*1973*), and Planned Parenthood v. Casey (*1992*) for a religious cause, purpose, and/or reason as so stated on many occasions (*Trump's interview with The Watercooler on Apple Podcasts, CNN's town hall with Kaitlan Collin, etc., and so forth*) then SCOTUS has violated the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment with the formation of a state church/a forced religious practice violating the rights of others. An act in violation of the First Amendment, the separation of church and state; and a irreligious act contrary to scripture.

**Is this truly the formation of a state church?**
Let's examine two interviews with ex-president Trump on an Apple Podcast called "The Water Cooler" with David Brody.

One interview.
*Q. David Brody*
*If Joe Biden gets elected POTUS what does that mean for America exactly?*
*A. Donald Trump*
*Well, I can tell you what it means for your religion, it means choice. It means ah that you're going to put a radical lefty on the court and that's going to be the end of, ah, "pro-life". It, it won't even have a chance. So, that's what it means, no one has been more pro, as you know, you've heard it many times, I think you might've said it yourself, but no one has been more pro-life as president I have. Etc., and so forth.*

Another interview.

Ex-president Trump discussing evangelicals not supporting his early 2024 presidential run and how he (Trump) feels about it.

> *"Nobody as you know and you would know better than anybody, because you do such a great job; nobody has ever done more for "right to life" than Donald Trump. I put three supreme Court Justices who all voted, and they got something that they've all been fighting for, for 64-years, many, many years. Nobody thought they could win it, you know they won it, ah, Roe v Wade, they won, they finally won.*

**Let's be clear; all three branches of government may be**;

- in violation of Free Exercise "if" SCOTUS was stacked to prohibit abortions for religious cause. If the Dobbs decision was enacted for any other moral reason outside of religion, can any branch of government show that those reasons were not arbitrary or capricious? Can they show a compelling government interest?
- in violation of Establishment "if" abortion prohibitions were enacted for religious purposes as suggested by ex-president Trump. "If" true, then the Judicial Branch of government is guilty of establishing a state-church.

**NOTE:**

This document was created within a week of the Dobbs decision reversing Roe, on June 24, 2022. It was mailed to numerous civil rights, and pro-choice organizations, including left-wing media affiliates to test a theory. The theory involves pretense. Are left-wing media organizations merely a conservative guise? What is news? How to focus the reporting of news? No one showed an interest (*minus one vague attempt to reach out*), maybe no one saw it. Everyone continued to frighten the people; business as usual. It's been nearly a year since Dobb's. Laws have been passed, lives have been ruined, and the republicans want to put abortions on the ballot every year until gerrymandering wins the day. The original document dismantled Justice Alito's 98-page opinion in its entirety. To conclude; Justice Alito's leaked abortion draft made a number of interesting points with no legitimate standing. This suggests one of two things, either the Justice was blinded by an agenda, or they lied to congress during confirmation hearings. I say this, because most cases aren't won on the bases of law, but upon the law argued in court; this document contains the right argument. For example, Supreme Court Justice Samuel A. Alito also suggested that the right to an abortion must be based on one or more constitutional rights. So, I show the historical record fastening abortions to the First, Fourth and Ninth Amendments. I employ the writings of Thomas Jefferson and James Madison to define a separation of church and state, and the unenumerated rights of the Ninth Amendment. Why? [1] Because Justice Alito's 98-page opinion made a lot of assumptions and ignored a great of facts about history. [2] Because the Supreme Court yields to the Supreme Law creating it. [3] Because a legitimate function/act of government is permitted or restricted by the grants of enumerated power. All grants and limits of power are either prohibited or authorized by three simple words "shall" and "shall not ". [*The enumerated powers of government are defined and listed/limited [Marbury v. Madison, 1 Cranch 137, 176 (1803) (Marshall, C. J.)*]. This information puts an end to overreach.

