I. INTRODUCTION

"At what point shall we expect the approach of danger? By what means shall we fortify against it?-- Shall we expect some transatlantic military giant, to step the Ocean, and crush us at a blow? Never!--All the armies of Europe, Asia and Africa combined, with all the treasure of the earth (our own excepted) in their military chest; with a Buonaparte for a commander, could not by force, take a drink from the Ohio, or make a track on the Blue Ridge, in a trial of a thousand years. At what point then is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reach us, it must spring up amongst us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen, we must live through all time, or die by suicide." President Lincoln; Lyceum Address[1]

NOW COMES, I, Chris Sevier, former Judge Advocate/combat veteran, whistle blower, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 21, F.R.C.P. 24(a), and 24(b) move to intervene as a member of the true minority of sexual orientation classification.[2] I sustained the same injury by the same Respondents under identical circumstances as the Petitioners except that I attempted to marry an inanimate object, not a member of the same-sex.[3] The same clerks office in Nashville denied my "fundamental" and "individual" right to marry the spouse of my choice for the identical legal

[1] This same quote by Lincoln was used effectively in the Documentary "America: Imagine a World without Her " by Dinesh D'souza, as part of a public awareness campaign to promote the truth.

[2] I seek to proudly intervene, as a member of the true minority sexual orientation class, in order to fasten my ship to the Petitioners' so that we may sail to an equal destination under the same rainbow colored flag. Move to intervene here as I did in the lower courts because I have standing and because I care. Anger is not the opposite of love. Hate is. And the final form of hate is indifference. I am not indifferent to what this case means to children, national identity, state sovereignty, and the integrity of the United States Constitution. I am a proponent of the rule of law. I am not here to win a popularity contest, I am here to redress a potential injury, while protecting children, the Constitution, and my personal interest naturally. Our grandchildren will be impacted by this action for generations to come. This case is a glorified domestic case so the feelings of adults is entirely secondary. I hope that the Court views this matter through the lens of a parent, not just as a justice so much. The best interest of all the children should apply in accordance with the spirit of T. C. A. § 36-6-106. Either the Petitioners and I are discriminating against the traditional married couples, by asserting that our relationships are equal, or traditional marriage proponents are discriminating against us. It is one or the other.

[3] I am a member of the true minority of sexual orientation classification, and protections under the 14th amendment belong to more than just the largest majority and largest minority of a suspect class. The Petitioners want to expand the definition of marriage to merely justify conduct that has been rendered to be savage and depraved since the inception of mankind, but I submit that the new definition they campion is still too narrow and exclusive for purposes of the Constitution and for my personal tastes and others who are like minded. No matter how hard the Petitioners and I attempt to camouflage our quest as one regarding "benefits," we simply want the general public to see our conducts as normal, so our kids will feel normal about us. This action is about adults wanting respect for conduct that society has held to be contemptuous since the inception of humanity. My motion to intervene is timely. And I can file briefs on the same schedule as the original parties.

reasons the Petitioners' requests to marry a person of the same sex was denied. [4] As an added bonus, the clerk threatened to have me arrested, if I did not leave. I move to intervene as an indirect ambassador of individuals who desire "man-animal," "man-machine," and "man-woman-woman" marriages, as a result of the sexual orientation that they too have cultivated after acting upon "trusted urges." The Petitioners assert that the definition of marriage is "too narrow," but I say that the Petitioners definition is "still too narrow." I seek a "newer definition of marriage" than the outdated one that allows for "same-sex couples and opposite-sex couples" to wed in other states.[5] I seek a "more modern Constitutional right" than the petitioners. Just because factions of the liberal media opposes my marriage, but not the Petitioners, at this juncture, raises the question, when did the mass media become a basis for policy making? When was it ever a good idea to trust our feelings as a basis for policy and law? The Petitioners were allowed to marry in states that legally permit same-sex marriage so their request is "old hat."[6] Clearly, the same-sex couples seek "state sanctioned savagery." I merely seek a deeper form of

---

[4] Here are a few of many cases that establish that marriage is a fundamental and individual right: *Zablocki v. Redhail*, 434 U.S. 374 (1978);*United States v. Windsor*, 133 S. Ct. 2675, 186 L. Ed. 2d 808 (2013); *Lawrence v. Texas*, 539 U.S. 558, 576-77 (2003); *Loving v. Virginia,* 388 U.S. 1 (1967). See also: *See Bostic v. Schaefer*, 760 F.3d 352 (4th Cir. 2014) (fundamental rights); *Latta v. Otter*, No. 14-35420, 2014 WL 4977682 (9th Cir. Oct. 7, 2014) (animus, fundamental rights, suspect classification); *Bishop v. Smith*, 760 F.3d 1070 (10th Cir. 2014) (fundamental rights); *Kitchen v. Herbert*, 755 F.3d 1193 (10th Cir. 2014) (same). I stand with our President, in suggesting that at least on the surface, there are people of goodwill on both sides of this debate, but that does not mean that all sides are arguing an equal set of truth claims. One set of truth claims is vastly superior to the others. To suggest that all truth claims are equal is a truth claim itself that is vying for superiority amongst all of the rest and is merely an imperialistic and jaded way of getting on top. To say that there are no absolutes is an absolute, such arguments bring us back to square one. All of us are bring to the table an exclusive set of truth claims that we are trying to make the other side adopt. We are equal in that regard.

[5] The opinion of the court of appeals (App. 1a-100a) filed with the Petitioners writ is reported at __ F.3d __, 2014 WL 5748990.

[6] In terms of "*evolving meaning, if* all else fails, the plaintiffs invite us to consider that "[a] core strength of the American legal system . . . is its capacity to evolve" in response to new ways of thinking about old policies. *DeBoer* Appellees' Br. at 57–58. I am here to to it a step further than the same-sex marriage proponents to say that the definition of marriage has to evolve further than they seek. I am here to to it a step further than the same-sex marriage proponents to say that the definition of marriage has to evolve further than they seek.

"state sanctioned savagery."[7] In light of the positions taken by the dissent in the 6th Circuit, where do you draw the line? App. 22-23. My intervention makes the slippery slope argument a reality, not merely a hypothetical. For better or worse, I should be allowed to intervene as a member of the true minority of "sexual orientation." The question as to whether we should based our laws on "sympathetic sob stories," which is a form of manipulative bullying of its own, can be better determined with my direct presence in this action.

Most importantly, I should be allowed to intervene because it will better help the public, especially members of my young adult generation, better understand the concepts of law that get lost in "heady concepts" like "heighten scrutiny." For the sake of the public's interest, I should be allowed to intervene so that the case is more clearly understood. In the event that the Petitioners and I are living a life of delusional distortion, the evidence shows that there has been enough deception of "the truth of things."[8] I see how this case plays out amongst my peers in reality, not just in theory.[9] Permitting me to intervene, helps dissolve the "wait and see" consideration, raised by the Dissent. App(a) 45-60. My intervention shows that we can immediately "see" that changing the definition of marriage blurs lines and pushes us towards us collectively towards dehumanizing lifestyles in the area of sexuality.[10] Changing the definition of

---

[7] I mean, rights need not be countermajoritarian to count do they?. *See, e.g.*, Civil Rights Act of 1964, Pub. L. No. 88352, 78 Stat. 241.pag 37. Can't I force my sexual savagery on everyone else like the gay Petitioners? *Love* Appellees' Br. at 5.

[8] The truth is that there is a Nexus between pornography, homosexuality, strip clubs, planned parenthood, human trafficking, child molestation, To refuse to admit that is a refusal to think and see the truth of things.

[9] I am a part of the EDM scene and engage in fashion modeling, I see how this push plays out in my peer group in a reality. https://soundcloud.com/darinepsilon/darin-epsilon-ghost-wars-all-that-couldve-been-andre-sobota-remix

[10] The "wait and see" arguments are the same ones raised by my Defendants, Microsoft, Apple, Verizon, in the porn cases where filters have been demanded. See exhibits. case 3:14-cv-1313 and 3:13-cv-0607. We have seen that easily accessible pornography on filterless devices has created a public health crisis and a sexual holocaust. Pornography on

marriage does not cultivate the desired respect for "man-man," "man-animal," "woman-woman," "man-woman-woman," and "man-machine" relationships because persons of authentic faith will not accept lifestyles that the God of the Bible has declared to be outside the four corners of His plan despite the atheistic liberals best efforts to convert Christians to their beliefs that are predicated on the exciting possibility of meaninglessness. I understand that forcing same-sex marriage, man-machine marriage, and so forth will polarize the Nation further.[11] Apparently, the Petitioners think that this will be a positive, but cannot really explain how. At least my involvement will enable the Court to maintain Constitutional integrity. American Christians will never support the lifestyles that the same-sex marriage couples and I promote because they are one of many discourageable behaviors on a list that includes murder. But the Petitioners are merely selfish adults, who want to act as they feel and have the state sponsor it.[12] The ultimate agenda here is to do away with all Christian institutions in the name of "freedom," and somehow, the United States will be miraculously be better for it. [13] The Court should not be persuaded by the unexamined assumption of the superiority of our cultural moment.[14] The cultural climate is

---

laptops and cell phones that is accessible 24/7 has normalized perversions of sex and false permission giving beliefs that has not increased "freedom" but immense suffering.

[11] This is a matter of National security interest. There are members of Churches who would be more prone to follow the commands of their pastor than the commander in chief for good cause.

[12] This entire plight amounts to a war on Christianity. As the appeals court acknowledged: "While these cases present a denial of access to many benefits, what is "[o]f greater importance" to the claimants, as they see it, "is the loss of . . . dignity and respect" occasioned by these laws." App(a).

[13] http://www.patheos.com/blogs/churchformen/2014/11/marriage-will-be-ruled-unconstitutional/

[14] If children are to grow up thinking that marrying a member of the same sex is a viable option under the law, why can't they also feel that marrying a machine, an animal, or a combination of persons is a viable option equally? Just because people are not lining up to marry animals, machines, ect in the same way that same sex couples are does not mean that they will not be. People may begin to line up to marry inanimate objects or multiple partners in an effort to be noticed. See https://www.facebook.com/video.php?v=10152634804730513&fre. If basing laws on feelings and distorted truths is valid, the persons of other sexual orientations should be allowed to marry. Here are a few of thousands of people whose interest I indirectly represent by intervening, who are otherwise being left out in the cold:

always narrow, exclusive, outdated, and on its way out. The temporal cultural feeling makes for a disastrous basis for law. Hollywood has been pushing to covert the United States from a "Christian Nation" to a "gay Nation" ever since Dr. Kinsey came creeping onto the scene with his sadous agenda to legalize his desire to permit adults to molest children of the same-sex or the opposite-sex to satisfy their perverse appetites. "Go figure." App 45(a). *Baskin v. Bogan*, 766 F.3d 648 (7th Cir. 2014). This not simply the way I feel about it; this is what American History shows.

