

Elect me, and I will end abortion in Iowa!

Strategy for Stopping Infanticide by Christmas 2013 in Iowa

Despite the courts, and any lingering Senate dictators

By **Dave Leach**, candidate for State Representative, Des Moines' South side
Pilgrim@Saltshaker.US <> www.Saltshaker.US/SLIC

“Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph.” --Thomas Paine

We can do it! God has provided two things on our side: the Truth, and the law.

This strategy is founded on tested, irrefutable legal arguments that abortion hasn't been legal since 2004.

This is not just the argument that Roe was bad law from the beginning. Everyone knows that. Even infanticidist lawyers know it: they have a whole range of wannabe replacement rationales standing in line to replace Roe when Roe finally wears out its courtroom welcome.

This is an argument that Roe's legal force ended in 2004, when federal law “established” that all unborn babies are human beings – the event which Roe itself said would “of course” cause the “collapse” of Roe, and of any legality enjoyed by abortion.

This is a strategy you can judge for yourself, whether it really can enable me to keep my pledge, if you elect me, to (1) get a law passed even though I would be but one of 100 lawmakers in but one of two chambers, and the other chamber may still be throttled by Hell's favorite, Dictator Gronstal; (2) win in court when the law is challenged even though the law would be defended by the Attorney General over whom I have no control; and (3) hold any judges accountable who ignore law and precedent so flagrantly that even average voters understand their threat to the Rule of Law even though that may require mass social movements or constitutional amendments which no man can promise.

And all by Christmas?!!! C'mon!

This may be the time to admit to you that sometimes the space and pithiness requirements of a headline force a writer to tell a little fib. In half a dozen words you just can't tell the whole story in all its glorious details. So in my headline, where I said “I” will do all these things, the honest truth is that if you get me elected, **we** have the power to do all these things. I can't do it alone! But together, **we** can definitely do it. Assuming, that is, we work with God, as I do by the limited understanding He allows me.

Uh, and also, about that Christmas thingy – well – uh, let me come back to that later.

Back to the legal argument.

If you've ever been on a prolife mailing list you must have seen a fundraising letter promising that with enough money we can get a “personhood” declaration in federal law, which will trigger Roe's “collapse” clause and end legal abortion.

Well, did you know the “personhood” of all unborn babies was “established” in federal law on April 1, 2004? For an analysis of this law, and theories why proliferers haven't jumped on this opportunity, see www.Saltshaker.US/SLIC/NoGreenerLight.pdf.

Instead of abortion being “constitutionally protected” by the 14th Amendment, the 14th Amendment now requires states to criminalize abortion in order to protect the right to life of unborn human beings.

That's the argument in a nutshell. No court has said so, but no court has said it's not so. Courts can't rule on whether these arguments are true, because proliferers haven't brought them a case that forces courts to address them. Courts can't rule on issues not brought before them.

I am ready to pass a law criminalizing abortion, in order to bring Iowa law in compliance with

the 14th Amendment. I am ready to pass an accompanying Joint Resolution which lays out the arguments, which will draw the most vicious scrutiny of infanticide's deadliest legal minds like moths to a porch light, so that when proliferers, lawmakers, and voters see no one able to refute these arguments, they will be encouraged to march forward with criminalizing infanticide.

Posted at the directory www.Saltshaker.US/SLIC/

The law and resolution: [.../SLICresolution.pdf](#)

Two legal briefs which develop these arguments in greater detail: [.../TwoBriefs.htm](#)

My response to Americans United for Life's fear of challenging legal abortion while the Supreme Court is occupied by killer coddlers:

[.../AULmissingOpportunity.pdf](#)

The Congressional Record of debate during the 2004 law, during which proliferers like Steve King assured Democrats that the law wouldn't upset abortionists, with my analysis:

[.../CongressionalRecord2004.pdf](#)

My legal brief analyzing the wannabe Roe successors, showing them none can withstand the "establishment" of the fact that all unborn babies are human beings: [.../No-Roe-backup-plan.pdf](#)

A Resolution is a statement of facts, often listing several legal facts, but without creating any penalties for any actions, as a law does. In other words a resolution doesn't make anything "illegal". A law, on the other hand, creates penalties for specific actions, but is a poor place to state facts. Some laws begin with a statement of legislative intent behind the law, and sometimes those statements contain a statement of some fact, but never a whole page of facts or legal arguments. A resolution is the only place for that. Voters will think the legislature is "taking the law into its own hands" if they see the legislature criminalizing abortion as if Roe v. Wade didn't exist, and as if courts aren't so ready to call any law "unconstitutional" which restricts abortion very much – *unless* voters see the legal arguments justifying the law.

