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**Thesis Generator**

While Abortion is wrong because it is killing of the unborn baby, Conservatives believe, its against the tenet of the ten commandments in Exodus 20:13, "Thou shalt not kill”. But to the Liberals, ROE V. WADE should not be overturned by the supreme court, because the US constitutional law upholding since 1973 is 50 years old as a legal statue. Overturning Roe v. wade is an infringement on the fundamental human rights of females’ right to their bodies. And Women have a right to be prolife or prochoice about abortion when it is medically necessary.

**THESIS STATEMENT**

Perhaps, pro-life, or pro-choice is the right option or temperament towards Roe v.Wade abortion. But independent opinion in the seeming mayhem may not be a bad idea if the woman’s human rights, dignity, and bodily integrity are protected. Perhaps, to stave off the heat and trauma generated by the infamous supreme court judgment overturning the 50-year-old Roe v. Wade on June 24th, 2022. But some may see the independent as someone who has no contribution nor performs any action but sitting on the fence or sideline. Not precisely, because there are several options to explore for any victim of abortion. More study is required about the US Supreme court’s role in overturning Roe v. Wade. Such judgment seems to suit the political and religious aspirations of the conservative Christians and the GOPs, due to the tenet of the ten commandments “Thou shalt not kill.” This is understandable. But, to the Liberal Christian Democrats, the decision by the supreme court to overturn Roe v. Wade is unconstitutional, and they are not encouraged by this. The top court decision is an affront to a woman's right to choose or decide about her body regarding abortion. And to the Independents Liberals and some moderate conservatives, the supreme court must be seen as an impartial body of laws despite the breaking storms of religious and political controversies surrounding abortion. And the highest court must remain an unwavering jurisprudence and an arbiter, interpreting the legal philosophy and laws of the land without fear or favor.

**THE ROE V. WADE JUDGMENT 2022 AND THE**

**INCONSEQUENTIAL CONTROVERSIES**

1. **Introduction**

Given the historical and uneven landscapes in the series of legal judgments on abortion rights, 1973-2023, both left and right socio-political spectrums are still weary of abortion phobia and euphoria. And they find the controversies generated intense and sometimes palpable. “A woman's right to choose what happens to her body is an issue that often makes headlines. In 2022, the US Supreme Court made the controversial decision to overturn *Roe v Wade*, the 1973 law which made access to safe abortion a constitutional right (Dhairyawan, 2023). Even so, until now, many unanswered questions about Roe v. Wade need to unravel why there has been no end in sight to abortion rights in the United States of America for five straight decades. And why are abortion rights and activism still stirring up such gigantic frenzies of political and religious controversies? Sometimes, it is visibly spewing up durst of anguish and hatred within and outside political parties and among Christian denominations. Thereby creating storms of dogmatic dilemmas causing excruciating emotional pains and untold misery and suffering to the pregnant victims of the unborn child. Yet, after 50 years of Rove v. Wade judgments, what roles, if any, are truthfully and judiciously played by biblical doctrines, leadership, theological scholars, and the judiciary, perhaps based on the 13th and 14th amendments in the US constitution? This study will investigate the legal sensitivity of the US supreme court as an arbiter of justice, human rights, and the dignity of women. And it will determine the extent political and religious controversies surrounding Roe v. Wade may have partly or wholly played and influenced the court’s decision to overturn 50-year-old legal statutes on abortion. Thereby causing untold seismic shifts, earthquakes in the US religious and socio-polity, never seen before compared to the alarming controversies surrounding the voting rights Act of 1965.

**Length and breadth of study**

This study will analyze historical precedents, and political facts, religious, and fundamental human rights about Roe v. Wade overturned by the supreme court on the 24th of June 2022. And will investigate the timelines of the supreme court judgments as they reflect the 13th and 14th amendments of the US constitution, from 1973 - 2022. It will assess the new adjudication if the ethos of external political bidding by the conservative Gops or the evangelicals, and the pathos of some peculiar extreme liberalism or orthodox religiosity tainted the recent judgment. Sutton, B. (2023), suggests the “June 24, 2022, a decision that voided Roe v. Wade raises grave concerns about resurgent forms of authoritarianism even in democracies.” Olasky, M. (2023), states that, *“INDIVIDUALS AND GROUPS”* that seek to restrict access to abortion often use-prenatal [unborn children] to lay on people’s emotional associations.” Most likely, the pressure from hardcore-religious and political conservativism from the GOP right and the hard-core liberal progressivism from the DEM’s left (earlier mentioned), may have significantly influenced the outcomes of some legal judgments, past and present, in red and blue states in the US. Moreover, it will seek how these political parties and religious denominations can approach and utilize a common ground to embrace some forms of collaboration to give and take. For example, they can trade places without compromising their secular or Christian doctrines or values but agree to disagree, or agree maturely. And it will determine how each state can play collective roles to exercise their preferred regulatory laws about abortion without harassing or coercing the female victims and resident in their states to flee the state, nor using any false biblical doctrines, legal, or medical sanctions to intimidate and force them against their will.