The United States Supreme Court must hand down decisions that accord with transcultural/natural law to maintain its respectability, and I am an advocate of judges by moving to intervene in light of my injury so that the Court can make more sensible decision for the good of the Nation that will reverberate into the future for generations to come.[15] In this action, the

---

(1) In 2007, Liu Ye of China married a cutout of himself, he preferred to be with himself than no one. (2) In 2003, Jennifer Hoes married herself in the Netherlands on her 30th birthday. It was a large affair in front of friends and family. Hoes said, "Why not pledge allegiance to yourself in a ceremony, as the basis for completion of your life and relationships?" (4) In October of 2010 30-year-old Chen Wei Yih married herself in Taiwan. She decided she was at a good point in her life to marry, and was receiving social pressure to do so, but had found no suitable partner. She solved the problem by marrying herself instead of feeling ashamed. (5) In 2006, a Hindu woman in India claimed she had fallen in love with a snake and then married the snake in accordance with Hindu marriage rituals. (6) After a 15-year courtship, a British woman married Cindy the dolphin in a ceremony in Israel. She claimed when they met it was love at first sight and calls the male dolphin, "the love of my life." (7) In Sudan in 2006, Charles Tombe married a goat. (8) A former soldier from San Francisco claimed she fell in love with the Eiffel Tower. So, in 2008, she made it official and went so far as to change her name to Erika La Tour Eiffel. (9) In 1979, Eija-Riitta Berliner-Mauer married the Berlin Wall after having fallen in love with it when she saw it on TV as a child. (10) Sal 9000 fell in love with the character he met playing "Love Plus" on his NintendoDS and married her in 2009. (11) Amy Wolfe of New York married a ride she had ridden more than 3,000 times. She's had relationships with other objects, but she committed to the Nacht ride, because like in the case of Kate with guys, those objects were not satisfying any more. (12) Lee Jin-gyu of South Korea married a pillow that he had had sex with for years in 2010. The two plan on adopting someday. (13) Davecat married his blow up doll in 2000. "She provides me with a lot of things that I can't get out of an organic partner, like... quiet," he said. Davecat and the doll were featured in TLC's show 'My Strange Addiction.' In 2005, Salvita married a clay pot in India because she was dissatisfied with men. On December 3, 2013, Paul Horner married his dog in San Francisco California at Chapel of Our Lady at the Presidio. The wedding was hailed as a victory of equality, love, tolerance, and progress.

[15] *Baker* does not age, because the law doesn't age, only people and culture age do. People groups can move out from under the truth or towards the truth, but the universal law that is woven into the fabric of the Universe that was recognized by our Founding fathers does not change ever. Baker accords with universal/self-evident law, but the

Court must give all variations of a suspect class equal protection under the law, if "sexual orientation" is infact a class. [16] Otherwise, the Court must have the backbone to declare that traditional marriage is a "stand-alone relationship" that warrants special protection so that our children and grandchildren will not be led astray by a fraudulent agenda that offend decency, morality, logic, and science by individuals who champion personal bondage, self-absorption, spiritual blindness, and a life marked by settling for less, due to a flawed beliefs backed by a mass media steeped in porn culture. [17] (Shame combined with distortions of the truth are quite the powerful force. It is why persons of the fake Islam religion blow themselves up). Either the Petitioners and I are discriminating against traditional married couples, or proponents of accident marriage are discriminating against us for wanting to marry something other than a member of the opposite sex. Given my involvement in *General Synod of The United Church of Christ v.*

Petitioners and I jointly asking that the Court disregard transcultural truth that will encourage savagery and slavery. *Baker v. Nelson*, 191 N.W.2d 185, 186 (Minn. 1971)

[16] My request to marry an inanimate object is no less irrational or implausible than Sgt Dekoe's request to marry Kosture and call him his wife. No one can judge the affections of my heart any more than the Petitioners. The fact that "marriage" is a "Christian institution," and the same-sex marriage couples and myself seek to "marry" means that we are ratifying the validity of Christianity. So, the Bible's definitions of marriage should be considered. The New and Old Testament would say that all forms of sexual activity outside the context of traditional marriage are discourageable because such sexual encounters are subversive to human flourishing. 1 Tim. 1:8–10; Rom. 1:26–27; 1 Cor. 6:9–10; see also Leviticus 20:13; 18:22; Jude 7; Genesis 19. It happens that Christianity is backed by the brain science of neuro-transmiters like dopamine, oxytocin, serotonin, Beta Fosb is merely coincidence but not any less valid because it is true.

[17] As a patriot with standing, who risked his life in Operation Iraqi Freedom to advance the rule of law, I have been respectfully asking several Federal Courts, who have a difficult task,, to take a hard stand on the dominance of Christianity or another set of truth claims.. Allowing my intervention poses an imminent question, not a theoretical one of speculation, and merely because it may be inconvenient for the agenda of some does not make it any less plausible and relevant. My motion is timely, and the same laws are at issue: Tenn. Const. art. XI, § 18; Tenn. Code Ann. §§ 36-3-101 to 505, under the United States Constitution (the "Constitution"). The Constitutionality of the law in dispute narrowly defines marriage between "one man and one women," not "one man and one man," "one woman and one woman, "one man and one machine," "one man and one animal" which violates the Due Process Clause and Equal Protection clause of all classes of sexual orientation, not just same-sex orientation because it is the largest minority. The Court cannot provide partial expansion of the equal protection clause, and leave behind all other classes in the name of "tolerance" and "equality" without impeaching the entire integrity of the Courts and the purpose that this case seeks to accomplish.

Cooper, 3:14-cv-213 with revisionist preachers for seek to marry members of the same-sex due to an elaborate ploy dreamed up by the ACLU, I do not think that there is any doubt that this entire campaign by the same-sex couples that is a war against Christianity. Let's face it, marriage itself is a Christian institution.

II. REQUEST TO INTERVENE REJECTION BY THE PETITIONERS COULD SINGLE HANDEDLY PUT A STAKE IN THE HEART OF THE CASE

The email exchange between the Petitioners and myself, over this past weekend, regarding my intervention in this case is so telling that it could alone decide this case for better or worse. But the attitude of the Petitioners unquestionably proves that I must be allowed to intervene or there is not justice at work in this case.

_____

From: Chris Severe [mailto:ghostwarsmusic@gmail.com] Sent: Friday, December 05, 2014 4:23 PM To: Shannon Minter; aorr@nclrights.org; bharbison@sherrardroe.com; pcramer@sherrardroe.com; shickman@sherrardroe.com; jfarringer@sherrardroe.com; mtholland@aol.com; Abby Rubenfeld; martha.campbell@ag.tn.gov; kevin.steiling@ag.tn.gov; sandy Garrett; Krisann Hodges; newseditors@wsj.com Cc: APNASHVILLE@ap.org; hope@focusonthefamily.com

Subject: Re: Again and Again I ask: do you give permission to intervene? I'm moving to intervene in Tanco before the USSC

"To the Petitioners and respondents,

I am moving to intervene before the USSC in Tanco by Monday. Do I have your consent to intervene? Best, Chris"

_____

RESPONSE: On Fri, Dec 5, 2014 at 4:33 PM, Abby Rubenfeld

<arubenfeld@rubenfeldlaw.com> wrote: "Mr. Severe:

no, you do not have permission. your issues have nothing to do with this case.

Abby R. Rubenfeld"

_____

REPLY: Chris Severe <ghostwarsmusic@gmail.com> Fri, Dec 5, 2014 at 4:56 PM To: Abby Rubenfeld <arubenfeld@rubenfeldlaw.com>
Cc: Shannon Minter <sminter@nclrights.org>, "aorr@nclrights.org" <aorr@nclrights.org>, "bharbison@sherrardroe.com" <bharbison@sherrardroe.com>, "pcramer@sherrardroe.com" <pcramer@sherrardroe.com>, "shickman@sherrardroe.com" <shickman@sherrardroe.com>, "jfarringer@sherrardroe.com" <jfarringer@sherrardroe.com>, "mtholland@aol.com" <mtholland@aol.com>, "martha.campbell@ag.tn.gov" <martha.campbell@ag.tn.gov>, "kevin.steiling@ag.tn.gov" <kevin.steiling@ag.tn.gov>, sandy Garrett <sgarrett@tbpr.org>, Krisann Hodges <KHodges@tbpr.org>, "newseditors@wsj.com" <newseditors@wsj.com>, "APNASHVILLE@ap.org" <APNASHVILLE@ap.org>, "hope@focusonthefamily.com" <hope@focusonthefamily.com>

“Hey Abby,

thank you for that response, as dehumanizing and hypocritical as it is. If you will recall, your lawsuit has to deal with sexual orientation and equal rights. So therefore, my motion to intervene has everything to do with this case on the terms of your foundational arguments. The problem is that you do not represent anyone's interest other than same sex orientation which leaves all other variations of sexual orientation in the cold. The newer definition of marriage you seek is not expansive enough. If you will recall the 6th Circuit said this:

‘If it is constitutionally irrational to stand by the man-woman definition of marriage, it must be constitutionally irrational to stand by the monogamous definition of marriage. Plaintiffs have no answer to the point. What they might say they cannot: They might say that tradition or community mores provide a rational basis for States to stand by the monogamy definition of marriage, but they cannot say that because that is exactly what they claim is illegitimate about the States’ male-female definition of marriage. The predicament does not end there. No State is free of marriage policies that go too far in some directions and not far enough in others, making all of them vulnerable—if the claimants’ theory of rational basis review prevails.’ pg 23.

And whether you want to accept it or not, your response to me, alone completely invalidates the entire case for those of us who are proponents of sexual orientation being a class. Polygamist, man-animal, and man-object marriages are completely excluded by the very animus and bigotry

that you attach to all proponents of traditional marriage. Please stop making us look bad. Best, Chris

---

I'll let the Court can public extract the inferences, but it is clear that I should be allowed to intervene because no other variation of sexual orientation is represented by the self-serving Petitioners.

IV. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

A. Consolidation Attempt with 3:13-cv-0607

As an intervenor, I am not new to this action and many others like it. I have been involved here since the inception - the Middle District of Tennessee level. To start, I moved to have this action consolidated with 3:13-cv-0607;[18] *Sevier v. Apple Inc*. (DE 50; App.).[19] (If the Court wants to see an example where Congress and the executive have gotten it wrong in the area of sex by crawling in bed with predatory pornograpers and tech companies like Tim Cook's

---

[18] After filing the Apple lawsuit the UK press wrote, "Last week, a man in the U.S. sued Apple for not including a default "safe mode" that prevented him from accessing porn. Chris Sevier said his Macbook led him to a serious porn addiction that resulted in depression and his family leaving him. While many initially mocked the case, the UK is now asking tech companies to do exactly what Sevier asked for, showing how serious lawmakers around the world are taking the issue of online pornography" https://socialreader.com/me/content/XULox

[19] There is no question that pornified society thanks to filterless devices has cultivated a toxic atmosphere where this question of same sex marriage has been presented before the Court. The reason that CEO Tim Cook at Apple champions pornography and homosexuality is because he knows that exposure to obscenity will liberalize children to grow up more sympathetic to gay and lesbian lifestyle. The outgoing Attorney General Eric Holder knows pornographys connection to the same-sex marriage quest, and this is precisely why he refuses to prosecute a single obscenity violation. History has taught us that the American public does not like being hustled or lied to.

1. http://www.usatoday.com/story/tech/2014/10/30/tim-cook-comes-out/18165361/

2. http://www.christianpost.com/news/porn-use-linked-to-gay-marriage-support-researcher-finds-87008/

3. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8E5ITLCGaqY

Apple Inc.[20], who share the same homosexual values as the Petitioners, read the attached exhibits from Fight The New Drug. The cries of 1000 teenage testimonials should shake this Honorable Court to the core in another area where selfish adults in positions of authority have it distorted reality to advance a selfish financial and political agenda. Although the Petitioners and I seek "new rights" the secondary harmful effects of adults getting it wrong in the area of sexuality is disastrous for the youth. Due to Congress's refusal to cure COPA by the passing of filter legislation that would regulate the Tech companies following the *Ashcroft,* society has "waited" and "seen" that allowing children to walk around with x-rated theaters in their pockets has cultivated sexual holocaust in the form of a human trafficking pandemic. *Ashcroft v. American Civil Liberties Union*, 542 U.S. 656 (2004); *Ashcroft v. Free Speech Coalition*, 535 U.S. 234 (2002). App(a) 21. I do not think that there is any dispute that this action is the fruit of the normalization of inherently perverse sexual conduct that was unthinkable 20 years ago to the point that the United States is chiefly responsible for cultivating a world wide human trafficking epidemic and a public health crisis within our borders, since we have allowed pornography to emerge from above ground due to the deregulation of Tech companies who hide behind section 230 of the Communications Decency Act that the ACLU left in tact. (App.(c); App(a) at 7.[21] Homosexuality, child molestation, human trafficking, abortion is part of an nexus so my attempts to consolidate this action with the Apple litigation was by no means invalid.