This strategy assumes that getting me elected will require a tidal wave of voter involvement, since without that, I have no hope. I have no money, (compared with the \$80,000 typical budget of a winning campaign), no campaign staff, I live in a district with twice as many registered Democrats as Republicans, and I have a track record of losing – I ran and lost six times before, always living in heavily Democrat districts and lacking money. Mainstreamers, therefore, won't throw buckets of money at me. Not right away.

Mind you, it is not my preference to live in a heavily Democrat-dominated district, with no money, a record of losing, and little mainstream report! But that is where God has placed me, and God has promised me that with enough faith not to quit we can move a mountain, and this bloody mountain has obstructed my view of America's glory for so many decades that I can't even enjoy TV any more, so I will do what I can "with all my might". Ecclesiastes 9:10.

Actually it was always God's preference, throughout the Old Testament, that His people face their enemies vastly outgunned and outnumbered, so that after their victory everyone would give God the credit. Definitely, when you and I win, everyone will know it was not by my power, talent, or resources alone!

The kind of miraculous tidal wave it will take to get me elected would ride the hope of ending abortion. This strategy assumes enough decent Iowans care enough, to respond to my dramatic pledge with enough support to put me in office. A wave powerful enough to do that would be powerful enough, I assume, to sweep others into office, preserving the Republican majority in the House and creating one in the Senate.

This wave will be powered by confidence in these legal arguments. This confidence will be fueled by the outcome of scrutiny of them by infanticide's deadliest legal minds. I don't expect it to be fair. For example, when I wrote a legal brief that was used in the Scott Roeder case, two different news reporters got separate law school professors to say my arguments had no merit. Somehow the article featuring their quotes seemed to hold together, even after each professor admitted that he had not

actually *read* my brief! (For a positive review of my brief by a top writer about criminal trials, go [here](#).)

My strategy assumes enough people will love life enough to not trust hostile reporters but check my website, and observe for themselves that the points I make are never squarely addressed, much less refuted. It also assumes that any flaws in my arguments will be minor enough to repair, as scrutiny reveals any weaknesses.

It also assumes that you other concerned voters will turn to other prolife experts and lawyers for an appraisal of my arguments. You will urge experts to take the time to seriously analyze my arguments, and you will find a couple of others to ask the experts with you. Matthew 18:20. This is something that has been difficult for me to accomplish alone; to get busy experts to analyze more than a page of information. (A record of some of those contacts is available towards the bottom of the page at www.Saltshaker.US/SLIC.) But faced with several friends who care deeply about infanticide and really want to know if there could possibly be anything to my claims, they will take the time, and my strategy assumes that when they do, they will agree that my arguments have merit. (If I am seriously wrong, this much scrutiny will quickly expose it and put an early end to all this trouble I am causing, so I can retire to my TV set in blissful stasis.)

With the consensus of friendly experts, a network of word-of-mouth information about these arguments will emerge able to bypass the misinformation of hostile reporters. Which is basically what "grassroots" means.

So where are we? Ah yes. Riding a wave of public interest and scrutiny of a plan to actually end abortion within a year of my election. People are so enthusiastic, relieved to finally have a serious plan for an imminent end to 40 years of bloodshed, that money is pouring in. Word of mouth is all over it. People are comprehending the urgency of getting Republican majorities in both chambers, in order to remove Gronstal and make this possible, so people are helping other candidates too. People are also appreciating the importance of having an Iowa Attorney General who will seriously defend this law once we pass it.

Tom Miller, Democrat, actually ran as a prolife Democrat when he ran against Don Avenson (who became governor, and is now a lobbyist) in 1990. Miller needs to be asked how enthusiastic he would be about defending a law that criminalizes abortion, challenging Roe's very continuance. If not, that is further reason to support a Republican candidate.

So try to imagine me elected. Then what? I introduce the bill and accompanying resolution.

Why the resolution doesn't actually have to pass.