- i.e. what is and what isn't a legislative/judicial activity.
- *Shall" or "must" means an action, procedure, or duty is mandatory and/or required.*
- *"Shall not" or "must not" means an action, or procedure is prohibited and/or an obligation not to act and/or to refrain from acting is duly imposed (if done; is not a legitimate act of government). If a legislative and/or judicial body does what is prohibited, then it is not a*

*legitimate legislative or judicial act. Likewise, if the bodies are derelict the same applies (a violation of oaths).*

- The enumerated powers of governments quantify all [official] legislative, judicial, and executive activities. If a legislator, judge, or executive does that which they're prohibited from doing it is not a protected legislative, judicial, or executive activity, and the official(s) is liable (*Ex parte Young, 209 U.S. 123 [1908], religious marriage; child discipline, etc*.). Likewise, if a legislator, judge, or executive neglects to do as required, likewise the same (*for example the senate held no real impeachment trial of ex-president Trump*).
    - As it pertains to domestic violence; campaign promises, congressional hearings, senate debates, and idol talk are all protected by Free Speech and the Speech and Debate Clause. However, the committee and subcommittee hearings listed below specifically sought ways to negate the religious protections of marriage to prosecuted men and women in spite of unprohibited exercise. The problem is *"no punishable deterrents for wayward lawmakers [Maybury v Madison]"*, therefore redress and Ex parte Young must apply. Its unimportant that the legislative and judicial branches of government, including law enforcement officers didn't care to discriminate and/or differentiate between the workings of theocratic household and the violent acts of troubled individual. State actors were "prohibited" from legislating, policing, and ruling on the issue. Hence it was not a legal or lawful legislative and/or judicial activity. *The Supreme Court of the United States maintains the right to declare void any act of Congress because of its unconstitutionality* [*Chief justice Marshall; Marbury v Madison*]. This is called nullification. The same is true concerning "qualified immunity". In this case the Supreme Court has stood in clear violation of constitutional law; for the Court(s) are not enumerated with the powers to make rules or laws; but it may only judicate in matters "arising under" the constitution. Sections 1 & 2, of Article III of the U.S. Constitution creates the Judicial branch of government and limits the judicial power of the Supreme Court within the confines of cases, laws, and equity "arising under" the constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties…
        - Pursuant of Title 42 U.S.C § 1983, Justice Frankfurter negates redress of grievances granted by the First Amendment; the court is not enumerated with the power to do so. Likewise, pursuant of "qualified immunity" SCOTUS negates Due Process granted by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments. SCOTUS is not enumerated with the power to judicate "*above*" the constitution, its grants to the people, and the supremacy of the Supreme Law of the Land. SCOTUS is only enumerated with the powers to judicate matters "arising under" the constitution; it cannot deprive of rights nor prohibit grants.
        - In other words, Title 42 U.S.C § 1983 is an inferior law/a procedural due process law prohibiting superior rights/substantive due process laws pursuant of the Supremacy Clause. The Supremacy Clause guarantees a redress of grievances for all first Amendment violations, therefore, Title 42 U.S.C § 1983 is a deprivation of rights.

- In the matter of the Dobb's the court gravely error in its decision by stating that "*the constitution does not confer a right to abortion [Roe v. Wade, 410 U.S. 113 and Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pa. v. Casey, 505 U.S. 833]*." Did the court forget the Ninth Amendment? The math is simple; is the power to prohibit abortions a federal or state grant of power? If so, then where is the enumeration found in the Constitution under Articles I, II, III & IV (*Legislative, Executive, Judicial and/or State*)? The Ninth and Tenth Amendments implicitly states that all grants and powers not retained by the governments are retained by the people. Is it the government(s) intent to negate, deny, and deprive the rights of the people? Can the courts show a constitutional enumeration for the prohibition of abortion? Can the nation show a compelling government interest? Fact is, abortions have no standing in government. The function of the constitution is to govern the government; so, what does abortion have to do with governing? The overreach is personal (*private*), arbitrary and capricious. Abortions don't fall under the general welfare, full faith and credit, commander-in-chief, necessary and proper, commerce, confrontation, grand jury, takings, appointments, impeachment, war powers, treaty, export, due process, or equal protection clauses of the constitution.
    - General Welfare: governmental concern for the health, peace, morality and safety of its citizens (*a moral obligation to help*). Generally, in reference to spending.
    - Full Faith and Credit: the recognition and enforcement of the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of one state by another.
    - Necessary and Proper: enables Congress to make the laws required for the exercise of its other powers established by the Constitution.

- In order to defined and/or differentiate between the powers delegated to the states and the rights of the people; we look at the Tenth Amendment.