B. Prior Intervention Attempts Here

---

[20] http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2014-10-30/tim-cook-im-proud-to-be-gay;

http://fightthenewdrug.org/

[21] Those who share the kindred spirit with the pilgrams may pack up and relocate elsewhere if the Court sides with only the Petitioners.

Besides consolidation, I moved to intervene in the District Court in this action. Respectfully, due to personal pro-same sex values of the single female District Court Judge in Tennessee, my request to intervene was not granted. No explanation was offered, which supports the immediate presumption of abuse of discretion. *Michigan State AFL- CIO v. Miller, 103 F.3d 1240, 1248 (6th Cir. 1997); C.M. v. G.M., 238 F.3d 420 (6th Cir. 2000)*. Furthermore, I moved to intervene at the 6th Circuit Court of appeals level. The request was denied, even by the so called "tolerant" female dissenting Justice. (App(a) 44-68). I now move to intervene at the Supreme Court level, and the request should be reviewed de novo. *Okl. v. Ozarks Rural Elec. Co-op. Corp*., 79 F.3d 1038 (10th Cir. 1996).[22] At the very minimum, the Court must make the parties file written responses to my motion to intervene. The Petitioners have no explanation to prevent the intervention and the Respondents conceed to the slippery slope of sexual orientation classification. I do not see how anyone with a straight face could possibly say that I do not have the right to intervene.

IV. SLIPPERY SLOPES, OPENING DOORS, EVIDENCE THAT DEMANDS A VERDICT

"A prime part of the history of our Constitution . . . is the story of the extension of constitutional rights . . . to people once ignored or excluded." *United States v. Virginia*, 518 U.S. 515, 557 (1996). But if that is true for the Petitioners, it is completely true for me and my request because I too am excluded. Same-sex couples at least have a host of states that they can already get married in. But there are few if any states that will legally allow a man to marry his blow up doll,

[22] The District Court's sua sponte denial in a discrimination action against the true minority violates the spirit of the due process clause under the 5th Amendment and triggers the notion that a "bare . . . desire to harm a politically unpopular group cannot constitute a legitimate governmental interest," *Romer v. Evan*, 517 U.S. 620, 116 S. Ct. 1620, 134 L. Ed. 855 (1996).

his faithful canine, or his low maintenance pet gold fish.[23](see https://www.realdoll.com). Such marriage unions, to include my own, have an equal chance of procreation as Tanco and Jesty, which is to say zilch. Therefore, the other true minority classes of sexual orientation should not be treated unequally.

The majority in Court of Appeals and I completely agree that this is true:

> If it is constitutionally irrational to stand by the man-woman definition of marriage, it must be constitutionally irrational to stand by the monogamous definition of marriage. Plaintiffs have no answer to the point. What they might say they cannot: They might say that tradition or community mores provide a rational basis for States to stand by the monogamy definition of marriage, but they cannot say that because that is exactly what they claim is illegitimate about the States' male-female definition of marriage. The predicament does not end there. No State is free of marriage policies that go too far in some directions and not far enough in others, making all of them vulnerable—if the claimants' theory of rational basis review prevails. pg 23.

The fact that the Petitioners do not offer an explanation to stand by monogamy or other forms of marriage besides "straight" and "gay," which are man-made conventions or "explanatory labels" to begin with, is not a detail that can merely be swept under the rug by the Federal Judiciary because it is convenient to do so. When the Appeals Court said that "it does not end there" in reference to allowing polygamist to marry, it was referring to my intervention request. Every time I seek to intervene in this cases, the same-sex couples say that I cannot but then have no explanation for why not other than it makes their entire plight look ridiculous and pathetic. But my involvement either highlights that or it drives home the quest for true equality and tolerance, as I clearly hope.

Accordingly, the Dissent in the Sixth Circuit amounts to an engrossing TED Talk or, possibly, an introductory lecture in Political Philosophy on the way that post-modern relativist

[23] In terms of statistics, the evidence shows that there will be fewer divorces between man-machine couples than between man-man or man-woman ones.

attempt to get on top by arguing that “truth is relative,” and therefore, “no one set of beliefs is superior,” which is truth claim itself that is flawed on its own terms. [24] Although the dissent was hussled by the emotional appeals of the Petitioners, it was unclear whether the dissent was sympathetic towards my request to intervene or whether a “line in sand” was drawn due to the same bigotry allegedly harbored by the Respondents exclusively. In keeping with the Dissent, I should not be treated as an "abstraction." App. at 27. I too must be "recognized as a person," suffering actual harm as a result of being denied the right to marry where [I] reside or the right to have [my] valid marriages recognized there.[25] App(a) 43. I should be allowed to intervene. At the very least, the Court should ease the burden off of itself by making the Petitioners and Respondents respond to this motion. A sua sponte denial of this motion, itself shows evidence of bias, prejudice, avoidance, and railroading by a Federal actor. There is a silent form of bullying taking place in this act that is down right nefarious. In this case the Court may invalidate all same-sex marriages or Christianity as the basis of policy making by inference. The case is too important not to allow me to intervene.

V. INTERVENTION SHOULD BE ALLOWED GIVEN THE IMPLICATIONS OF SEVIER V. CUOMO BEFORE THE COURT THAT PRODUCED WINSOR 14-cv-5380

[24] That is, I have the equal right to "force convert" society to my world view in the same way that same-sex couples do, as they disenfranchise the states, and appeal to judicial arrogance to convert them into zars. There is only one problem. Apparently, not all world views are equal. To say that all truth claims are equal is itself a truth claim that is vying for superiority amongst the rest of them. I think we can all agree that Nazism was an inferior world view. On the basis of the dissent's position, I have an equal right to be a bad influence on children as the same-sex couples. The Petitioners are antagonist of the truth. I have an equal right to be an antagonist of the truth as they. I should be allowed to intervene.

[25] I am not a "political zealot" trying to push reform on their fellow citizens; they a committed machinist wanting equal status to force my married neighbors, friends, and coworkers, who would see my conduct to be obscene to accept me. In fact, I am a combat veteran who did not commit fraudulent enlistment like some of the Petitioners, who should have zero credibility before the Court, since they have admitted to committing felonious activity within the complaint itself. App(a) at 43.

Furthermore, I recommend that the Court strongly consider the implications my pending lawsuit, *Cuomo et al,* 14-cv-5380, in the same venue that gave us the breath taking decision in "*Windsor*." [26] I filed a lawsuit against several states that support traditional marriage and same-sex marriage alike, suggesting that their definitions of marriage were too narrow and outdated. (see Exhibits). If intervention is allowed, I'll nonsuit the claims against the defendants from Tennessee in that pending action. [27] The Honorable Judge Peska from New York, who is hailed as a prospective Supreme Court candidate, is manifesting symptoms of a panic attack in that case because I have challenged the Constitutionality of the law that allows a person to marry a person of the same-sex as "being too narrow" for the identical reasons that the Petitioners have argued here.[28] Although New York's "modern laws" permit same sex marriage, New York's definition is still "too narrow for my taste" in accordance with the arguments asserted by the Defendants. (see Marriage Equality Act of 2011). The states that have allowed for same-sex marriage in the name of "tolerance and freedom" do not know how to even respond to my lawsuit to expand marriage "farther still" so that anyone can marry "anyone" or "anything" based on sexual urges they have acted upon, since acting upon one's "trusted feelings" is apparently a

[26] *Windsor* v. *United States*, 699 F.3d 169 (2d Cir. 2012). Pending now is a lawsuit against a myriad of Attorney Generals and Governors for the laws that discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation for those of us in the "pan sexual" or "other" category. The states that have decided to authorize same sex marriage are at a total loss as to how to respond to that lawsuit, since it rest entirely on the very authority that opened the door to same sex marriage in the first place. If this Court does not allow me to intervene, a New York Court might decide the fate of the Utah's marriage laws.

[27] This is not the only case that Governor Haslam and Attorney General Cooper are my defendants in. See 3:14-cv-1313. Attorney General Cooper used to work across the hall from me at the same law firm. Sufficit it to say we are on acrimonious terms.

[28] I am not sure if the ACLU saw that lawsuit coming so early.

"fundamental right."[29] In *Cuomo*, I rely on all of the arguments advanced by the *homo* Petitioners here. What is to stop me from challenging the laws in all of the states that have allowed for same sex marriage. I mean, the ACLU has asked me to wait, but why should I? Sympathy appeals do not work on me, like they have on countless Federal Judges who are lead around the by the nose ring by the pornified cultural climate. The homosexuals are completely unsympathetic to the true minorities of the excluded sexual orientation classification. The Petitioners feel that it is perfectly fine for them to infiltrate pro-traditional marriage predominantly evangelical states and scheme to force same-sex marriage down throats of the voting majority, but when I seek to have the so called "tolerant states" change their definition of marriage to meet my cultivated orientation, they mount a nuclear meltdown in keeping with their lack of morality and do not even know how to even respond. It is as if these states are operating in a bubble of illogical distortion with manifest blindness, which also happens to be the hallmark of ISIS culture. The fact that there are states within our union that seem to lack the ability to even define "right and wrong" is beyond disturbing and patently anti-American. [30]

VI. ANIMUS

If the Court wants to see what real animus looks like, consider the reaction from the New York District Court to my request to marry an inanimate object. The *Cuomo* court recently ruled sua sponte "no matter the Plaintiff's reasoning, the Court finds the Plaintiff's [request to marry a non-member of the opposite or same-sex] frivolous and meritless." In other words, the Federal

---

[29] When I get stuck in traffick on Pennsylvnia avenue, I have the urge to honk and yell, but I resist that natural urge because I do not want to be accused of disorderly conduct, and I am no scoff law.

[30] The Military is having to cope with the repeal of "Don't Ask Don't Tell" and it is poisoning it from the inside out and damaging moral severely. Instances of sexual assault by members of the same sex are out of control because the truth has been traded for something else. There has been an exodus of Soldiers who value honor, virtue, and morality, once the gays were allowed to infiltrate the military setting. Unlike lawyers, as demonstrated by the Petitioners counsel, Soldiers are held to higher disciplinary standards because their lifestyle deals with life and death.

District that gave us *Winsor,* following Attorney General Holder's monumental abuse of process, "found my claims to be meritless" because "the court found my claims to be meritless." *Windsor*, 699 F.3d at 2675 2691. We call that "circular reasoning" in the JAG core. The same-sex marriage proponents have dug a hole that they don't seem to know how to get out of, trapped in their own insanity predicated on egoism that is so systemic that even weak minded Government officials are blind to it.[31] The hard truth is that my request to marry an inanimate object may not be equal to a man's request to marry a woman for self-evident and biological reasons,[32] but there cannot be any question that my request to marry an inanimate object is not any less "frivolous" or "meritless" than SGT DeKoe's request to marry Kostura and call him his wife. [33] The equality and validity of my request to marry my spouse of choice is self-evidently equal to the Petitioners and for the identical legal basis.[34] The Court cannot allow this action to dissolve into a game of

---

[31] Allowing me to intervene with enable the Court to reconcile two inconsistent positions taken by two female Federal Judges, who are cheerleaders for same-sex marriage: the Dissent in the 6th Circuit said "the correct result is so obvious," in pushing to have same-sex marriage adopted, but Judge Peska in the New York District Court ruled that my request to marry an inanimate object was "meritless" and "frivolous." She then threatened to sanction me. Perhaps the problem is the human heart. And for us humans to use our feelings to come up with policies to guide our Nation is, respectfully, "down right dumb." What we need is a compass so that our Nation is not like a guideless ship on the high seas at night meandering towards jagged rocks. Fortunately, due to providence, our Nation is blessed to have a compass. That compass comes in the form of Constitution, and the Constitution is derived from the Bible. That is not the way I feel about it. That position squares with objective evidence. This Nation was built on the foundation of Christ. This does not mean that we mandate Christianity, but our policies should be shaped by it, if we want to continue to prosper.