I believe the legal arguments that Roe has "collapsed", laid out in the [resolution](#), are so powerful that with each step of the resolution's passage through the House, it will be taken more seriously, and the Experts of Legal Death will try that much harder to torpedo it. But the more they try and fail, and the more hostile reporters cover up their failure with less than the whole truth, the more

Why the resolution is important. When I first posted these legal arguments on my website, they were basically ignored. When I inserted them into the court record of the Scott Roeder case, they were read by a judge, and by the anchor of "In Session", who personally told me they were the reason the judge allowed a defense he otherwise wouldn't have. We'll see what the Kansas Supreme Court does with the arguments. But that trial is seen by proliferers as a messy venue for an attack on Roe. So now I am posting these arguments on my website again as part of a campaign for state representative. They will be ignored a little less than before I was a candidate, but not much less. However, the more support I receive, the harder my campaign is to ignore, and therefore the harder these arguments will be to ignore. If I am elected, these arguments will be paid much more attention to. Once the resolution is introduced after the next election, and then if it gets out of subcommittee, and then out of full committee, and then is passed by the House, and then by

voters and lawmakers who are paying attention will circumvent established news sources with their own word-spreading, and will be encouraged to support the accompanying bill which criminalizes abortion.

Thus I believe the arguments of the resolution are so powerful that they will achieve most of their purpose even if the resolution is never enacted by both chambers. Thus my strategy does not rely on its ultimate passage. But it relies on passage of the accompanying bill.

the Senate, and then is signed by the governor – at each step up the ladder of official acceptance, these arguments that Roe is toast will be harder to ignore: infanticidist lawyers will be forced to address them publicly.

My strategy is premised on the irrefutability of these arguments. Therefore the more scrutiny, the better, because the more people will see that they pass even the most severe, ruthless, unfair tests.

A related benefit is that the resolution will be enough in the news that people will actually see the legal arguments in it, and be educated. They will see that its opponents not only have any moral standing, they have no legal standing. This is important to building such a tidal wave of public support that not even Dictator Gronstal will be able to stop it – if he is still around after I am elected!

Another benefit is that it will almost guarantee that these arguments are in the trial when Iowa's attorney general defends the law in court.

Will other Republicans support it? Or are they like herding cats under even the most qualified leadership, with me counting as the least qualified? All I can say is that even without a wave of support to ride, I have communicated with several of them, and find them open to my ideas, if not bold enough to run with them themselves.

So now the law and resolution are passed. Or at least the law.

Now it is time to challenge the law in court.

If infanticidists dare to test it in court, the courts will be forced by the pressure of the Attorney General's defense of a state law to *squarely address* Roe's "collapse", a thing courts are very reluctant to do except under great pressure. Once they address it, the truth about Roe's demise will be so vivid that they will have to acknowledge it, by the same power of Truth that stopped the Pharisees' accusations when Jesus' words were so obviously true. The Bible describes the reason the Pharisees' mouths stopped working. It is the same dynamic that operates from the most enlightened Republic to the most desperate tyranny, varying only in degree: "they feared the people." Mark 11:32, Luke 20:19, 22:2, Acts 5:26. Two more principles that work for victory even in corrupt courts are illustrated in Luke 18:1-8: the weariness of a judge against a perpetual onslaught of pleading for fairness, and the sympathy of God. Take courage from God! Don't assume that just because sin has reigned 40 years, it will inevitably reign one more! It is giving up that makes mountains immovable!

It is even possible that infanticidists would be afraid to challenge our law, just as the Pharisees were afraid to bring any more cases before Jesus (Matthew 22:46, Mark 12:34, Luke 20:40). The Pharisees controlled the Sanhedrin which was like our Supreme Court and Congress and President combined! Why were they afraid of Jesus? Because Jesus spoke the truth so clearly that it was more powerful than any government or police force. Truth, clear enough, paralyzes armed soldiers, as the soldier testified in John 7:46: "The officers answered, 'Never man spake like this man.'"

Let Jesus' example (John 13:15, 1 Peter 2:21) be our goal.

Let us lay aside all fear that clear truth might "offend" somebody, or rob us of "credibility", but rather let us speak it so clearly that infanticidists will be terrified at the thought of risking a court challenge to our law, because being unable to refute the arguments in the Court of Public Opinion, they would have good reason to fear being unable to refute them in a Court of Law, either. If they challenge the law, they would risk having the courts rule against them, setting the stage for the end of abortion

across America. If they leave the law alone, then the blow to the Infanticide Industry would be limited to Iowa. At least until proliferators in other states tried the same thing.