Davis, M. F. (2022), Under longstanding Supreme Court precedents,

particularly Roe v. Wade (1973) and Planned Parenthood v. Casey (1992), the

federal constitution set a baseline for abortion access as a fundamental right

nationwide this fundamental right had been grounded in the liberty provision of

the federal form as a matter of substantive due process, reflecting the

constitution's underlying values of liberty, dignity, equality, and bodily

integrity (pp. 851, 912).

**Initial Supreme Court Ruling in 1973 and the 14th Amendment Rights**

Center for reproductive rights (2023), In its landmark ruling in Roe v. Wade,

410 U.S. 113 (1973), the Supreme Court recognized that the right to abortion is

a fundamental human right protected by the Fourteenth Amendment of the

Constitution-which guarantees everyone the right to make personal decisions -

about family and childbearing.

1. **Description of the problem**

To many, the overturning of Row v. Wade in 2022 by the US supreme court is erroneous and problematic. In the US, the unpredictable Abortion rights and series of leading court judgments often create awkward issues for both parties, GOPs, and Dems. Aceves, W. (2023), “In anticipation of the Court’s decision, several states adopted “trigger laws” restricting abortion.” These states’ punitive actions cause pain, torn emotions, and anxiety to pro-choice Christians leaning toward the Democratic party. Most likely, the pro-life stance of the conservative is in observance of a tenet of the Old Testament commandment in Exodus 20:13: “Thou shalt not kill.”

**Complete U-Turn by the supreme court in 2022:** Whereas “In Dobbs v.

Jackson Women's Health Organization (2022), the US Supreme Court overturned

longstanding court precedents that protected abortion as a fundamental right.

Without that federal baseline, many states pass restrictive laws threatening

providers and complicating patient care (Davis, M. F. 2022).

Wade, R. (2022). Combining religion-state relations and comparative

constitutional law might sound like a recipe for controversy between women

who were denied the procedure had experienced a substantial increase in debt,

bankruptcies, evictions, -In contrast, women who had received an abortion had

remained stable or improved. Empirical evidence (para. 3). Sutton, G. (2023,

February), The economic toll of these bans stretches far into the future,

beyond the moment of birth, imposing a substantial obstacle on socioeconomic

freedom and often revealing legislative hypocrisy.

The series of supreme court judgments against abortion rights is scary. They

cause psychological and emotional pain, mostly among minority women victims,

especially teenage moms who cannot stand the socioeconomic rigors and the stigmas

often associated with abortion. The abortion laws in red states intend to subject the

victims to arrests and fines, and even imprisonment if they attempt to carry

out abortion surgery or even buy abortion pills online or in blue states like California,

New Jersey, and Washington.

**B. Counterclaim**

Abortion rights should be a personal choice made either by the pro-lifer or the

pro-choicer individually, to decide on her own, or as a woman or mother concerned

on one hand or left to those affected, comprising the woman and family after due.

consultation with the family’s physician, who is a pediatrician and gynecologist, for

the safety and health of the mother and the unborn child.

Ziegler, M. (2020), Pro-lifers maintained that legal abortion would

psychologically affect women and put the disabled at risk. Introduction (p. 11,

para. 1).

Matsuura, H. (2022): On the 24th of June, the Supreme Court

overturned Rove v. Wade, a landmark ruling that established the constitutional

right to abortion almost five decades ago (Dobbs v. Jackson, Women’s Health

Organization 2022). Editorial. (para. 1).

**C. Thesis Statement**

This study will unfold the political and religious ramifications and the

acrimony between conservative Christians, the GOPs, and the liberal Christians, the

Dems party over pitching endless political and legal battles about rights and wrongs,

the dos and don’ts, and the vindictive arguments that won’t quickly go away in fifty

years of history in the aftermath of Rove v. Wade, 1973-2022.

Balkin, J. M. (Ed.). (2023):  In 1973-Roe v. Wade struck down the abortion

laws of most states on a single opinion- over reproductive rights. Political

strategizing around Roe helped energized two social movements- divided into

two political parties over abortion rights. The process became a central issue

in the Federal judicial nominations-symbolizing the proper roles of courts in a

democratic society. Introduction. (para. 1).

Balkin reveals the fundamental causes of rifts over abortion rights, purely on

religious and political grounds. There seems to be a clash between the liberal

fundamental human rights of women and the conservatives’ sacred religious rites.