> Tenth Amendment
> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Also see Sections 1 & 2 of Article IV, of the US Constitution, pertaining to powers of the States. Under the Articles of Confederation, the states retained the right to write and enforce its own laws with no compliance to federal rules. Sections 1 & 2 gives full faith and credit to the state's power to lay laws (*public acts*), and judicial proceedings for as long as these activities do not interfere with and/or in any way violate the Privileges and Immunities of federal and state citizenry. At one time in the nation's history the Supreme Court policed state court proceedings by limiting the application of local state laws over another state's laws. This precedent draws much needed attention to the state of Idaho. We ask why hasn't the Court acted upon it? The state of Idaho has made it illegal for others to help a pregnant minor abort through medication or procedures in the state of Idaho and/or in any other state; punishable by two to five years in prison. In short, Idaho has implemented laws restricting travel for abortions and/or to prosecute abortion providers of another state for helping its own

residents/citizens abort [House Bill No. 242 (2023)]. Additionally, the states of Arkansas, Tennessee, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Georgia intend to violate the private medical records of federal citizens residing in their local states for legal out of state abortions. This is a blatant violation of Privacy, Probable Cause, and Illegal Search and Seizures pursuant of the Fourth Amendment. According to afore mentioned abortion statutes, prohibitions only fall under the jurisdiction of the named states. Jurisdiction is at issue. If an alleged crime/abortion was performed in the jurisdiction of another state where abortions are legal then probable cause doesn't exist. The overreach is clearly a violation of privacy and illegal search and seizure. Again, all of these overreaches are procedural due process law imposed against federal citizenry and substantial due process.

- "*We start with start with the first principle. The Constitution creates a Federal Government and enumerated powers [Chief Justice Rehnquist].*" "*This government is acknowledged by all, to be one of enumerated powers [McCulloch v. Maryland, 17 U.S. 316, 405 (1819)].*" "*The powers of the [national] legislature are defined, and limited; and that those limits may not be mistaken or forgotten, the constitution is written [Chief Justice Marshall; Marbury v. Madison (1803)]*". Historically, I can continue to list other cases, all showing a "*pattern and practice*" of governmental attempts in the deprivation of rights. Attempts to tenuously link one enumerated power to another 'ad infinitum' … knowing that governmental acts beyond its enumerated powers are "merely acts of usurpation". So, why say that the constitution does not confer a right to abortion if the constitution was written not to be mistaken or forgotten? Is this tyranny? Is the denial of rights, enforcement of illegal, unlawful, and unconstitutional laws harassment and/or oppression? Is the country being nudged to see if we're still awake?

Again, as it pertains to domestic violence; campaign promises, congressional hearings, senate debates, and idle talk are all protected by Free Speech and the Speech and Debate Clause. However, the committee and subcommittee hearings listed below specifically sought ways to negate the religious protections of marriage to prosecuted men and women in spite of unprohibited exercise;

List of involved congressional acts and senate committee hearings;

- Domestic Violence Terrorism in the Home; Hearing before the Subcommittee on Children, Family, Drugs and Alcoholism of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, United States Senate, One Hundred First Congress, Second Session. April, 19, 1990
- Violent Crimes Against Women: Hearing Before the Committee on the Judiciary, United Stated Senate, One Hundred Third Congress, First Session on the Problems of Violence Against Women in Utah and Current Remedies, Salt Lack City, UT, April 13,1993.
- Domestic Violence; [1]Not just a family matter; Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Crime and Criminal Justice of the Committee on the judiciary, House of Representatives, On hundred Third Congress, Second Session, June 30. 1994.

[1] The title in itself is an admission of guilt (*unprohibited exercise*).

- Implementation of the Violence Against Women Act; Hearing Before the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, On Hundred Third Congress, Second Session on the Implementation of the Violence Against Women Act provisions of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act (Public Law 103-322), September 29, 1994];

Title 42 U.S.C § 1983, is the first prohibition against the people's right to petition the Government for redress of grievances; and is thereby illegal, unlawful, and unconstitutional. The ability to prohibit redress is not an enumerated grant or power. The act to prohibit redress is prohibited by both the First Amendment and the Supremacy Clause. Thereby, Title 42 U.S.C § 1983 it is not an authorized activity for any branch of government.