But that would at least take another year or two, which would give them time to take some classes to train for honest jobs. They might appreciate that extra time to downsize their budgets, homes, and vacations, by staying out of court.

But what if the response of courts is to ignore the issues, hoping to pretend them away?

This would be a serious risk for judicial careers, to the extent the tidal wave of voter understanding of this issue, necessary to get me elected in the first place, is still paying attention as the justices rule.

Here is a principle that is the key to victory over abortion, no matter whose arguments eventually prevail: [to the extent voters aren't paying attention to a ruling, or don't care, or are intimidated because courts seem to be the best branch of government to understand what is constitutional, judges can make up anything they please with no fear of being held accountable. Conversely, to the extent voters understand that a particular ruling undermines the rule of law to a degree that brings shame upon the judiciary and anarchy to American law, they will vote to remove those offenders, and will support lawmakers who hold them accountable.](#)

Thus it is vital that voters understand these arguments.

[It is also vital that voters understand how it can be legally safe for legislatures to correct, overrule, or in any way restrain irresponsible judges, without simply transferring the potential for constitutional irresponsibility from the judiciary to the legislature.](#)

Newt Gingrich has some great ideas for constitutionally restraining judges: see www.newt.org/sites/newt.org/files/Courts.pdf. Here are some highlights from the 46 page analysis:

Newt offers the example of a law insisting that “our creator” is central to our definition of rights. Congress would set limits on court jurisdiction to review the law, a thing which Congress already does often. If the Supreme Court overturns the law, Congress should pass it again and affirm the constitutional right of Congress and the President to define the court’s jurisdiction. If the court won’t back off, Congress could pass another law saying that any judge refusing to obey legislative limits on jurisdiction is subject to impeachment. Congress can codify grounds for the impeachment authority which the Constitution gives Congress. It could list “the issuing of unconstitutional opinions”, “asserting arbitrary power”, or “usurping the authority of the legislature”. Congress can establish procedures for committee hearings on certain judicial decisions, and requiring judges to explain their constitutional reasoning, and to hear a proper Congressional Constitutional interpretation. The Constitution gives Congress the authority to abolish all lower federal courts and replace them with new ones. As Steve King says, the Constitution gives Congress the power to reduce the Supreme Court to Chief Justice Roberts sitting at a card table with a candle.

I also offer a solution, that balances the authority of courts, legislatures, and voters, leaving them co-contributors to determining what is constitutional. . Here is my proposed constitutional amendment, which could amend the Iowa Constitution, and which could also, ratified by the Iowa legislature, begin the process for amending the U.S. Constitution:

Proposed Amendment to the Iowa and U.S. Constitution: [When the Supreme Court finds a law unconstitutional, the legislature that enacted the law may vacate the Court’s order, and the Court’s jurisdiction over it, by reenacting the law after the following election.](#)

[Legislatures, approved by the people after the people are educated by courts, shall thus be the supreme authorities over the constitutionality of laws. \(For discussion and more options, see \[www.Saltshaker.US/SLIC/ConstitutionalAmendment.pdf\]\(http://www.Saltshaker.US/SLIC/ConstitutionalAmendment.pdf\)\)](#)

But you can see this final confrontation, between judges used to getting away with murder and

the intimidated remainder of America, will require an unprecedented tidal wave of voter understanding. The same tidal wave necessary to get me elected. Voters will gain confidence in their understanding as they watch Infanticide's brightest lawyers try in vain to refute them. If judges rule without squarely addressing the issues which voters know are the relevant issues, the bottom line is that if Iowa judges so flagrantly, so clearly violate the law that average voters know it, they will be voted out of office.

If infanticidists dare to carry the case to federal courts and risk ending abortion in the rest of the states, the same dynamics will be at work except that the bottom line will be that voters will press Congress to restore the Rule of Law by limiting the U.S. Supreme Court's jurisdiction through methods such as those pioneered by Newt Gingrich.