**II. Main Argument One**

**A**. Abortion is against the will of God and, therefore, unacceptable. And conservative

Christians, Evangelicals, Pentecostals, mainstream Methodists, Protestants, the GOP, and some liberal Christians stand by the scripture, *“Thou shalt not kill”* (KJV, Exodus 20:13: a tenet of Ten Commandments). Mohor-Obreja, B.(2023), The Orthodox Church has always taught that human life begins at conception when sperm fuses with an egg to produce a living. (Abstract).The fused eggs are spermed-up eggs and not embryonic fetus.

**B**. Abortion endangers the lives of the mother and the unborn child; it’s not healthy.

KANE, B. M. (2023), The intention of "the right to choose" is to solve that

problem by asserting one's autonomy-And in Catholicism, we view that as

a tragic decision, one that diminishes both a mother and her child.

**C.** The Supreme court overturned Rove v. Wade, in June 2022, and states

Legislative bodies can decide whether to legitimize abortion rights or not.

Berg, J. A., & Woods, N. F. (2023), In July 2022, the United States Supreme

Court issued a decision – overturning Roe *v. Wade-* which means women’s

ability to choose to have an abortion or continue a pregnancy is no longer

protected by the constitution of the United States, “Consequently, each state

can now independently decide the legality of abortion”.

Berg’s variant, clause “abortion is no longer protected by the constitution of the

United States,” speaks volumes. To a liberal Christian mother of an unborn baby, it

indicates a quagmire. But to the pro-life conservative Christian, it’s a joyous

moment for celebration.

**III. Main Counter / Opposing Arguments**

1. It is a woman’s constitutional right to decide to have an abortion. Abortion is a

fundamental human right and freedom of choice, and it’s protected by the 13th and

14th amendments of the constitution. It is, therefore, an infringement of the

fundamental human rights by the US supreme court to overturn Roe v. Wade in

2022. Morgan, L. M. (2023), The 2022 US Supreme Court overturned the constitutional right to abortion-reveals a growing rift in global reproductive governance. The global momentum is currently with human rights contingent”.

1. The sovereign will of a woman affords her the freedom and right to abortion

when she is between life and death, irrespective of biblical or doctrinal faith.

Roubaix, M. (2023), Reproduction is a fundamental natural right, but there are

corresponding obligations and limitations to this right.

1. Abortion does endanger the life of the mother or the unborn child; then it should be

to individual choice or collective family and physician decisions. Hershenov, D.

(2023). Some abortion defenders claim that fetuses are parts of pregnant women.

Abortion opponents often respond that fetuses aren’t maternal parts.

**IV. Main Arguments Two**

1. Abortion is not acceptable; it contradicts Christian morality and faith doctrines.

Clarke, S. (2023). The doctrine of the sanctity of life-traditionally characterized as a Judeo-Christian doctrine-has it that bodily human life is an intrinsic good and is always impermissible to kill an innocent human. Abortion and euthanasia violate the doctrine - and are not amenable to debate.

1. Abortion can endanger the lives of the mother and baby and future childbearing.

Courtney, P., & LDH (2023), The risk associated with abortion include: Pelvic Infection; Blood clots in the uterus;  Heavy bleeding;  Cut or torn cervix;  Perforation of the uterus wall; Anesthesia-related complication; It endangers future pregnancies; and childbearing.

**V. Counter-Opposing Arguments Two**

1. The overturned Roe v. Wade abortion right is unconstitutional; it violates the

woman’s universal fundamental human rights to elect or not to have an abortion.

Rebouché, Rachel (2016) Human rights have helped advance abortion rights,

and it explores the relationship between human rights discourses and

abortion access;-the incorporation of abortion rights in international human

rights bodies.

1. **Lack of abortion rights** often creates mental health stigma and issues in female

victims, including fear, anxiety, and depression. Sometimes you have an unscheduled

therapeutic abortion due to medical problems and fetus deformity. In addition, there

are issues of endangerment, incest, and rape that crush families and victims with hurt.

Ogbu-Nwobodo et al. (2022), believe the implications of the *Dobbs* decision

is best viewed through an intersectional lens encompassing structural

racism, reproductive injustice, and mental health - trauma, and substance use

disorders stigma, discrimination, and adverse health outcomes in pregnancy.

**VI. Arguments Three**

1. Independent politics about Roe v. Wade**:** There are Christians and politicians who identify as moderate conservatives, and independent liberal Christians in both parties. Yet, they are neutral to Roe v. Wade whether it’s overturned. Independent Religious views about Roe. V. Wade:Some devout Christians may not ascribe to abortion due to their staunch biblical doctrines and faith and choose to be independent or neutral to the religious or political sensation generated, they prefer individual rights.
2. Sovereignty and Abused Legal Rights about Roe v. Wade**:** The neutral politician or Christian prefer individual human rights to prevail and not make a public show out of abortion. Steinfeld, L. et al. (2023, Legality of abortion has been one of the most controversial political initiatives in modern times; The debate often devolves- into disagreeing either access to services- or service refusal.