[32] The Court of Appeals here said: "It is not society's laws or for that matter any one religion's laws, but nature's laws (that men and women complement each other biologically)."" App(a) 22.

[33] The fact that SGt DeKoe committed fraudulent enlistment by misleading recruiters at MEPS about his sexual lifestyle is felony offense that cannot simply be swept under the rug, as SGT DeKoe improperly uses his military service to float patriotic appeals before the Court in a manner that molest the rule of law itself in a service discrediting manner. There a people in jail who have committed far less serious crimes that fraudulent enlistment.

[34] The Chief Judge of the New York District Court engaged in the exact same dehumanization against me on the basis of my sexual orientation against that the Petitioners complaint the Respondents of having committed, with the distinction that the Respondents did not literally threaten the Petitioners. As the cherry on top to dismissing my complaint to marry my object of affection, the poor Judge Peska went so far as to threatened me with sanctions if I attempted file anything else, and vowed to violate my 1st amendment right to petition the court for relief, as if to reinforce her complete disregard for the Constitution. Fortunately, I am the only one present here who has been shot at by Al Qaeda, so the New York Court's threats were not persuasive. A motion for reconsideration has been filed in

linguistic semantics because the gays are convinced that their feelings alone are the best trustworthy source of law. Such a contention is per se evidence of mental illness of self-entitled narcissism. Objective truths must be applied or history itself will hold the Court's decision in extreme contempt and the Court's authority will diminish further, when we need a robust system of checks and balance now more so than ever in this Country whose influence is decreasing because we refuse to embrace the truth. The Courts, the executive, and the legislature are not doing the American public any favors by allowing it to lie to itself, when there are members of this Honorable Court who are subject matter experts of the truth, justice, logic, and law. The adoption of lies threaten our unity and influence in the world, as a force of good. Our National identity is at stake. I should be authorized to intervene.

VII. FREEDOM AND TRUTH

"Euclid's first common notion is this: Things which are equal to the same things are equal to each other. That's a rule of mathematical reasoning and its true because it works - has done and always will do. In his book Euclid says this is self evident. You see there it is even in that 2000 year old book of mechanical law it is the self evident truth that things which are equal to the same things are equal to each other." Abraham Lincoln

"Objective truth" has its place inside the Courtrooms of the United States more than inside any other governmental institution. I became a lawyer because of the character of the justices of old, who operated in a culture of honor and gave me reason to believe that the Courts can get it right. The cultural environment has changed, since then. Respectfully, culture have moved so away

---

which I beg the Court that gave us *Winsor* to issue sanctions so that it can be said with convincing clarity that I have been persecuted for attempting to defend the integrity of the Constitution by the United State that gave birth to the entire initiative before us. Unsurprisingly, the New York District Court is stalling to rule on my motion for reconsideration, knowing that I am intervening here and that any decision it makes will be immediately filed with Court and serves to either discredit all same-sex marriages or to blow open the doors to total equality on the basis of sexual orientation. But all of these considerations aside, the key point to see is that the New York District Court, due to out of its own arrogance established that if my request to marry my preferred object of desire is "sanctionable," then so is Tanco's request to marry Jesty. It has to be either or. The elementary precepts of justice demand as much under the very arguments of equality that the Petitioners float.

from truth as a Nation, given the abuse of the first amendment, that I feel compelled to give a short overview of truth and freedom for both the public's benefit, if not some members of the Court. The significance of "truth" and "freedom" should be considered here, since these fundamental concepts tend to be hijacked by the self-interested. In todays post-modern-western individualistic society, "freedom" is more complex than we think it is; and "truth" is more important than we admit. Without the "truth," there is no "freedom."[35] Freedom is not "the presence of the restriction" or "the absence of "restriction." Freedom is the "presence of the right restrictions." The set of restrictions that fit the givenness of our nature is the set that the Supreme Court must adopt in defining marriage, if we are to advance towards a richer freedom as a Nation. [36] The evidentiary record since the foundation of this Nation shows that crafting our laws to push mankind towards a healthy lifestyle is an act of sacrificial love. To fail to do so, even under the best intentions is an act of extreme hate.[37] Accordingly, the Court should define marriage in a manner that creates the most amount of intimacy, reconciliation, and peace in light of the givenness of our nature, despite whose feelings it hurts, to include my own.[38] If the Petitioners and I are equally delusional as the New York District Court ruled in *Cuomo*, this most Honorable Courts would be doing all Americans to provide us with a wake up call, so that we may seek counseling and reconsider our lifestyles, while "there's still time to change the road

[35] Then you will know the truth, and the truth will set you free." John 8:32

[36] For example, a fish laying on the grass is not free at all; it's only when the fish is restricted to water can it flourish in light of its design.

[37] It is not by mistake that we put drug dealers in jail.

[38] I make this argument even if it is subversive to my personal request here because the Constitution must come first. When I stepped outside the wire in Operation Iraqi Freedom downrange, my personal interest were secondary to the Constitution at that time as well.

[we're] on."[39] (See Led Zeplin Stairway To Heaven). The Court should not permit us to languish in continual darkness. Afterall, "*darkness cannot drive out darkness; only light can do that. Hate cannot drive out hate; only love can do tha*t." The "light" that Reverend King referred to comes in the form of transcending truth of the New Testament, and I am convinced that many of the wise and discerning Honorable Justice here have the backbone to "speak the truth in love" for the good of our Nation so that we as a people may be set on the right course for our individual and collective benefit. The United States Constitution provides the compass, and the Court's decision should accord with transcultural law in order to advance human flourishing. I make no apologies for my request to intervene nor my request for the Court to demonstrate "leadership" in the face of adversity.

VIII. THE UNEXAMINED ASSUMPTION OF THE SUPERIORITY OF OUR CULTURAL MOMENT

Our experts now believe that the experts from 50 years ago had beliefs that were laughable, primitive, and plain wrong. However, the evidence shows that 50 years from now, the experts of that time will find our experts' ideas to be primitive, laughable, and plain wrong as well. To suggest otherwise is too simplistic.[40] Prior to Dr. Kinsey's research initiatives that began during War II, 20 years ago the idea of non-traditional marriage was entirely unthinkable. [41] Aristotle spoke of the continuing debate in all societies between "old speech and new speech" in his discourses on rhetoric. This fight is not new. The struggle between good and evil is as old

---

[39] Confess your sins to each other and pray for each other so that you may be healed. James 5:16.

[40] This case boils down to which set of truth claims should we use to base our policies on "man's reasoning vs. the God of Bible's." It is historical fact that the master narrative of the United States Constitution was the Bible, which has amounted to a compass for our nation and the yardstick for determining reasonableness.

[41] 1 Corinthians 1:20; *Where is the wise person? Where is the teacher of the law? Where is the philosopher of this age? Has not God made foolish the wisdom of the world?*

as time. The United States Supreme Court must come to terms that religion is at bar in Court controversies such as this one,[42] and "without a faith basis, there is no basis for morality, without morality, there is no basis for law."[43] To suggest otherwise is per se evidence of delusional reasoning or worse, "game playing to accomplish a nefarious agenda."

IX. WITHOUT A FAITH BASIS, THERE IS NO BASIS FOR MORALITY, WITHOUT MORALITY THERE IS NO BASIS FOR LAW

United States Supreme Court long since settled that the United States is a Christian Nation. *Church of the Holy Trinity v. United States*, 143 U.S. 457 (1892). It is the result of the fact that we live in a Christian Nation that all of us here in this case can have a such robust debate of this critical matters without fear of reprisal.[44] The New Testament is the yardstick of reality and the definer of right and wrong. Our laws are derived from it. It is not the Petitioners and I but the Respondents, who like Reverend King, stand on the vantage point of the Bible in making their arguments in the defense of traditional marriage.[45] Rev. King did not argue that the United States

---

[42] All of us are bring to the table semi-religion unproven faith based assumptions in answering the question presented. Religion at the end of the day is a set of truth claims to the greater questions.
All of us bring a set of semi-religious unproven faith based assumptions to the public square in attempting to answer the "greater questions." We are all advancing a set of exclusive truth claims, but one set is superior to the rest. This is fight between Christianity and Atheism.

[43] The fact that the Petitioners admit that they are post-modern relativists, means that they do not believe in morality, which means they have no basis for even seeking justice in the first place, which should invoke 12(b)(1) and 41(b).

[44] It is merely a fact that I am the poster child of reprisal campaigns, which is more reason to speak up. The Tennessee Supreme Court and District Attorney Offices in Tennessee and Texas have targeted me for speaking out against corrupt District Attorneys and members of the Board of Professional Responsibility, who lack adequate checks and balances.

[45] The Dissent in the Court of Appeals in this case made parallels to the civil war in pushing for same-sex marriages. Yet, to do have done so is totally counter productive the the same-sex marriage quest that I join. The war to end slavery was fought to make the United States more of a Christian Nation. The war that the same-sex petitioners and I bring pushes the Nation away from Christianity towards becoming a more savage nation. Homosexuality and slavery promote savagery that offend the self-evident reasoning. The fact that the Dissent does not see that or more likely, does not want to see that is itself evidence of the fallibility of humans. Perhaps instead of looking towards our own minds to promulgate policy, we should look to Jesus Christ, who was the only man who claimed to be God with lasting credibility. It is ok of the Court to say that Christianity is a superior set of truth claims to base our policies on, if in fact it is.

was "too Christian" in fighting segregation. He argued that the United States was not "Christian enough" in pushing for civil rights on the basis of something as uncontrollable and insignificant as "skin color," where there is no choice involved whatsoever.[46] For the proponents of gay marriage to invoke the name of Dr. King is a self-defeating act that supports traditional marriage. However, if the Court is to disregard transcultural law, by following brilliant philosophers like Lady Gaga and the philosophers are MTV, then the Court must at the very minimum give ALL variations of sexual orientation equal protection, and I should be allowed to intervene to help the Court resolve the question, since my sexual orientation class has been left in the cold by the Petitioners, who fail to mention any other orientation beyond their own in their voluminous.[47] That is, I should be allowed "to cash" in the Petitioners adult-centric conquest. As someone who works in the entertainment field, I understand the streams of influences. The USSC is a major stream of influence, and I would urge the Court, not to lose sight of how its decision here will impact children for generations to come. [48] The Court should shape our laws to steer our people towards lifestyle choices that lead to maximized liberty, and not towards of lifestyle of opportunity cost that amounts to settling for less, regret, shame, and transferrable suffering that will adversely impact the current generation of children and generations to come. There are more

[46] I love the Army's approach to race. The civilian sector should prosper from it. The Army instills in recruits that all people are one color - "green."

[47] Respectfully, the Nation would profit if parts of the Courts stopped tapping into sources, like Modern Family and tuned into Joyce Meyer instead. The question is which direction does the Court want to lead the Nation, towards Christ/child-centric reality or self/adult-centric reality.

