

The Abortion Issue

And Your Rights!

The Abortion Issue has flared up since the 1960s when it was universally considered immoral, a hushed-up topic and was forbidden and punished by law at the State level. The issue reached the supreme Court by 1973, culminating in the case of *Roe v. Wade* [410 US 113], which allowed the practice as national policy. As its notoriety increased over the years, abortion has become an electoral single-issue topic or an irrelevant polarizing hot-button.

But abortion is not an isolated conundrum in the grand parade of social problems; it is central to the mechanics of society based on the relation of citizens and their government. The Preamble to the US Constitution recognizes the priority of *We, the People* over government. The Preamble indicates the blessings ordained and established thereby are for "ourselves and our *posterity*." Citizenship, prior to the Civil War era, was by inheritance and place of birth or by inheritance and naturalization; both were *jus sanguinis*, by blood. This sovereignty of citizenship was

based on the fundamental authority of the *family unit*, a large family unit.

The Civil War did not end with victory; it was not a war of conquest against a separate sovereignty. It only had a "cessation of hostilities" and then the real issue of the war continued through *legal process*. Congress proposed to add to the *sovereign body* of the United States but was unable because that sovereignty was by inheritance alone. Congress in fact does not want any more Citizens like the original, nor be limited to powers they granted by the Constitution, but proposed instead to make a peculiar class of persons directly subject to Congress. **Instead of People acting in their sovereign capacity to create government, government purports to make its own subjects.** The 14th amendment begins, "All persons born ..."

In *Roe v. Wade*, Justice Blackmun: "If this suggestion of personhood (of the fetus under the 14th amendment) is established, the appellant's case, of course, collapses, for the fetus' right to life would then be guaranteed specifically by the amendment." Except it says, "All persons born," none others have legal standing in law. How is a fetus considered a person under the 14th amendment with even statutory privileges

if it is not yet born? **There is a reason why the unborn child is in this legal no-man's-land.** Rights originate from the nature of the creation, whether *rights* from God when He created the various Peoples of this world or *privileges and immunities* from man when he created subjects through legislation. God revealed Himself to the ancestors of these various Peoples. He made covenants with them and their posterity, forever. Being an *offspring, progeny, a natural person* according to this, there is no contravening or interfering thing of man with "the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God." Such offspring are the product of and the same status as their parents, all the way back.

You are an inch from understanding the connection between *Roe v. Wade* and your legal status. If I wanted to disconnect you from your inheritable rights, I'd make a gap between your parents' rights and you. *Posterity* is a continuous process, life doesn't *begin* at conception, life *continues* at conception. Rights *continue* uninterrupted at conception; the right to life of the parents is the same right of their unborn offspring. By the 14th amendment declaring you must be born to be recognized, that nine-month gap between conception and birth separates

you from the rights you should have inherited from your parents, *in law*. The abortion issue, in light of the 14th amendment, reveals the broken status or relation you have with government. You are born into this world as a blank sheet of paper on which the legislature can begin writing. No other legal status arrives with you when you are born, according to the 14th amendment. This point spills over into every social issue, be it race, gender, religion, suffrage, borders, money, you name it. These will be all tied together as the *Uniform Theory of Social Issues*. **And since the 14th amendment is hostile to every man's liberty, the abortion issue is not limited to the sole privilege of women to choose.**

Every Pro-Life supporter also thinks their legal status is derived from the 14th amendment. That's how you are a citizen, right? That's your equal protection, right? The 14th is the most important part of the constitution, right? Without the 14th you have nothing, right? **Pro-Life and the 14th amendment are each based on contrary principles. Pro-Life and pro-14th amendment statements argued together are ignored by courts.** Pro-Lifers have yet to resolve all of their ideas within the *Uniform Theory of Social Issues*.

Pro-Life supporters want to add a right-to-life amendment to the Constitution. It already exists, it's the Preamble. 'Question is, do they have the understanding and legal status to make that claim?

Parties to a court case make the best arguments they can but perhaps some points are unknown to them and they make ineffective arguments. Poorly framed arguments mean justices are free to roam about. Justice Blackmun's comment though, the fetus' right to life would be guaranteed if it was a person under the 14th amendment, places the privilege of abortion on bedrock, regardless of other points. You attach to it? Valid abortion.

Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization [597 U.S. 215] "overruled" *Roe v. Wade*. The majority relied on the nebulous oxymoron, *ordered liberty*, and referred the exact definition of this, and the abortion issue, back to the States. No one brought up the nature of 14th amendment personhood. If only pro-choice people knew how to better argue the point! They could get further on this and countless other issues.

Also not mentioned, the 14th amendment has a Section 5, "The Congress shall have

power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article." Notice how quickly Congress passed *The Respect for Marriage Act* [2023], protecting same-sex marriage, after the *Dobbs* decision, concerned the supreme Court would reverse its support for such relationships. It was perceived that an Act of Congress was needed to fulfill Section 5 of the 14th amendment. Tucker Carlson laughed, "Homosexual marriage is already protected by the supreme Court! Why would they pass this law now?" But Congress knew it must pass legislation on the subject to completely remove it from State jurisdiction and fulfill all of the provisions of the 14th amendment. The homosexual union issue is not well understood by the public and is generally tolerated if not considered immoral. The abortion issue, however, will be a hard sell to get the public to overwhelmingly approve abortion on the scale desired by Congress including abortion right up to the moment of birth for any reason whatsoever. But it will happen. **Pro-Lifers have little understanding of how abortion fits into the Big Picture nor how they are unwitting promoters of it.** The 14th amendment must go!