



Biblical Citizenship Briefing

March 2026

This briefing is strictly for your information. It is a summary of some current public policy issues, including pending legislation, that involve moral and biblical principles. While suggested action may be included from time to time, no specific position by EFCC is implied. Find contact and subscription information at the end of this document.

In California

Bills Move to Committees – The committee process in Sacramento has begun. This is a great time to let your views on pending legislation be made known to committee members. You may also make your own assemblymember or state senator aware of bills that you support or oppose even though they may not see the bills for some time. Here are a few important measures:

Protecting houses of worship (SB 1070) – This bill by Sen. Shannon Grove (R-Bakersfield) simply enhances current law that prohibits intentional disruptions of religious worship by increasing penalties upon conviction. The measure will make the crime – currently a misdemeanor – chargeable as a felony for serious, coordinated or repeated disturbances. Fines would be increased from \$1,000 to up to \$5,000 and imprisonment in county jail from a maximum of one year to 16 month and up to three years, or both. Read more [here](#). Find out more at protectworship.com. Find memes to share [here](#). SB 1070 will be heard in the [Senate Public Safety Committee](#) on March 24.

Preserving private spaces for males and females (AB 1998) – Assemblywoman Leticia Castillo (R-Corona) has introduced this bill to protect privacy in intimate spaces ensuring they will only be occupied by persons who share their biological sex. The author states, “I authored AB 1998 because parents across California are asking for clarity and commonsense protections in intimate spaces where females deserve privacy and safety. This measure simply requires that bathrooms, locker rooms, and changing areas in businesses be separated by sex, while still allowing single-occupancy gender-neutral options. Protecting civil rights and protecting females are not mutually exclusive, and this bill makes sure we do both.”

To leave no room for interpretation, the bill defines “sex” to mean “an individual’s immutable biological sex, either female or male, defined as follows: “Female” means an individual who naturally has, had, will have, or would have, but for a congenital anomaly or intentional or unintentional disruption, a reproductive system that produces, transports, and utilizes the large gamete, or ova, for fertilization.” (A similar definition is offered for “male.”)

AB 1998 has not yet been assigned to a committee. Though its success is not likely in the current climate at the State Capitol, prayerfully, it will at least receive a hearing. Find out more, including a video testimony about an incident in Santee, [here](#).

Making abortion available on college campuses (AB 2540) – The State of California has required student health centers on University of California and Cal State campuses to provide chemical abortions since 2023. Now, Assemblywoman Catherine Stefani (D-San Francisco) has introduced AB 2540 to expand the medication abortion requirement to community college campuses beginning in 2028. Chemical abortions may be performed by staff at the student health center, through telehealth services, or by providers associated with a contracted external agency. The bill also requires the centers to raise awareness of the availability of these “services” by actively promoting awareness, providing information on those services to students, and posting the availability of those services on their internet websites. In addition, the centers would be required to report the number of such centers, the number of medication abortions performed by January 2029. AB 2540 has been assigned to the [Assembly Health](#) and [Higher Education](#) Committees, but no hearing date has been set. **Pray** that pro-life organizations will be able to reach college women faced with unplanned pregnancies and help them choose life rather than death for their preborn babies.

What you can do this legislative session: To share your views with your legislators, simply call their offices (district or state) or send a message through their website. Find your state representatives at findyourrep.legislature.ca.gov. If timing is an issue, just leave a message after hours. You may check on the status of any bill that interests you at leginfo.legislature.ca.gov. Click on “Bill Information” and search by bill number, topic, or author. You may also find a list of many bills relating to life, faith, education, and family on California Family Council’s watch list [here](#). (*Referrals are for informational purposes only, does not imply an endorsement by EFCC of the opinions, positions, or contents of the site.*)

In the Courts

Supreme Court Gives CA Parents Incredible Win, Restores Parental Rights in California – On March 2, the U.S. Supreme Court granted Thomas More Society’s emergency application in the Escondido case, *Mirabelli v. Bonta*. In its press release, the legal firm states, “The landmark 6-3 [ruling](#) is the most significant parental rights ruling in a generation. The Court found that California’s secret transition regime likely violates parents’ rights under both the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment and the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, holding that the state “cut out the primary protectors of children’s best interests: their parents.” In the recent *Mahmoud v. Taylor* decision, the high court ruled that school policies denying parents the ability to opt their children out of instruction contrary to their religious beliefs violate the parents’ First Amendment rights to free exercise of religion, allowing them to opt out of such instruction.

The *Mirabelli* ruling states, “California’s policies will likely not survive the strict scrutiny that *Mahmoud* demands. The State argues that its policies advance a compelling interest in student safety and privacy. But those policies cut out the primary

protectors of children’s best interests: their parents.” And “the denial of plaintiffs’ constitutional rights during the potentially protracted appellate process constitutes irreparable harm.”