> First Amendment
> … shall make no law… prohibiting… the right of the people… to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

All federal complaints filed in federal court fall under the jurisdictions of various federal codes. The nature of a suit must be selected from a list of codes for all cases filed in federal courts. This is the first barrier preventing citizens from suing the government, legislators, and judicial officers' acting in official capacity, under the color of law, and/or state-actors. A federal judge may offer an "*Opinion and Order Summary Dismissing Complaint for Failure to State a Claim upon which Relief can be Granted*" to dismiss the case, stating that the plaintiff failed to file a suitable claim under Title 42 U.S.C § 1983. This is the reason most attorneys shy away from First Amendment cases. In which case, please remember these three words; "shall" and "shall not". If the government does that which its prohibited from doing, and/or abstains from an obligation then it is a dereliction of duty, a violation of oaths, is not an enumerated power of government; and no protections apply. Both the government(s) and the state-actors are liable; have no immunities under Title 42 U.S.C § 1983.

> Title 42 U.S.C § 1983
> …shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress, except that in any action brought against a judicial officer for an act or omission taken in such officer's judicial capacity, injunctive relief shall not be granted unless a declaratory decree was violated or declaratory relief was unavailable.

Most First Amendment cases involving Redress are turned away by Title 42 U.S.C § 1983, and this is why the governments tend to trample First Amendment Rights (*remember the tear gas shot at peaceful George Floyd protestors*). Under Title 42 U.S.C § 1983, it's assumed that all legislative acts are protected activities, but thanks to the Trump administration, including but not limited to Congressman Mo Brooks the courts were forced to disclose exactly what is and what isn't an official legislative and/or judicial activity. Justice Frankfurter's opinion for Title 42 U.S.C § 1983, was predicated on the 1689 English Bill of Rights, the Articles of Confederation, and the Speech and Debate Clause of Article I (*Legislative*), Section 6 of the U.S. Constitution.

- [First] the 1689 English Bill of Rights ask for redress twice.
- [Second] Article III of the Articles of Confederation was written to protect the religious freedoms and sovereignty of the Thirteen Colonies.

- [Third] the Speech and Debate Clause of the U.S. Constitution was "only" written to protect elected or appointed officials from retaliation from other branches of government. Even though the Speech and Debate is often entwined with Free Speech of the First Amendment; the D.O.J. (*Mo Brooks*) concluded that free speech, political speech, speech against the Constitution and/or the status quo is not a legislative activity. Neither are the legislative and judicial acts which these official bodies are prohibited from doing, because of the words "shall" or "shall not".
- [Forth] our country was not formed by the laws or documents preceding it/the ideals that the founding fathers refused and discarded. The United States was formed by the ideals that the founders selected and chose. For example, eight of the original Thirteen Colonies contained laws restricting religious freedoms in their perspective state constructions during the old Confederation. All of those restrictions were then removed under the New Constitution of these United States.

The U.S. Constitution founded the nation by forming our system of government. Hence, the Constitution governs the government by prescribing grants and limits of power. Therefore, the enumerated powers of government are defined and limited.

- The first American Experiment was formed by The Articles of Confederation adopted by the Continental Congress on November 15, 1777. This document served as the United States' first constitution and was in force from March 1, 1781, until March 4, 1789. Only eight short years. Too many short comings, weaknesses, oversights, and problems. Therefore, it was rejected and replaced.
- The second American Experiment was formed by the U.S. Constitution, written September 17, 1787, ratified 1788, and has been in operation since 1789 (*ratified all states May 29, 1790*), a total of 234-years.
- A rebellion against the United States by the Confederate States of America (*CSA a.k.a. the Confederate States or the Confederacy*) lasted four short years from February 8, 1861, to May 9, 1865.

Please note the following:
*[(McCulloch v. Maryland; Justice Marshall)" … the power of the federal government is "defined and limited" and therefore: "Every law enacted by Congress must be based on one or more of its powers enumerated in the Constitution"]. [(Marbury v. Madison, 1 Cranch 137, 176 (1803) (Marshall, C. J.). "The powers of the legislature are defined and limited; and that those limits may not be mistaken, or forgotten, the constitution is written"]. Chief Justice Marshall's expressed opinion [(We admit, as all must admit, that the powers of the Government are limited, and that its limits are not to be transcended. But we think the sound construction of the Constitution must allow to the national legislature that discretion with respect to the means by which the powers it confers are to be carried into execution which will enable that body to perform the high duties assigned to it in the manner most beneficial to the people. Let the end be legitimate, let it be within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited, but consist with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are Constitutional; 17 U.S. 421.)]. "A Law repugnant to the Constitution is void". Marbury v. Madison (1803) Chief Justice Marshall.*

Please remember that the Slaughter-House Cases, 83 U.S. 36 (1872) identified two forms of citizenship in the United States: federal and state. Federal citizens are entitled to substantive Due Process according to its constitutional guarantee. State citizens, according to the slaughterhouse cases, pertains to the children and/or the creations of a state such as corporations. This form of citizenship is governed by procedural due process laws. However, it's not uncommon for local governments to impose procedural due process laws on federal citizens, especially in courtrooms. Unfortunately, substantive Due Process rights must be hard fought. This is no easy trick because if the courts were actually forced to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt them the system would collapse under the volume of its own weight (*case logs*).