[48] If "little Billy" is to grow-up under the impression that it is a legally viable option that he someday marry either "little Timmy" or "little Sally," the Constitution dictates that "little Billy" also know that marrying a chicken, blow up doll, or a combination of things is an equally legally viable option. If not the Court will infuse hypocrisy into our most foundational laws and create instability, rendering us without identity. The pro-gay champions often publicly assert that "God not only made Adam and Eve, he made Adam and Steve" However, in the setting of that argument, God also made "Adam" and "trees." So, if Adam wants to marry the tree that should be fine as well, since God also create that.

American kids now more so than ever who “think they are gay” when being “gay” is a man made convention that does not even exist. Easily accessible pornography and shame have a lot to do with that. This action is not just a matter of the heart, it is grounded squarely in the neurology of the brain science of dopamine, and anyone who suggests otherwise has an emotional problem with the truth.

The Supreme Court has recognized the secondary harmful effects of pornography.[49] The Court should recognize the secondary harmful effects of encouraging homosexual lifestyle. Perhaps the Federal Government should not encourage its citizens to open doors to act on urges to have sex with machines, animals, non-spouses, and members of the same sex. Perhaps Planned Parenthood, for example, needs to be banned from our public schools because the organization is spewing forth false permission giving beliefs that violate the givenness of our nature. But if the Court finds that homosexual should be allowed to marry it has zero basis to prevent me from marrying my object of affection, polygamy, and eventually, the court should

[49] The Supreme Court and other state and federal courts have recognized the harmful secondary effects of"hard-core porn shops" and other "sexually oriented businesses" that specialize in pornography and commercial nudity and upheld the right of cities and counties to enact zoning and licensing ordinances based on reports and studies of their destructive impact. There were at least forty such studies and reports of municipalities and state agencies that have documented such crime impacts and urban blight, including those reports from such diverse communities as Los Angeles, Cleveland, New York City, Phoenix, Minneapolis, Indianapolis, Seattle, Oklahoma City, Houston, Dallas, El Paso, Las Vegas, .Alliance, Ohio, Newport News, Virginia, Manatee County, Florida, Adams County, Colorado, and New Hanover County, North Carolina. As the Supreme Court said in the *Paris Adult Theatre* case in 1973, "The sum of experience...affords an ample basis for legislatures to conclude that a sensitive, key relationship of human existence, central to family life, community welfare, and the development of human personality, can be debased and distorted by crass commercial exploitation of sex. The States [and Congress] have the power to make a morally neutral judgment that public exhibition of obscene material, or commerce in such material, has a tendency to injure the community as a whole, to endanger the public safety, or in Chief Justice Warren's words, to jeopardize, States' "right. . .to maintain a decent society." *Paris Adult Theatre Iv. Slaton,* 413 US 49, at 63,69 (1973). As noted by the Supreme Court in *Roth v. United States,* 354 U.S. 476, at485 n. 15 (1957), and *New Yorkv. Ferber,* 458 U.S. 747, at 754 (1982), there is an international Treaty that can be used by U.S. and other Nations to cooperate in identifying and prosecuting obscenity offenses. The original Treaty is called "Agreement for the Suppression of the Circulation of Obscene Publications", signed at Paris, May 4, 1910 In the U.S, it is reported at 37 Stat. Pt. 2, p. 1511, Treaties in Force 209 (U.S. Dept. of State), Treaty Series 559. The 1949 Protocol transferred the recording and tracking functions to the United Nations. There are now over 130 signatory countries. Pursuant to the spirit of these prosecutorial treaties, other countries can follow our standard and imposed requirements that all devices be sold with filters in effect.

ratify child exploitation because there is no reason to stop it. As it stands now the DOJ refuses to prosecute obscenity laws regarding adults. In terms of marrying inanimate objects, the Court itself is required to be married in theory to an inanimate object known as the United States Constitution. So the Court should be able to relate to my request and permit intervention.

X. CLASS PROTECTION IS AN ALL OR NOTHING THING

Under the due process class and equal protection clause, all variations of a suspect class are afforded protection, not just the largest majority and the minority. Take "race classification" for example, the Supreme Court has stated that "all men," "all women," and "all Americans," cannot be discriminated against on the basis of race. *McDonald v. Santa Fe Trail Transp. Co.*, 427 U.S. 273, 278-79, 96 S. Ct. 2574, 2578, 49 L. Ed. 2d 493 (1976). This includes non-obvious and unpopular race classes like "whites." See *McDonald,* 96 S. Ct. 2574 at 278. [50] Therefore, by extension "all men," "all women," and "Americans" cannot be discriminated on the basis of their "sexual orientation," no matter how peculiar their taste might be.[51] This is of course only true if

---

[50] The Supreme held in regarding to discrimination against whites: Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits the discharge of "any individual" because of "such individual's race," s 703(a)(1), 42 U.S.C. s 2000e-2(a)(1).5 Its terms are not limited to discrimination against members of any particular race. Thus although we were not there confronted with racial discrimination against whites, we described the Act in *Griggs v. Duke Power Co*., 401 U.S. 424, 431, 91 S.Ct. 849, 853, 28 L.Ed.2d 158 (1971), as prohibiting "(d)iscriminatory preference for Any (racial) group, Minority or Majority" (emphasis added). Similarly the EEOC, whose interpretations are entitled to great deference, Id., at 433-434, 91 S.Ct., at 854-855, has consistently interpreted Title VII to proscribe racial discrimination in private employment against whites on the same terms as racial discrimination against nonwhites, holding that to proceed otherwise would "constitute a derogation of the Commission's Congressional mandate to eliminate all practices which operate to disadvantage the employment opportunities of any group protected by Title VII, including Caucasians." EEOC Decision No. 74-31, 7 FEP 1326, 1328, CCH EEOC Decisions ¶ 6404, p. 4084 (1973).7**2579 This conclusion is in accord with uncontradicted legislative history to the effect that Title VII was intended to "cover white men and white women and **all Americans**," 110 Cong.Rec. 2578 (1964) (remarks of Rep. Celler), and create an "obligation not to discriminate against whites," Id., at 7218 (memorandum of Sen. Clark). See also Id., at 7213 (memorandum of Sens. Clark and Case); Id., at 8912 (remarks of Sen. Williams). We therefore hold today that Title VII prohibits racial discrimination against the white petitioners in this case upon the same standards as would be applicable were they Negroes and Jackson white.

[51] For example, A white police officer in Ferguson cannot use deadly force against a black citizen without probable cause. And a black police officer in Utah cannot use deadly force against a white citizen without evidence of hostile intent.

"sexual orientation" is a suspect class as several courts, other than the 6th Circuit Court of Appeals, have found in hoping to leave their mark on history. [52] However, when those courts found sexual orientation to be a class, they were not considering the complete picture and were clearly intoxicated by the unexamined superiority of our cultural moment. [53] On the basis of the terms offered by the Respondents, my intervention takes a hypothetical slippery slope and makes it a reality. Intervention must be permitted because to bar intervention would be an act of racism on the terms argued by the Petitioners here and the Court in *Winsor,* 133 S. Ct. at 2683-85[54]

XI. INESCAPABLE EVIDENCE OF RACISM DEMONSTRATED BY THE PLAINTIFFS THAT IS NOW PART OF THE PERMANENT RECORD FOREVER THAT THE COURT CANNOT IGNORE

I should be allowed to intervene because the Petitioners position is so hypocritical that it threatens all other forms of sexual orientation, as the Petitioners breath lies into the public record in using the "race card." In all of the same sex marriage cases that I have moved to intervene in,

---

http://q13fox.com/2014/11/24/ferguson-grand-jury-decision-expected-today/

http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2014/sep/3/justice-dillon-taylor-after-white-utah-man-fatally/

[52] In only considering the "gay orientation," while being "punch drunk" on culture, these Courts sought to established "sexual orientation classification" *Pedersen v. Office of Pers. Mgmt*., 881 F. Supp. 2d 294, 3 18-19 (D. Conn. 2012); *Watkins v. US. Army*, 875 F.2d 699, 725 (9th Cir. 1989); *Hernandez-Montiel v. INS,* 225 F.3d 1084, 1093 (9th Cir. 2000), see G.M. Herek, et al., Demographic, Psychological, and Social Characteristics of Self-Identfled Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Adults in a US. Probability Sample, 7 SEXUALITY REs. & Soc. POL'Y 176, 186, 188l *Golinski v. Office of Pers. Mgmt.*, 824 F. Supp. 2d 968, 314 33 (N.D. Cal. 2012); *Lawrence*, 539 U.S. at 558 - 560.

[53] This matter involves religious, psychological, economic, sociological, considerations and the Court must understand them all the lead us in the right direction.

[54] As a matter of honor, the Dissent in the 6th Circuit re-emphasis a duty to uphold the Constitution, saying that failing to do so reduces the judiciary to a "sham." An uncharacteristic emotional outburst, the dissent stated: "More than 20 years ago, when I took my oath of office to serve as a judge on the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, I solemnly swore to "administer justice without respect to persons," to "do equal right to the poor and to the rich," and to "faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties incumbent upon me . . . under the Constitution and laws of the United States." *See* 28 U.S.C. § 453. If we in the judiciary do not have the authority, and indeed the responsibility, to right fundamental wrongs left excused by a majority of the electorate, our whole intricate, constitutional system of checks and balances, as well as the oaths to which we swore, prove to be nothing but shams."

all of the Petitioners have equated their plight to the "race fight" in their complaints and motions. [55] I then exercised my right to travel and relocate to many states where these matters were pending, just as the Petitioners did. *Saenz* v. *Roe*, 526 U.S. 489, 498, 499 (1999). I then move to intervene, after sustaining the exact same injury by the clerk's office denials with a minor twist. I am of the true minority of sexual orientation. I then make the same arguments using the exact same legal authority as the same-sex proponents,[56] only to then witness the gay Petitioners make a complete "about face" on foundations of their own arguments in vehemently opposing my intervention request. In doing so the Petitioners not only "explain away" the "explanation" for

---

[55] On facebook.com millions of people posted the equal sign to show their support to gay marraige in equating it to a matter of "equality," when it has never been about that. Its about selfish adults trying to steal dignity from traditional married couples and have it supplanted on themselves in order to make them feel less ashamed of their decision to molest members of the same sex, which is so inherently shameful they are forced to label their plight "gay pride." To post the equal sign accomplishes an act of racism by the unwary and the easily duped.

[56] (1). On May 30, 2014, at 5:04 AM, I emailed Plaintiff counsel entitled,"Again and Again I ask: do you give permission to intervene? I'm moving to intervene in Tanco today." I attached the motion to intervene and inquired: "I move today to intervene in the 6th Circuit Court of Appeals. I ask unto you pursuant to the local rules and the 6th Circuit rules, do you permit or reject my rule 24 request to intervene? The response you give will be telling, even if you withhold a response in bad faith. Best, Chris."

(2) On Fri, May 30, 2014 at 8:00 AM, Petitioners counsel on behalf of the same-sex quest responded, "Chris, Plaintiffs, [Petitioners], do not consent to your request. Shannon." (This response demonstrates that the same-sex Petitioners do not really see their fight as one under equal protection or race, as they pretend. In light of the response, the question presented is who are the real bigots?)

