


2022 Illinois General Election
Questions for Judicial Candidates

(Please Print Legibly)

NAME James Odom E-MAIL james.odom@covenanthome.com

Judge of the Circuit Court for the
OFFICE SOUGHT Twenty-Fourth Judicial Circuit (Randolph) CAMPAIGN PHONE _____

WEBSITE _____ DATE September 22, 2022

SIGNATURE 

1. What do you think is the most important task of an Illinois judge?

To secure God-given unalienable rights to those persons within his or her jurisdiction by the adjudication and administration of criminal and civil matters in court.

2. What does it mean to uphold and defend the Illinois Constitution?

To rule in accordance with the text of the Illinois Constitution as understood when ratified, as it conforms to the objective law of the Creator.

Is this oath an objective requirement that you understand how it limits your behavior? How? Yes.

This would prevent me from ruling under any theory of interpretation which goes beyond the text of the document itself, such as a "living" document theory, except only in a case where the document were to violate the law of the Creator (e.g., depriving certain individuals of rights, such as has been the case with blacks in America, or Jews in Germany) or to violate the U.S. Constitution. Though many practitioners do, American (and English) law do not recognize law that violates the Divine Law (Blackstone).

Give an example of something you might face which would challenge that limit, and how you would respond.

Known violations of rights of humans, such as elective abortion. I would rule in a manner so as to uphold the rule of law that secures the right to life to all humankind. Not recognizing the permanent assignment of gender by God for the purposes of properly administering law. I would rule in such a manner as to recognize fixed genetic gender for legal purposes.

3. Law schools typically teach three methods of Constitutional interpretation: Natural Law, Strict Construction, and Living Constitution. Do you believe all of those to be equally valid? No.
No, Natural Law (that all laws must conform to the law of the Creator) is the official law of the land from the founding. Strict Construction is valid as long as not contrary to the law of the Creator.

Do you believe any of them to be contrary to an oath to defend the Constitution?

Yes. A "Living" Constitution, by making the magistrate himself the determiner of the content of the document, declares the document itself meaningless and destroys the meaning of the document. This is a clear violation of an oath to protect and defend the document.

Which would you associate with most closely as your own method?

Natural law, because we should uphold the laws made, but man, being imperfect, will from time to time make laws for self-benefit, and at the cost of others' unalienable rights (e.g., slavery, abortion).

In these cases it is the magistrate's duty to secure those rights despite tyranny of the majority or other magistrates.

4. Do you believe that there is a fixed basic standard of moral law that all men know? If so, what do you believe to be the origin of law?

Yes. All men are given a conscience and thereby understand basic "human rights," or basic right and wrong, which represents objective Divine Law.

Is it possible to reconcile legal protections for discrimination against women with the concept that gender is not fixed?

No. Non-fixed gender logically destroys the possibility of gender non-discrimination.

Do you believe that the law presumes gender to be fixed?

Yes, and attempts to act otherwise remove or threaten to remove the unalienable rights of others by injecting chaos, rather than order into the legal system.

Do you believe it is lawful to redefine marriage to include something other than one genetic man and one genetic woman?

No. I believe it is unlawful to redefine marriage to other than one man and one woman. Marriage in the as defined by the Scriptures is an unalienable human right, usurped by any such redefinition.

Is gender assigned by God or mankind? By God.

5. Would it be lawful under the American rule of law for government not to prohibit murder or rape (i.e. not to secure basic unalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, or those specified in the Bill of Rights)?

No. Because the right to live, and the right not to be sexually abused are basic human unalienable rights (that is, God commands not to murder, and not to rape, therefore we each have an unalienable right not to be murdered or raped, and the authority of government therefore comes from God's giving that right to each individual - the consent of the governed), government has the duty to secure them.

6. Would-no protection under the law be equivalent to equal protection under the law? Explain.

No. It would be unlawful for the government, particularly in the United States, to withdraw all protection of unalienable human rights.

7. Judges at the Nuremberg trials were convicted of upholding duly passed laws in Germany. Why?

Because those laws were contrary to basic Divine human rights. We are not to obey unlawful commands.

8. We already know you'll appropriately follow precedent, but do you believe that the U.S. Constitution contains a right to abortion? **YES / NO**

Elective abortion violates basic Divine human rights, and is never lawful.

9. I believe that Illinois is required by the 14th Amendment to equally protect all human beings at any location within its jurisdiction. **YES / NO**

10. I believe that an unborn child is a human being. **YES / NO**

11. Had I been a member of the Supreme Court in 1973, I would have joined Justice White's dissent in Roe v. Wade. **YES / NO**

Please mail, email to the address below, email to v.kathy@illinoisfamily.org, or fax to 708-781-9376 no later than September 15, 2022.