> Fourteenth Amendment Section 1.
> All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States (federal) and of the state wherein they reside (state)….
>
> [*Satisfying legislative procedure alone is not enough to satisfy Due Process (Chicago, B. & Q.R. Co v Chicago 166 US 226,237 (1897) Justice Harlan*].
>
> Federal citizenship is the reason all state policing agencies need probable cause to detain and arrest federal citizens. Resultantly, there are many ways to eradicate police brutality and unarmed police shootings.

- The information contained in this document clearly shows that abortions have been a longstanding religious exercise for 5,179-years; recently prohibited by the narrow frame of Catholic dogma 435-years ago in 1588, and 166-years ago by the American Medical Association (*AMA*) in 1857. Please note that the AMA is not a religious organization. Please note that Catholics are divided on the issue of abortions as well as Protestants. Simply because others fail to understand their rights/religion, this doesn't mean that you must surrender yours. *[(450 U.S. 707 Thomas v Review Board of the Indiana Employment Security Division; the court also erred in apparently giving significant weight to the fact that another religious practitioner might yield their faith. The courts should not undertake or dissect religious beliefs on the surrendered grounds of others. The free exercise of religion is not limited to beliefs which are shared by all members of a religious sect;)*]. The passing of abortion laws (*may have*) improperly relied on lessor facts that others "struggling" with their beliefs… were not able to "articulate" their beliefs precisely (450 U.S. 707 Thomas v Review Board of the Indiana Employment Security Division).
- [*Thomas v. Review board 450 U.S. 707; a person may not be compelled to choose between the exercise of a First Amendment right and any other programs or consequence*].

Thus, in Justice Alito's 98-page opinion he claims that an abortion is not an enumerated (*listed*) right retained by the people. I've already shown this to be false, but more than that, the people seem to yield in acquiesce. Even Justice Thomas is of the opinion that the courts should revisit the issue of contraceptives, same sex marriage, and same sex intercourse. Why? Is the America government God's government on earth or is there truly a wall of separation between church and state? Regardless of our views about sin and iniquity, even the Lord Jesus was wise enough to let the wheat grow with the tare until the time of the harvest least we root up the wheat with them (*Matthew 13:29*). This is the proper Christian attitude that God commanded people to have. If a

doesn't want their children to be influenced by pagan sexuality (*including fornication*) then they should raise them accordingly. If you don't want your child's school to be assaulted by an act of vengeance, then teach them to stop bullying (*to love their neighbor as themselves*). It's not the government's responsibility to make a better world; it's yours. Even if abortions weren't predicated on the First Amendment, they would still be protected by the Ninth Amendment. But to answer Alito's question regarding his speculation of history; wondering if the founding fathers knew about and or intended to include abortions when they wrote the Bill of Rights; I show Thomas Jefferson's and Ben Franklin's views on abortion prior to ratification of the Bill of Rights (*12/15/1791*). Both were well aware of it, and one even wrote an instruction manual for inducing abortions. To be frank, I'm surprised Justice Alito would try to throw out the Ninth Amendment with his opinion. The Ninth Amendment is one of the most powerful amendments in the entire Bill of Rights. So, much so that the courts have nearly done all to avoid discussing it altogether.