(3) On Fri, May 30, 2014 at 11:32 AM, I emailed the Petitioners an email entitled, "Smidgen of Hypocrisy Anyone? Games of Semantics? Internal Threat to the Constitution?" I retorted: "Shannon, there must be a mistake - you denied my request to intervene (see your response below); I ask that you reread the pleadings. How can you deny my request to intervene, equate this matter to a race plight, and argue sexual orientation equal protection, only advocating protection for the largest minority? Is this merely all a game of semantics for the Plaintiffs? Children and the integrity of the Equal protection clause hang in the balance. In case you miss something, I have reattached the pleadings. Additionally, I have attached some of the pleadings from the contemporaneous pornography lawsuit to suggest that even though I am not recruiting kids to have an amended sexual orientation, like the gays are, does not mean that ALL classes of sexual orientation MUST have equal protection as a suspect class. I am not on board with recruiting, but to be at odds with my request in both the lower Court and Court of appeals completely demonstrates the lack of sincerity in your argument. But it appears that you are not only toying with the emotions of the general public in this case by denying my request, you are posing an imminent threat to the integrity of the United States Constitution and therefore, National Security. The perpetuation of self-deception and the deception of others is not a act of love but of callous evil and hate." Best, Chris

their entire case in chief, they also conclusively proved that they do not sincerely believe that their case to be on par with the race plight whatsoever.[57] In fact, the Petitioners' false use of "the race card" as a platform to accomplish selfish ends is entirely racist in and of itself.[58] The African American community should be outraged at this flagrant racist exploitation by those who are proud to be enemies of morality. The Petitioners are literally riding on the backs of persecuted slaves, and their arguments should be completely invalidated. The horse faced hypocrisy by the gay Petitioners, threatens all other variations of the sexual orientation suspect class and reopens our Nation's most egregious wound, associated with slavery and racial discrimination. [59] It is completely outrageous.

Imagine if during the 1964 civil rights movement, African American group arguing for class protection for the purposes of the 14th amendment on the basis of race. [60] Then a hispanic person attempted to intervene, as an ambassador of his race after sustaining an identical injury, and in response, the African American plaintiffs teamed up with white supremacist defendants to say "no you cannot intervene, your particular race variation should still be discriminated

---

[57] Given the direct evidence of fraud committed on the Court, as embodied in the email exchange, the Court cannot just be nonresponsive or indifferent to it.

[58] If I am not allowed to intervene and the Petitioners are successful, Washington will need to tear down the Martin Luther King memorial and build a gay one instead.

[59] The fraud does not stop with the phony race arguments, in this case, we have lesbians virtually pretending to be the natural parents of an adopted child, when procreation between these couples is as impossible as procreation between myself and a machine. It is out right misdirection. Adopted children of same sex couples have a fragmented ancestral chain. Adopted children of traditional marriages have fragmented ancestral chain, but not to the same extent. And moreover, it is what traditional couples, who adopt, symbolize and represent that makes them distinct, insofar as they represent all marriages. In light of fraud, the same sex marriage couples make a better case for why they should not be allowed to adopt more so than they make the case that they should be allowed to marry at the expense of all other sexual orientation divisions.

[60] *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954); (42 u.s.c. 2000a).

against." [61] That is exactly what has occurred here, if sexual orientation is found to be a class.[62] I am like the hispanic intervenor, and the Petitioners are like the African Americans, the largest minority, and the Respondents are like the white supremacists in the analogy.[63] Unquestionably, I deserve a seat at the table in this action, even if it is inconvenient for the railroad agenda cultivated by an entire mass media that is steeped in porn culture. [64] The true question presented here is whether traditional marriage is a relationship that is "stand alone" and unequal to all other forms of sexual and spiritual unions. I leave that for the Courts to decide, and ask that the Court rise above the fleeting culture momentum. If sexual orientation is a protected class, my orientation should not be left out in the cold because it is part of the truer minority.

XII. THE TRUE MINORITIES INTEREST ARE BEING LEFT OUT

In their motion for a Preliminary injunction the Petitioners state:

---

[61] Now that I have revealed exposed this fraud to the Court, the Court must be responsive to it, and cannot just allow it to be swept under the rug, like the President attempted in light of Louis Lerner's targeting at the IRS. The Court cannot sweep the evidence of fraudulent enlistment memorialized by the same-sex Petitioners in the public record in such a high profile case.

[62] The Petitioners argue to the Court that this case is equal to a race matter, relying on *Loving v. Virginia,* 388 U.S. at 1 -12. . *(*which was the case that allowed inter-racial opposite sex couples to marry). So, if this case was equal to a race matter as the Petitioners have tireless argued, one would think that the Petitioners would want ALL classes of race represented. But "NO," that is incorrect! The Petitioners have proven to be the most bigoted group of all- only advocating their brand of sexual orientation, and telling all others classes of sexual orientation to "take a hike." At least the Respondents have the backbone to make factual and scientific arguments that traditional marriage is superior to all other forms in rejecting my request to intervene based on a faith basis. But the Petitioners retreat into hiding when I use their arguments to defend my the rights.. The Petitioners' counsel is in fact violating the rules of professional responsibility by making racist arguments, advancing dangerous legal paradigms, like "the ends justify the means." There is a duty of candor owed to the Court and to the public that the Petitioners molest.

[63] Yet, in this case, the Respondents are arguing from the vantage point of the New Testament, unlike in the race plight, where their positions were incomplete conflict with the New Testament.

[64] Even the Respondents stipulate that all sexual orientation classes must have equal protection and due process rights extended to them if traditional marriage is redefined, under their "slippery slope" arguments. (FN See Appellant. Jeffrey Michael Hayes, Polygamy Comes Out of the Closet: The New Strategy of Polygamy Activists, 3 Stan. J. Civ. Rts. & Civ. Liberties 99, 109 (2007).

Because the Anti-Recognition Laws target same-sex couples, and only those couples, for denial of recognition of their otherwise valid out-of-state marriages, these laws, on their face, discriminate against gay, lesbian, and bisexual people on the basis of their sexual orientation. *See, e.g., Windsor v. United States*, 699 F.3d 169, 181 (2d Cir. 2012) (analyzing DOMA as discriminating against gay and lesbian people); *Massachusetts v. United States Dep't of Health & Human Servs*., 682 F.3d 1, 11 (1st Cir. 2012) (same).

From this excerpt, it is clearer that the Petitioners are only interested in advancing their branch of sexual orientation at the exclusion of all others to include my own. I join the Petitioners in their argument in their motion for preliminary injunction with a minor twist.[65] Intervention must be allowed because the Petitioners are only advancing the interest of their class of sexual orientation. The Petitioners are quick to state that "marriage is the most important relation in life"

---

[65] The Petitioners argue in their motion for an injunction:

"In *Windsor,* the Supreme Court noted that whether "heightened equal protection scrutiny should apply to laws that classify on the basis of sexual orientation" is an issue "still being debated and considered in the courts." 133 S. Ct. at 2683-84. Factors that the Supreme Court and other courts have used to determine whether a classification warrants heightened scrutiny under the Equal Protection Clause include: whether the group targeted by the law has suffered a history of invidious discrimination, *see Mass. Bd. of Ret. v. Murgia*, 427 U.S.307, 313 (1976); and whether the characteristic defining the group bears no relation "to the ability to perform or contribute to society." *Frontiero v. Richardson*, 411 U.S. 677, 686 (1973). If a classified group has suffered a history of discrimination based on a characteristic that has no bearing on their ability to perform or contribute to society, it is very likely that the classification "provides no sensible ground for differential treatment." *City of Cleburne v. Cleburne Living Center*, 473 U.S. 432, 440 (1985); *see Murgia*, 427 U.S. at 313 (holding heightened scrutiny is appropriate when members of a group have "been subjected to unique disabilities on the basis of stereotyped characteristics not truly indicative of their abilities"). As additional—but not dispositive—factors, courts have sometimes considered the group's minority status or relative lack of political power, *see Plyler v. Doe*, 457 U.S. 202, 216 n.14 (1985); *Lyng v. Castillo*, 477 U.S. 635, 638 (1986) ("minority *or* politically powerless") (emphasis added), and whether the characteristic defining the group is immutable or an integral part of a person's identity, *see Bowen v. Gilliard*, 483 U.S. 587, 602 (1987). Burdens imposed based on sexual orientation meet all four criteria since gay, lesbian, and bisexual people have experienced a long history of discrimination, sexual orientation does not bear any relationship to a person's ability to perform in or contribute to society, gay, lesbian, and bisexual people face significant obstacles achieving protection through the legislative process, and sexual orientation and sexual identity are so fundamental to one's identity that a "person should not be required to abandon them to avoid discrimination." Under heightened scrutiny, Respondents bear the burden of proving the Anti-Recognition Laws' constitutionality, and those laws cannot stand unless the government can present "an exceedingly persuasive justification," showing that the laws substantially further an important government interest. *Virginia*, 518 U.S. at 533; *Windsor*, 699 F.3d at 185. As shown below, the Anti-Recognition Laws cannot withstand any level of equal protection scrutiny, let alone satisfy this demanding burden."

There is no way the Petitioners can make these arguments only to turn around and assert that my intervention is impermissible.

Zablocki, 434 U.S. at 374-378, but they do not consider that I feel the same way about my object of affection. Perhaps this is is because the Petitioners are as equally bigoted as the Respondents, who at least took my intervention request under advisement.[66] Being married is of immense personal importance the Petitioners, as it is important to me and my object of desire and polygamist and theirs. I can equally assert along side of the Petitioners that I have suffered the same severe humiliation, emotional distress, pain, suffering, psychological harm, and stigma by the state of Tennessee's refusal to permitted me to marry my object of desire.[67] If the Petitioners feel like "second-class citizens," those of us in the real minority, who want to marry machines, animals, multiple persons ect, certainly feel like "third-class citizens," as was unquestionably proven by the response of the Federal Courts in Florida,[68] *Brenner v. Scott*, 2014 WL 1652418

---

[66] Remember morality has no place in this case, according to the Petitioners. What is more disturbing is that the Petitioners do not even have a psychological center.

[67] The Supreme Court has reaffirmed at least fourteen times that the right to marry is one of the most fundamental rights—if not the most fundamental right— of an individual. *Loving*, 388 U.S. at 12. (The Court was referring to traditional marriage in each case but who cares). The Court has defined marriage as a right of liberty (*Zablocki v. Redhail,* 434 U.S. 374 (1978), privacy (Griswold v. Connecticut, 381 U.S. 479 (1965), intimate choice (*Lawrence v. Texas*, 539 U.S. 558 (2003), and association (*M.L.B. v. S.L.J.*, 519 U.S. 102 (1996). Marriage is "a coming together, for better or for worse, hopefully enduring, and intimate to the degree of being sacred." Griswold, 381 U.S. at 486. It is "the most important relation in life" and "is of fundamental importance for all individuals." *Zablocki*, 434 U.S. at 384 (internal quotation marks omitted); see also *Cleveland Bd. of Educ. v. LaFleur*, 414 U.S. 632 (1974).The Supreme Court has also repeatedly reaffirmed that "[c]hoices about marriage" are "sheltered by the Fourteenth Amendment against the State's unwarranted usurpation, disregard, or disrespect." *M.L.B*., 519 U.S. at 116; see also *Planned Parenthood of S.E. Pa. v. Casey*, 505 U.S. 833, 848 (1992) (marriage is "an aspect of liberty protected against state interference by the substantive component of the Due Process Clause"). In light of this history, the district court recognized that "[t]here can be no serious doubt that in America[,] the right to marry is a rigorously protected fundamental right." JA 365. These arguments all equally apply to the Petitioners, as they do to other branches of sexual orientation, including mine. But the Petitioners are not presenting the arguments that protect all forms of sexual orientation.

[68] In *Brenner*, the Court called my request to marry an inanimate object, "removed from reality." However, if my request is "removed from the reality," then the Court must equally find that the Petitioners' case is "removed from reality." A man's request to marry another man only to make him his wife is by definition totally removed from reality. The Court cannot have it both ways and except reasonable people to respect its decision. Proponents of same sex marriage in Washington often say that those who are not are "on the wrong side of history" because it sounds catchy, but perhaps the Petitioners and I are equally "on the wrong side of reality," as well as the wrong side of History as the Florida Court determined.