**VII. Counter / Opposing Arguments Three**

1. Independent, negative & positive political influences: Socio-political independent

stand about Roe v. Wade can cost the pro-lifer some political capital and affect his

chances of election or re-election in most red states. This may not be any political

capital in blue states.

1. It may affect your Christian leadership status, values, and faith standing in the eyes of your denomination if you are neutral without criticizing abortion or welcoming it overturned in June 2022.
2. The sovereignty and will of the woman are paramount: To a victim, the option is to embrace elective, or therapeutic abortion, for medical, social, and legal reasons. Carson, S., & Carter, S. K. (2023), “During-the COVID-19 pandemic, twelve states banned or restricted abortion to preserve personal protective eq (PPE); however, abortions commonly occur in clinics and use less PPE.”

**VIII. Summary – Comparative Analysis**

1. The overturning of Roe v. Wade in 2022 is a legal and religious victory for the right.

The left is crushed and against it. And millions of mothers are hurt, in bad shape, and

suffering emotionally. Fleck, L. M. (2023), Dobbs Court is justifiably criticized

for not respecting public reason. Johnson tends to have a composite answer to

this.

Johnson, R. (2022), *Roe*relied on a doctrine known as ‘substantive due

process, which interprets certain fundamental liberties as falling outside the

scope of either federal (Fifth Amendment) or state (Fourteenth

Amendment) and government’s authority-pertain to-to contraception,

reproduction. Introduction. (Para. 2).

1. The lifelines on Roe v. Wadelegal hurdles from 1973 to 2022 contain hundreds of dramatic legal tussles going on for fifty years between state legislative bodies and activists, women’s movements and individuals, and the supreme court. Cohen, D. S., Donley, G., & Rebouché, R. (2023) “examines the paradigm shift that is occurring now that the Supreme Court has overturned Roe v. Wade. The inter-jurisdictional abortion wars are coming.” These controversial cases have cost the state and federal government billions of dollars that should have been spent instead on the abortion victims, homeless population, immigration, border crisis, education, and failing US infrastructures. A reasonable independent opinion comes with transparency, and professional ethical standards. Smith, M. L. (2023), “A theory of interpretation that is more transparent tends to be preferable-Increased transparency tends to promote the values of constraint, democratic legitimacy, and an understanding of what the law is.”

**IX. Conclusion**

**A.** Independent Impartiality: The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologist

and Physicians, ACOG (2019), states that, *“*The science of medicine is not

subjective. “As physicians, we are focused on protecting the health and lives

of the patients for whom we provide care. Without question, abortion can be

can be medically necessary.” But, to Saad, T. C. (2023), “Because abortion

is defined as intentionally causing fetal death, abortion is never medically

necessary”.

The additive is “medically necessary”, if the fetus greatly endangers the life and

health of the mother or the child. The variant is, “ intentionally-and never

medically necessary”. Saad’s standpoint is perhaps based on religiosity and some

extreme dogmatic values which may not always fit in squarely in certain

precarious and compelling situations. It is like, because you are religious,

it is unnecessary to fight in a bloody war (like Ukraine and Russia)?

The critical analysis of the seeming paradigms on ACOG’s “medical “necessities”

and Saad’s “not medically necessary due to intentionality” is an expression of some

extreme dogmatic bias. And the medical health of any unborn child is paramount.

An unborn fetus must not be subject to any religious or political sensationalism.

Abortion is a serious medical business and not bouts of trojan horse races.

1. The argument is not a complex one as millions of America may believe. i) There are

Capacities to nurture, the capacities for courage and information to exercise the

woman’s fundamental human rights, sovereignty and will to consult with her family,

physician, and in prayers, which are crucial, and non-negotiable. ii) Moreover,

people can work out their obedient faith, salvation, and righteousness (Philippians

2:12). iii) It is therefore not surprising to find devout Christians who are independent

in their intellectual understanding and assessment, wisdom, and conversations,

advocating for mutual respect and the dignity of the woman pertaining to her

freedom, and rights of choice to have abortion interventions . iv) Moreover, it does

not stop the independents, conservatives or liberals and their families from voting in

favor of, or against abortion on very well informed, religious, political, or on

personal grounds.

**The other frightening question to millions of America is**: What would one do if

the spouse, friend, relation, female clergy or pastor, or teenage child is a victim of

proposed abortion that greatly impairs their health, or life or the unborn child, or

medically proven that it will cost their lives (one or two)? Again, the answer is

simple. The victim must consult with the Holy Spirit for guidance, safety and

spiritual discernment. And must consult with family and the physician and take a

precise pro-life or, pro-choice action, to abort or not to abort the child strictly

prescribed by a medically certified pediatrician gynecologist (outside unbiased

dogmatic or political considerations).
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