> **Justice Thomas; marital privacy and contraceptives… brief overview**
> The Bible tells a very interesting story about privacy and/or the lack of privacy during sexual relations. Additional references can be found in the Book of Records. In Genesis 6:2-4 and Jude 6 we learn that a rogue group of angels left their first estate including their own habitation to marry earthly women and bear unnatural seed. This story is repeated in Jasher 4:17-18, Jubilees (*lessor Genesis*) 5:1-3 and Enoch 6:1-7, providing a list of all of the captains of the angels conspiring to commit the sin. However, the book of Reuben supplies the greatest amount of detail as to why the angels/watchers looked upon the daughters of men and took them for wives. According to Habakkuk 1:13 it's said that the eyes of the Lord are far too pure to behold iniquity; so according to the Book of Records God appointed angels/watchers to assist mankind on the earth and to observe them whenever they were in sin (*Ezekiel; many were clothed with eyes*). According to Reuben 2:17-18 the angels/watchers observed the people's sin and because of which they were allured by the beauty of women during their fornications and lusted after them, married them and bore unnatural seed. This portion of the story denotes a lack of privacy due to sin. However, the second half of the story defines marital privacy as protected by the First and Fourth Amendments. In book of Hebrews 13:4 its written that marriage is honorable and the bed undefiled. This passage has several specific meanings, but I'll only discuss one because it forbad the angels/watchers from observing marital relations sanctified by the Lord Himself. Does Justice Thomas know better than God? Is SCOTUS the new watchers? Is there an enumerated grant of power to allow it?

In Justice Alito's 98-page opinion (*Dobbs decision/abortion*), the justice wanted to know if the founding fathers intended to include abortion rights in the Ninth Amendment. But to the contrary, history shows that the federalist assumed that the government(s) would never attempt such an overreach to negate it. Fact is, abortions and contraceptive's have always been a legal practice in America since the Pilgrims' first arrived (*mainly married women*) … and were common enough to appear in the legal and medical records of the period (*common law era*). Official abortion laws didn't appear in the United States until 1821 (*Connecticut*) to protect women from risky/poisonous abortion procedures. A series of copy-cat laws spanning 127-years (*1825-1952*) showed 37 states copied Connecticut's law with extensive overreach. This anti-abortion effort began 34 years after the signing of the Constitution and the ratification of the Bill of Rights (*1791*). But I digress, yes, the founding fathers intended to include abortion rights in the Ninth Amendment. Thomas Jefferson was well aware of the issue of abortion due to his comments and observations about Native Americans bearing fewer children. We also know that Ben Franklin was personally acquainted with the issue, because he published an at home abortion recipe in a 1748 booklet called "The American Instructor or Young Man's Best Companion". Both of these men (*Jefferson and Franklin*) signed the Constitution at Independence Hall and ratified the Bill of Rights at Federal Hall.

Query;

> This country was founded on religious freedoms, particularly the right to worship according to the dictates of one's conscious, not forced to worship in a specific manner and/or simply the right not to worship at all. Some scholars take this to mean that the constitution is anti-religious, while others say neutral, but both point to the "No Religious Test" to support their arguments. Article VI specifies that "no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States." This prohibition banned a longstanding discriminatory practiced originating in England which was brought to America. While it is true that the United States was originally formed as a Christian nation we still have to ask; is congress/SCOTUS the new King George III?

Alito's 98-page opinion also called into question several comments made by Justice Amy Barrett (*Catholic*). If it's true, that SCOTUS aims to take heed and focus on the U.S. Constitution, then Free Exercise can only be determined by those long-standing religious practices found in history and not from the established interpretations of church dogma. Why make the point? In 1588, Pope Sixtus V. claimed that all abortions were murder, but in 1930 this view was reversed by Pope Pius XI. For some reason the church seems to be unsure. Yes, the Catholic Church has consistently viewed abortion as a sexual sin, however, an abortion is not a sexual act. With that aside, the church has not always regarded an abortion as homicide. In other words, the Catholic church has been established for 1,698-years since the formation of the church at the Council of Nicaea in 325 A.D., but it didn't define any church laws, canon, or opinion on the issue until 1,263-years later (*435-years ago*), while Judaism has been practicing religious abortions for 5,179 years. Is the Catholic view a valid interpretation of scripture? Why make the point? In 1993 we were introduced to the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (*RFRA*), but perhaps it's time to define "religion" and all of its associated exercises. Perhaps the courts should impose a test to determine free exercise. A test regarding the established validity of a religious practice based on its source (*text*) verses those interpretation which may otherwise be fraudulent and/or man-made.

- If abortions are defined by scripture as a religious practice, then it's irreligious to be pro-life.
- Please know the difference between scripture doctrine and dogma. Please remember that a religious theory called theology is no different than the theory of Atlantis, or the theory of evolution. Why make the point? Because legislators stacked the courts with a self-righteous indignation based on theories and they were wrong.