Thanks to the courage of Escondido teachers Elizabeth Mirabelli and Lori West, for now no school district in our state may conceal a child’s gender transition from their parents, change a child’s name and/or pronouns at school without notifying parents and receiving their consent, or require teachers to keep secrets from parents. CFC summarizes the current situation: “Following the Supreme Court’s ruling, the CDE informed school administrators that the district court’s injunction is in effect as to the certified class of parents and guardians. In one example shared with CFC, a principal forwarded instructions to staff explaining that public schools may not withhold or misrepresent information to parents about a student expressing gender incongruence. Staff were directed to notify administration or counseling personnel if a student requested a gender-related name or pronoun change, and if a parent objected, staff were told to use the student’s legal name and biological pronouns.”

“This is a watershed moment for parental rights in America,” said Paul M. Jonna, Special Counsel at Thomas More Society and Partner at LiMandri and Jonna LLP. “The Supreme Court has told California and every state in the nation in no uncertain terms: you cannot secretly transition a child behind a parent’s back. The Court’s landmark reaffirmation of substantive due process, its vindication of religious liberty, and its approval of class-wide relief together set a historic precedent that will dismantle secret gender transition policies across the country.” Read more [here](#) and [here](#). Read how this decision relates to the controversial PRISM teacher training in [this article](#).

Ninth Circuit Affirms Transgender Rights to Access Private Women’s Spaces – In 2020, Haven Wilvich, filed a complaint against two family-operated Korean-inspired spas, run by self-described “traditionally theologically conservative Christians.” The spa, where women and girls age 13 and up are often completely nude for massages, scrubs and other spa services, had denied Wilvich, a *pre-operative* transgender “woman” with male genitalia, access to its all-female facility. The complaint, [Olympus Spa v. Armstrong](#), alleged that the spa violated the Washington Law against Discrimination, a public accommodation law, claiming the spa’s policy violated its prohibition of discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. A Seattle federal judge dismissed the spa’s challenge to the complaint and, on March 12, a three-judge panel of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit [denied the appeal](#) 2-1. The court also [denied a rehearing](#) by the full court by the vote of 2-1, with a blistering dissent by Judge VanDyke which included highly unconventional language for a legal opinion. In a portion of his dissent he writes, “[It] feels like the supposed adults in the room have collectively lost their minds” and that “even where the Supreme Court has defined a clear rule protecting disfavored constitutional rights, never underestimate woke judges’ willingness to sacrifice constitutional rights on the altar of ‘social progress.’”

“Women and girls are not publicly available goods or services,” said Kevin Snider, Chief Legal Counsel of Pacific Justice Institute. “It is an abuse and perversion of public accommodation laws to give biological males access to the intimate spaces of unconsenting females when in a state of full or partial undress. In a decent society, it is common sense that women and girls require privacy in their intimate spaces.” The case may be appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court. Read more [here](#) and [here](#).

Pray for reason to prevail and for the privacy of both women and men (and particularly children and teens) in intimate spaces to be protected from intrusion by the opposite sex. The desire to accommodate people with various “identities” ought not harm innocent and unsuspecting participants in public, but sex-segregated, spaces. *Father, help our leaders craft laws and policies that respect the created differences between men and women. Please protect the innocent from harm. In Jesus’ name, amen.*

In the News

Federal Bill Seeks to Ban Abortion Pill – According to the Guttmacher Institute, the monthly average number of abortions in 2025 was approximately 100,000 – up 25 percent from the monthly average in 2022 before *Roe v. Wade* was overturned. Between 60 and 70 percent of those are chemical abortions. Mifepristone, the first drug of the abortion cocktail, blocks progesterone and kills the unborn child. According to data, complications occur in 11 percent of chemical abortions, causing issues such as hemorrhaging, internal infections and sepsis. With the ease of availability of abortion drugs, cases of boyfriends and even husbands slipping the drug to their partners to induce an abortion has increased.

These issues prompted Sen. Josh Hawley (R-MO) to introduce the “Safeguarding Women from Chemical Abortion Act.” The bill not only bans the use of Mifepristone and any similar drugs for abortion, but it also allows women to take the drug makers to court for “bodily injury or harm to mental health (including any physical, psychological, emotional, or physiological harm.” Those harmed may seek compensatory and punitive damages, as well as attorneys’ fees and costs. Sen. Hawley stated, “It’s time for Congress to take action. We’ve known for years that Mifepristone is risky. But it’s really just in the last few years that we’ve learned that this drug is inherently dangerous, and it is inherently prone to abuse ... This is a drug that is incredibly widespread and is inherently dangerous.” Read more [here](#) and [here](#).

This briefing was prepared by the EFCC Biblical Citizenship Committee. Referrals to websites are for informational purposes, and do not necessarily imply an endorsement by EFCC of the contents of those sites. To subscribe or unsubscribe, or if you have any questions, please e-mail Penny Harrington (penny.harrington@cox.net) ; www.efcc.org/biblical-citizens