(2014), and in North Carolina, *General Synod of The United Church of Christ v. Cooper*, 3:14-cv-213, in reactions to my motions to intervene. [69] The Florida and North Carolina Federal Courts demonstrated the same animus as the New York Federal Court, as these federal actors discriminated against me on the basis of sexual orientation for purposes of the 5th Amendment.[70] In response to my intervention request, the Federal Courts asserted that there was something "psychologically" wrong with people who tried to change the Christian definition of marriage. In doing so, they gutted the validity of all same-sex marriages and demonstrated that their is something psychologically wrong with themselves, since they are for gay marriage - whoops. (See the Dissent App(a) at 45).

---

[69] As a licensed minister of rewritten Christianity in a post-modern relativistic society, out to make buck, I moved to intervene in the North Carolina same-sex marriage case filed by heretical clergy members because this entire ordeal is a blatant and organized attack on authentic Christianity due to an emotional problem with the God of the Bible. Many don't want to believe that we live in a world where we were designed for relationship with the God of the Bible; we just want to do whatever we feel and assert ourselves as supreme commander. Like Hitler did.. The magistrate judge in that case ruled that my request to marry an inanimate object amounted to per se evidence of "mental illness," but if that is true, then the Courts must equally find that a man who request to make another man his wife is at very least an equal form of "mental-illness." Perhaps it could be argued that activity that violates the plan set forth in the unwritten New Testament leads to the cultivation of "mental illness." I appealed the denial to the District Court Judge under rule 72 and he stayed the matter until this Court resolves *Bostic*.

http://psychcentral.com/lib/higher-risk-of-mental-health-problems-for-homosexuals/0006527

[70] I have immense respect for the Courts and appreciate the difficulties of their jobs. But the Florida Court and North Carolina Court's went too far by threatening to sanction me or impose other forms of more extreme forms of punishments in face of my motion to intervene. In doing so, they engaged in the very dehumanization that the Petitioners hope to protect against in calling the Respondents as bigots. I am not necessarily asserting that my request to marry an inanimate object is equal to a man's request to marry a woman. But my request to marry an inanimate object is at least equal to a man's request to marry a man, but that does not mean that either the Petitioners or I should be overly persecuted for having cultivated inferior sexual orientations by choice or from the undue influence of others who did not have our best interest at heart. The Petitioners are correct in that there is slippery slope of the heart directed towards "sinners" by moralists that should be discouraged to a reasonable extent. However, it is one thing to "hate the sin but not the sinner," but that does not necessarily mean that the law should encourage certain destructive lifestyle choices in the area of sexuality, if traditional marriage is in fact a superior form of relationship. That too would be an act of immense evil. The reason we have obscenity laws is to fight against depravity and perversion. (see 18 U.S. Code § 1460 et. seq. and *Google*) Blurred lines are not a good thing. After all, who can deny that we are inseparably sexual beings and spiritual beings at the same time. The law should reflect these competing realities of the human condition with precision. It is not an act of justice for a Court to encourage destructive behavior. It is an act of cruelty, hate, and indifference towards one's fellow neighbor. Homosexuality is one step away from adults having sex with children. That's what Dr. Kinsey was gunning for.

When the Dissent in this case referred to the "psychological benefits of being married" the dissenting justice was referring to traditional marriages. *Id.* The medical evidence would show that psychological benefit of being married outside of these confines may amount to mental illness. So, I do not join the dissent in that position. The dissent has apparently allowed herself to be muscled by the Petitioners "sob stories" perhaps due to a lack of discernment. I too should have the equal right to muscle the Courts and society with "sob stories of my own" in using words like "freedom," "equality," and "tolerance, and "who are we to judge" mantra.

Such considerations aside, I ardently stand with the Petitioners in asserting that no one deserves to be persecuted for their sexual orientation, as a consequence of slippery slope of the heart of dehumanizing moralist, who look down their noses in condemnation of fault. However, that does not mean that unnatural sexual orientation cultivation should be ever be encouraged by policies of the United States. But in order not to destroy the Constitution, uniformity is a must if sexual orientation is a class. The way that individuals in society treat one another and the manner in which marriage is defined are completely separate issues.

People engaging in gay and lesbian conduct have endured a history of discrimination in the exact same way that people who have sex with beast and machines have, only the true minority is suffering more. *Windsor v. United States*, 699 F.3d 169, 181 (2d Cir. 2012). But the Petitioners make no mention of this discrimination against other classes in their pleadings, perhaps it is because their entire plight is grounded in "adult centered selfishness" and because they suffer from a more severe sense of bigotry than the Respondents are, who at least are making an argument that traditional marriage is superior to all other forms with factual evidence,

not a litany of pathetic emotional appeals that are purposed to twist reality and exploit the adverse permission giving beliefs.[71]

Inferrably, "polygamists," "beastialists", and "machinists" are just as equally a discernible group with non-obvious distinguishing characteristics as gays and lesbians are. [72] Even though the courts do not consist of psychologist or psychiatrist, the flawless *Lawrence* court has held that "no credible evidence supports a finding that an individual may, through conscious decision, therapeutic intervention or any other method, change his or her sexual orientation." The *Lawrence* finding applies squarely to me here; *see Lawrence*, 539 U.S. at 576-77.[73](decisions concerning the intimacies of the physical relationships of consenting adults are "an integral part of human freedom"); *see In re Marriage Cases*, 183 P.3d 384, 442 (Cal. 2008) ("Because a person's sexual orientation is so integral an aspect of one's identity, it is not appropriate to require a person to repudiate or change his or her sexual orientation in order to avoid discriminatory treatment."). [74]

---

[71] The Petitioners and I are clearly attempting to cheat to to win. According to the New York District Court, we are both delusional, so what is wrong with allowing us to live in the delusion that forcing victory will constitute a valid victory, even though such a position is unquestionably moronic.

[72] *See Windsor*, 699 F.3d at 181("homosexuality is a sufficiently discernible characteristic to define a discrete minority class," including because there is a broad medical and scientific consensus that sexual orientation is immutable); *Perry v. Schwarzenegger*, 704 F. Supp. 2d 921, 966 (N.D. Cal. 2010). Even though of course, there is no such thing as a "gay gene." There is evidence that humans have a spiritual crisis however that demands a remedy.

http://www.onenewsnow.com/perspectives/bryan-fischer/2014/06/17/the-latest-in-scientific-research-there-is-no-gay-gene#.VH54qhbDRFI

[73] The *Lawrence* Court cannot say that sexual orientation is something that one cannot help, only to have me show up, and the Court then say"we'll, we really didn't mean it." 539 U.S. at 558 -560. Could it be the case that while the Lawrence Court hoped to be sympathetic, they alienated all forms of sexual orientation besides gay and straight was therefore grossly unsympathetic? Or was the Lawrence Court plain wrong and amount to a rare instance of judicial fallibility?

[74] *Kerrigan v. Comm'r of Pub. Health*, 957 A.2d 407, 438 (Conn. 2008) ("In view of the central role that sexual orientation plays in a person's fundamental right to self-determination, we fully agree with the plaintiffs that their sexual orientation represents the kind of distinguishing characteristic that defines them as a discrete group for purposes of determining whether that group should be afforded heightened protection . . . .");

Accordingly, the true minority classes of sexual orientation deserve to have a voice in this affair, and I am not required to change my sexual orientation any more than the Respondents and Petitioners are, on the same legal basis that the Petitioners and *Lawrence* assert. Like Espejo and Mansell, who were legally married in another state, I too had a legal marriage ceremony in another state and another country, but the State of Tennessee refuses to recognize my marriage, as it did theirs. The Respondents discriminated against me when they reject my request to marry my spouse of choice, and in doing so, the same party has caused the same injury to myself.[75]

According to the Petitioners, because my marriage is legally recognized in another country and because I had a wedding ceremony in another state, my marriage must be recognized by the federal government by virtue of the decision in *Windsor*, *supra*, 133 S. Ct. at 2675-2691. I should be entitled to benefits. Currently, my metallic spouse and I are treated as legal strangers in our home for the same reasons that Miller and Vanessa are and that is wrong because we feel that it is.[76] The State of Tennessee's exclusion of "man-man," "woman-woman," "man-animal," and

---

[75] Just like Tanco and Jesty, I approached the Tennessee clerk to have a marriage license issued for me and my preferred spouse. The clerks office denied my request for a marriage license in the same manner and for the exact same reasons - my object of affection was outside the scope of the narrow definition. When I requested the clerk to for permission to file out a marriage license, I was referred to Tenn. Const. art. XI, § 18; Tenn. Code Ann. §§ 36-3-101 to -505 to -505 in the same way that the DeKoe and Kostura were. I suffered an identical injury by the same party because of the same laws. The clerk informed me that "a marriage license could only be given to one man and one female, not one man and one machine or one man and on man." Those of us whose sexual orientation has been classically conditioned upon orgasm through the straight forward science of dopamine to prefer sex with inanimate objects and animals do not have public support, like the gays. My branch of orientation is especially vulnerable and subjected to dehumanization. .

[76] Normally the laws of the United States should be based on conviction, not feeling, but traditions, like pesky State Sovereignty, are under attack and so with it other forms of tradition. Clearly, the Northern States are more advanced than the Southern States. Meanwhile, the marriages of opposite-sex couples that are legal in other states but would not be accepted in Tennessee (e.g., marriages of first cousins or a young partner) are routinely accepted in Tennessee if those marriages are legal in the jurisdiction where they are celebrated. This recognition of opposite-sex marriages but rejection of a man's marriage to a machine that does not meet Tennessee's criteria for marriage violates the rights secured to myself by the United States Constitution and the Constitution of Tennessee in the same way it violates the Petitioners.

"man-machine" couples from marriage adversely impacts "man-machine" couples, "same-sex" couples, and all other sexual orientation classes across Tennessee, by excluding them from the many legal protections available to spouses because the law is trying to discourage a certain life-style.[77] Allowing me to intervene demonstrates this point in the name of actual equality and tolerance, not the partial equality as floated by the Petitioners.[78] The exclusion from marriage to a machine denies myself "a dignity and status of immense import" in the same way it does the Petitioners. *Id*.[79]

XIII. MODERN FAMILY VS ANCIENT FAMILY

Tennessee's exclusion of same-sex couples and man-machine couples from marriage infringes on the Due Process Clause and the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and the Constitution of Tennessee equally to all classes of sexual orientation. [80] This discriminatory treatment is subject to heightened scrutiny because it burdens

---

[77] The Petitioners argue that "love is love." But then the Petitioners refuse to allow me to borrow that argument when it comes to me and my object of affection through rejecting my intervention request. Even if the same-sex marriage activity is completely moronic as the District Court in New York indirect indicated in *Sevier v. Cuomo*, I should have the same lawful right to engage in moronic activity as the same-sex couples.

[78] Of course there is no such thing as complete tolerance, because the intolerance of the tolerant becomes an inescapable reality. Those who profess to be tolerant are intolerant of those who adopt God's morality through humility at the expense of selfishness. The same is true in my anti-porn litigation, no censorship policy censors decency and morality.

[79] Moreover, man-man couples and man-machine couples' children are stigmatized and relegated to a second class status, just because they are in a marriage union that does not involve "one man and one woman." The exclusion "tells [same-sex couples [and couples of other sexual orientations] and all the world that their relationships are unworthy" of recognition, *id.* at 22- 23, and it "humiliates the ... children now being raised by same- sex couples [and man/machine couples]" and "makes it even more difficult for the children to understand the integrity and closeness of their own family and its concord with other families in their community and in their daily lives." *Id.,* 133 S.Ct. at 2694.