[additional content omitted this section]

**Additional information on the First Amendment; Separation of Church and State.**

**Separation denotes privacy [ref First, Fourth (privacy), and Ninth Amendments].**

Both Jefferson and Madison are recorded to define both religious clauses of the First Amendment to be a division, a divide, and a wall of separation between church and state. Let's turn to history.

- On January 1, 1802, Thomas Jefferson distinctly defined this matter in a letter to the Danbury Baptist Association. It reads; "Believing with you that religion is a matter which lies solely between Man and his God, that he owes account to none other for his faith or his worship, that the legitimate powers of government reach actions only, and not opinions, I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should "make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," thus building a wall of separation between Church & State."

- On June 8, 1789, James Madison concurs, as it is recorded in the Annals of Congress 434, to have written a text stating that: "The civil rights of none shall be abridged on account of religious belief or worship, nor shall any national religion be established, nor shall the full and equal rights of conscience be in any manner, or on any pretense, infringed."
- In furtherance, during a House debate on the subject; Madison explained that "he apprehended the meaning of the words to be, that Congress should not establish a religion, and enforce the legal observation of it by law, nor compel men to worship God in any Manner contrary to their conscience"; August 17, 1789, Annals of Congress 730.
- Thomas Jefferson and the Virginia Act for Establishing Religious Freedom; We hold it for a fundamental and undeniable truth, 'that religion or the duty which we owe to our Creator and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence.' The Religion then of every man must be left to the conviction and conscience of every man; and it is the right of every man to exercise it as these may dictate. This right is in its nature an unalienable right.
- James Madison, Virginia Declaration of Rights, 1776; "All men are equally entitled to the full and free exercise of religion according to the *dictates of conscience.*
- Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776.

  When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

  We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.

- James Madison is quoted, because he often revered as "The Father of the Constitution".

First Amendment
Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.
[additional content omitted this section]

**Additional information on the Ninth Amendment**
Federalist, and anti-federalist; James Madison, Roger Sherman, and James Wilson all define the Ninth Amendment; again, let's turn to history.

- During the ratification of the U.S. Constitution, debates emerged between Federalist and Anti-Federalists. The Anti-Federalists believed that if a Bill of Rights were omitted from the Constitution, then the government(s) would eventually assume too much power and walk over the people. The Federalists believed a Bill of Rights was unnecessary because the powers of government were limited, and such a thing could never happen (*if government officials stayed in their lanes*). Roger Sherman argued that a state bill of rights

was still in force, hence a national bill of rights was unnecessary. Ironically, one of the opposing groups was extremely naïve or deceitful, while the other was not. Thus, the Anti-Federalists vociferously complained about the absence of a bill of rights. In response, supporters of the Constitution (*Federalists*) such as James Wilson argued that a bill of rights would be dangerous. Enumerating any rights, Wilson argued, might imply that all those not listed were surrendered. And, because it was impossible to enumerate all the rights of the people (*implying that the list would be excessively long and/or fail to list all important rights*), a bill of rights might actually be construed to justify the government's power to limit any liberties of the people that were not enumerated/listed (*exactly what the government is doing today*). Nevertheless, because the Anti-Federalists demands for a bill of rights resonated with the public, Federalists like James Madison countered with a pledge to offer amendments after the Constitution's ratification. The first draft of the Ninth Amendment read as follows.

> *"The exceptions here or elsewhere in the constitution, made in favor of particular rights, shall not be so construed as to diminish the just importance of other rights retained by the people; or as to enlarge the powers delegated by the constitution; but either as actual limitations of such powers, or as inserted merely for greater caution.***"**

In a speech, Madison voiced the same concerns as Wilson, as he explained his proposed precursor of the Ninth Amendment in terms that connected it directly with Federalist objections to the Bill of Rights… the precursor reads as follows.

> *"It has been objected also against a bill of rights, that, by enumerating particular exceptions to the grant of power, it would disparage those rights which were not placed in that enumeration, and it might follow by implication, that those rights which were not singled out, were intended to be assigned into the hands of the general government, and were consequently insecure. This is one of the most plausible arguments I have ever heard urged against the admission of a bill of rights into this system; but, I conceive, that may be guarded against."*

The Committee dropped Madison's proposed declaration and rewrote the Ninth Amendment as it reads today.