That's about it. Courts would be under enormous pressure to squarely address the issues brought before them, to the extent they know voters understand the issues and can't be scammed or intimidated. But if, like the naked king continued his procession even after his nakedness was exposed by an innocent child, in the Hans Christian Anderson fable, the court trudges on towards Hell, dragging us all behind, we voters know what to do. We don't have to put up with it any more.

I almost forgot to explain how I came up with the target date of Christmas. Especially since court trials can take months, and appeals, years.

Of course if the baby killers wisely fear taking it to court, the Iowa law will outlaw abortion upon its passage, well before Christmas of 2013. Then there is the possibility that any tidal wave overwhelming enough to get me elected will overwhelm legal abortion by Christmas of 2012.

So I don't really have a prediction which of these victorious scenarios will occur, or exactly when. I just kind of thought considering what Jesus has done for us, that it would be nice to have something to give Him, on the day we celebrate His birthday.

So now the ball is in your court. I have pledged what *we* will be able to do, after you elect me.

I won't quit trying if you don't; in fact, even if I am defeated again, none of your efforts will be wasted because it will all shine light on these legal arguments, which may encourage other prolife lawmakers to run with them even if I am not there to shepherd them.

But this cause needs you to seriously try!

I am not asking for blind faith. In fact, as I wrote earlier, this strategy requires lots of scrutiny. So I urge you to begin right now asking any legal experts you know to analyze these arguments and tell you if they have merit. When they give you their answer, forward them to us, so if they are positive we can build our list of endorsements, and if they are critical we can respond to your expert, or if we find your expert persuasive we can fix whatever problem he has identified.

All I am asking, is that as you look out over the field of candidates needing your support, that you not be discouraged from helping me because your money and time would just go down a rat hole with nothing to show for it. (1) You will be helping end abortion, regardless of whether I am elected. (2) The truth and the law are on our side, and I have a realistic strategy ASSUMING your response is as dramatic as my pledge. (3) My election, and the end of abortion, against mountainous odds, will encourage others to believe God offers them victory, too, against mountainous odds, if they just have enough faith in God to not give up.

So how can you help?

Needed: money, experience and wisdom raising and managing it, help organizing volunteers. Help identify favorable voters in my district who will invite me over to meet their friends.

Tweet for me! "Like" SLIC! Tell your friends, and your "friends"!

Find volunteers anywhere in Des Moines willing to help go door to door to register people as Republicans and take them an early ballot; especially people who

haven't voted for awhile.

Wherever you are, you can help make phone calls. Let me know you are willing, and I will send you a list and things to say.

Pray. However, don't be surprised if, during your prayer, you feel nudged to act. Just as James 2 says faith without works is dead, I doubt if prayer without action has much life, either.

Contact: Dave Leach, 137 E. Leach, Des Moines IA 50315 <> 515-480-3398
www.Saltshaker.US <> www.Saltshaker.US/SLIC <> pilgrim@Saltshaker.US

“You aren't a viable candidate. All you talk about are the social issues.”

Check out my website, www.Saltshaker.US. You will find all kinds of issues treated in so much detail that you can even read the language of legislation I propose. It's just that when news reporters talk about me, they only tell you about the issues they find most objectionable.

But to say “social issues” like immigration and abortion should not be such a focus of a candidate?

While Constantinople was surrounded by Moslem hoards, the priests inside the church were debating really important stuff during their last hours.

They were debating how many angels can dance on the head of a pin.

I know how important you say it is to talk about obesity, speculations about future climate, the importance of funding so little children can be taught to respect Islam, and the corporate climate incentive retrogressive tax, but America, we have a problem. Enemies surround us. We are financially starving to death. And instead of coming together to address America's threats, we are fighting each other. Over stuff that often isn't even real.

We do it because we are afraid to look out the window at reality. We assume we can never change it. We assume our enemies are invincible.

That might be a reasonable attitude for an unbeliever. But not for a Christian.

“And you will, by the dignity of your conduct, afford occasion for posterity to say, when speaking of the glorious example you have exhibited to mankind: ‘had this day been wanting, the world had never seen the last stage of perfection to which human nature is capable of attaining.’” --George Washington, The Newburgh Address, 1783

Some Facts about the Alternative

If this hope isn't enough to inspire you, indulge me a moment while I frighten you by laying out the alternative which will surely occur, and very soon, so long as our abortion and immigration laws remain substantially unchanged. (Continued at www.Saltshaker.US/SLIC/TheAlternative.pdf)