> NOTE: the Bill of Rights was written/intended to be included in the U.S. Constitution after Article I, § 9 [*Legislative Branch*]. The Tenth Amendment was destined to be inserted after Article VI as the new Article VII [*after Supreme Law*], but at the urging of Roger Sherman's the Bill of Rights eventually emerged from the House as a list of amendments to be appended to the end of the Constitution, rather than integrated within the text. Sherman so declared that congress had no power to alter the wording or context of a constitution that had been approved by the people. On June 28, 1787, during the debate at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, Connecticut delegate Roger Sherman asserted: "The question is not what rights naturally belong to men; but how they may be most equally & effectually guarded in Society (*then why are the governments always trying to take these rights away, and why do the courts claim citizens don't have them; see* ***FIG A***.
>
> > Since the enactment of the Ninth Amendments, scholars and judges have argued about the meaning and legal effect of the Ninth Amendment, and the courts have rarely relied upon it.

- The Ninth Amendment defines 'other un-enumerated rights' as 'all un-enumerated rights retained by the people'. Madison argued that any attempt to enumerate fundamental liberties would be incomplete and might imperil other freedoms not listed. A "positive declaration of some essential rights could not be obtained in the requisite latitude," Madison said. "If an enumeration be made of all our rights, will it not be implied that everything omitted is given to the general governments?" Ergo, the framers of our Constitution enumerated the powers of the general governments and gave everything else to the people. In many cases of modern law, the States lay claim to the rights retained by the people. The verbiage of the Ninth Amendment was eventually reduced and simplified, but the grants remain the same.

Ninth Amendment
The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

[additional content omitted]

**FIG A**
Supplemental First Amendment abortion issue.

The religious rights to an abortion and/or abortifacients are only retained by the parents of an unborn child. Any non-parental persons, groups, governments, agencies, corporations, organizations, and/or institutions, causing a woman's fruit to depart from her (*abort/miscarry*) shall surely be punished by the punishment laid upon the person, group, government, agency, corporation, organization, and/or institution by the woman's husband according to Exodus 21:22 (*KJV & NLT*). If the woman is unmarried, then the punishment shall be established by the father of the child and/or the father of the woman, and/or by the woman's siblings and/or by her father's siblings and/or closest kinsperson in succession to the woman according to Numbers 27:8-11 (*KJV*). In this regard, First Amendment protections may charge any government agency, official and/or state actor with First Amendment violations and deprivations of rights, subject to redress of grievances. Uniquely, the punishment (*compensation*), penalty and/or redress attached to the unprohibited exercise removes any preestablished limits on torts in compliance to the exercise identified in Exodus 21:22 (*KJV & NLT*), as determined by a judge/court. The demand for redress, remedy, and/or liability is not only justified under both civil and criminal procedures, statutes, codes, and laws, but now the First Amendment; this negatively impacts the appeals process; particularly for private actors. The First Amendment has never been viewed in such a way before, but the language is clear, unprohibited exercise is to be upheld by the laws of the land. Even though the paradigm is consistent with judicial proceedings it represents an odd type of Sharia Law for Christians in America. It removes the protections of those causing an unnatural miscarriage and//or nonparental abortion. The word judge refers to an appointed biblical judge of God's people. A person dedicated to judging correctly/justly as demanded by scripture. This judge is to be present in Grand Jury proceedings and/or depositions if remedies are to be presented before trial.

> Actions that may cause the loss of an unborn child includes but is not limited to, direct or indirect actions, neglect, negligence, violent acts, drugs, raids, detention, fear, stress, abuse, traffic stops, etc.

Keywords
Abortion, abortion, abortion, abortion, abort, abortifacients, legal, constitution, constitutional, US Constitution, U.S. Constitution, first amendment, law, lawful, religious, Christian, Christianity, right, rights, civil, civil rights, illegal, unconstitutional, advice, advise, help, safe, procedure, drug, pill, pills, medicine, medicines, induce, court, supreme court, SCOTUS, Roe v Wade, Roe v. Wade, Roe vs Wade, Roe vs, Wade, Roe Wade, Dobb's, Dobbs decision, jail, arrest, medical, doctor, clinic, choice, pro-choice, pro-life, planned parenthood, contraceptives, sex, safe sex, adopt, adoption, over-the -counter, prescription, preacher, priest, catholic, protestant, orthodox, orthodoxy, fetus, womb, thigh, rot, pregnant.