[80] Allegedly, the United States is no longer influenced by Judeo-Christian values, as our founding fathers were, we are governed by the religion that "what is right for me is right for me and what is right for you is right for you." *Windsor*, 133 S. Ct. 2675. Of course the Nazi's believed that too. This new compass is part of individualistic Western post modern relativism to predicate policy on the idea that "as long as it does not impact anyone else we should be free to do whatever we want." Of course, such a contention is completely flawed, grounded in immense evil, and is not the set of truth claims to best accomplish human flourishing.

the fundamental right to marry and because it discriminates based on sex and sexual orientation against ALL CLASSES, not just the gayest class. The exclusionary laws cannot stand under any level of scrutiny because the exclusion does not rationally further any legitimate government interest. It serves only to disparage and injure lesbian and gay couples and their families in the exact same way that it harms man/beast, man/machine, and woman/man/woman couples. *Lawrence*, 539 U.S. at 558-560. There is no adequate remedy at law for either the Petitioners or myself. Unquestionably, the natural, procreative potential of different-sex couples distinguishes that group from same-sex couples, but we are asking the Court to merely disregard that detail, along with pesky-immaterial concepts "like state sovereignty." [81] [82] The Petitioners will apparently monkey with language to get what they want, and sell that to the public as being legally and factually valid exercise of the court, which is one thing, but myself, polygamist, ect should be allowed to capitalize on the fruits of their media driven efforts in the name of so called "freedom" and "love." This case boils down to "modern family vs. ancient family."[83] Ke$ha v.

---

[81] I admit that traditional married couples are factually and scientifically distinct because they are (1) in a legal binding relationship and (2) have the potential to create spawn that share their DNA following the natural use of sexual organs that correspond by the design of the Creator, we no longer recognize, as a Country as a result of our collective prideful arrogance.. It is possible, therefore, that neither the Petitioners or I should be asking that the Court discriminating against couples in a relationship that is factually and scientifically distinct and set-apart from all other potential sexual unions. Opposite-sex couples provide a system of natural accountability that the Petitioners and I are here to monkey with so that we feel more accepted. (Wars have ended because wives threatened to leave their spouse if they did not come home). Maybe, we just come to terms with the fact that we want to do whatever we want to do, and we should be allowed to do that, since who is to judge? The God of the Bible our Nation's leaders continue to reject under a policy of appeasement to be socially acceptable?

[82] If the Petitioners are correct, then all persons should have the right to marry all things in the name of equality, love, and tolerance in accordance with their sexual orientation because we are free from God and free to make our own rules. How dare the Respondents even consider arguing about a child-centered reality, when we have abortion laws that allow a parent to kill a child in the womb because personal convenience is paramount compared to a child's life. *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113 (1973). Of course, we all know that abortion is murder that creates two victims, the mother and the child, so those who practice it are proponents of self-injury and regret. Look at the uproar that *Hobby Lobby* decision created, even Scarlett Johansson is creating T-shirts with Planned Parenthood to oppose the decision, and clearly this actress's conduct should sway the influence the Court, since the gay agenda has always been championed as the paramount gospel of Hollywood, which it prays that political figures will embrace in order to be "cool."

[83]http://www.cbn.com/cbnnews/us/2013/June/Covert-Agenda-US-Didnt-Become-Pro-Gay-Overnight/

Lecrae, if you will. It is just that for me and others, the homosexuals definition of modern family is not modern enough.

XIV. THE LEGAL STANDARD INDICATES INTERVENTION SHOULD BE ALLOWED

There will be no delay and prejudice in this action because I will simply join the Petitioners in their briefs with the minor twist, instead of simply "man-man" and "woman-woman" relationships, I advance the interest of "man-machine" sexual orientation and by extension "man-animal" and "man-woman-woman" unions.[84] A machine is gender neutral, and my request to marry a machine comes closer to squaring with the existing definition of marriage as voted on by the Tennessee electorate than the Petitioners.

In determining whether to grant a motion to intervene on appeal, the Supreme Court and Court of Appeals consider the same factors that apply to motions to intervene in the district court pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24. *See Carter v. Welles-Bowen Realty, Inc.*, 628 F.3d 790, 790 (6th Cir. 2010). Under Rule 24(a), intervention as of right must be granted when a party files a "timely motion" and "claims an interest relating to the property or transaction that is the subject of the action, and is so situated that disposing of the action may as a practical matter impair or impede the movant's ability to protect its interest, unless existing parties adequately represent that interest." Under Rule 24(b), permissive intervention may be granted when a party

---

[84] This case is of tremendous national importance. There is a lot of confusion over these matters by the public. The Court should reduce pressure off of itself by making the Petitioners and Respondents file written responses to this motion. There is a lot of questionable sincerity of the parties on both sides in these kinds of cases, which is even more reason for the Court to make the parties respond to this motion by addressing the merits. Forcing the parties to file responses to the motion to intervene will give the Petitioners the opportunity to reconsider whether they are truly champions of equality or whether they are merely making shotgun arguments to accomplish an agenda predicated in absolute selfishness and fraudulent bigotry.

files a “timely motion” and “has a claim or defense that shares with the main action a common question of law or fact.” “[L]iberal intervention is desirable to dispose of as much of a controversy involving as many apparently concerned persons as is compatible with efficiency and due process.” See *United States of America et al v. State of Michigan*, 424 Fd.3d. 438, 43, (6th Cir. 2005) *Feller v. Brock*, 802 F.2d 722, 729 (4th Cir.1986). "If a post-judgment motion did not result in heightened prejudice to the parties or substantial interference with the process of the court, then the fact that judgment has been entered does not require the motion be denied.” *Patterson v. Shumate*, 912 F.2d 463 (4th Cir. 1990) (citing *Hill v. Western Elec. Co., Inc.*, 672 F.2d 381, 386-87 (4th Cir. 1982); *Grubbs v. Norris*, 870 Fd.343, 345 (6th Cir. 1998).

I am entitled to intervene as a matter of right, as well as permissive intervention. First, I have established that my motion is timely because I will stick to the Court's filing schedule. I very much want to participate in oral argument as a matter of equality so that these arguments can be part of the permanent public record in perpetuity. Here, I meet all the requirements to permissively intervene, all discretionary factors weigh heavily in favor of intervention, and there is no doubt that I, above all others prospective intervenors, can provide the Court with a valuable and unique perspective and argument on behalf of the true minority classes of sexual orientation. Further, in accordance with Supreme Court precedent, “when the nonparty has an interest that is affected by the trial court's judgment . . . the better practice is for such a nonparty to seek intervention for purposes of appeal.” *Marino* v. *Ortiz*, 484 U.S. 301, 304 (1988).

In addition, in a case of this significance and importance, which has the potential to shape the trajectory of the quest of all persons of nontraditional sexual orientations, not just “gay or straight people,” for full civil equality, having greater participation by affected parties and

greater airing of the issues can only benefit this Court by providing the widest range of arguments and perspectives available.

XV. SUSPECT CLASS IN THE 6TH

I acknowledge that in Sixth Circuit that sexual orientation "is not a suspect class in this circuit." *Equality Foundation of Greater Cincinnati, Inc. v. City of Cincinnati*, 128 F.3d 289, 292-94 (6th Cir. 1997); *see also Davis v. Prison Health Services*, 679 F.3d 433, 438 (6th Cir. 2012) (stating that "this court has not recognized sexual orientation as a suspect classification" and applying rational basis review);; *Scarbrough v. Morgan County Bd. of Educ.*, 470 F.3d 250, 261 (6th Cir. 2006) (stating that "homosexuality is not a suspect class in this circuit"). But I join the Petitioners in asserting that"sexual orientation should be" a suspect class because "it should be." And allowing me to intervene will better allow the Court to determine, if "it should be."

XVI. CHALLENGING THE RESPONDENTS' POSITION

The Court in *United States v. Windsor,* 133 S. Ct. 2675 - 2691, consistently emphasized that domestic-relations is "a virtually exclusive province of the States," *id.* at 2691, one that must be protected from unnecessary "federal intrusion." *Id.* at 2692. But obliviously, this tradition is being disregard along with the definition of traditional marriage and troublesome state sovereignty so that we can liberalize America in order to keep valueless Democrats like Nancy Pelosi, President Obama, and other pupils of Sal Alinsky in office and so that we without morals will feel less ashamed of our lifestyle choices that grossly offend transcultural law and the Godly principles that our Nation was built upon by men of objective valour, integrity, faith, humility,

and honor. So, any argument that tradition matters should fail automatically against my request.[85] [86]

Very obviously, the state's traditional control over domestic matters must be hijacked in the name of "progress," which must be played out fully in the name of "tolerance," "love," "equality," "progress," and "judicial narcissism." Full faith and credit is as outdated as morality and traditional marriage and is in the way of "progress." (Even though the Petitioners and I don't know what we are progressing towards, this apparently does not matter).[87] Ever since one state in our union legalized "same-sex marriage," a proverbial "crack in the dam" has been created, so that now all states are now forced to authorize same-sex marriage in the name of "tolerance" and "equality," at the expense of something as unimportant to our democracy as the voting process. But by legalizing same-sex marriage, there is nothing to stop me and others from making the crack wider (starting with the states that authorized same-sex marriage at the exclusion of other marriages, like man-beast). The Respondents have suggested that honoring this trend has made the idea of state sovereignty a sham, *Shelby Cnty. v. Holder,* 133 S. Ct. 2612, 2623 (2013), but

---

[85] I am not necessarily here to help liberal judges become the judicial wrecking ball foreshadowed in *Lochner v. New York,* 198 U.S. 45 (1905), overruled by *Ferguson v. Skrupa*, 372 U.S. 726 (1963*).* Yet, my presence may assist the Court to adopting the novel principle that marriage is whatever emotional bond any person says it is, as the Petitioners have argued.

[86] The Appellants put forth three risk factors in arguing against the expansion of the definition of marriage stating: (1) a risk of increased fatherlessness and motherlessness, with the emotional, social and economic damage such a deprivation imposes on children; (2) a risk of reduced birth rates, with the demographic and economic damage that would impose on all future children; and (3) more generally, a risk of increased self- interest in parental decision-making on a range of issues, including not just romantic relationships and procreation, but also recreation, career choices and living arrangements. (Appellant Reply at 3) Permitting me to marry a machine with sexual functions possess no greater risk in these zones of influence than legally allowing Call to marry Archer. I should be allowed to selectively read *Windsor* to apply to my plight equally as the Petitioners have applied it to theirs.

[87] The Petitioners and I are telling the Respondents that they "need to get with it." But get with what? We have no answer for that. Its like President Obama's "Yes we can." Which provokes, "yes we can what?" But like good Western Individualist in a post relativism society, the Petitioners and I just want to do whatever we want and cram our values down the throats of everyone else, even if it means hijacking the voting process.

we are not here to respect tradition, according to the Petitioners. *Washington v. Glucksberg,* 521 U.S. 702 (1997).

In their briefs, the Respondents suggest that the Petitioners do not acknowledge the policy dilemma or the risks that expanding the marriage definition poses to children generally.[88] My plight does bare "adult interest," but it does not bare adult interest any more or less than the Petitioners.[89] So, I should be allowed to intervene for that reason on the bedrock of equality. Besides this entire ordeal has more to do with the straight forward science of neurotransmitters like dopamine and oxytocin than anything else. [90] Clearly, I did not file this lawsuit to completely gut and discredit all same-sex marriage, as Lifesite News asserted to the public. However, the press was correct in offering:

"From a scientific standpoint, Sevier's claim that he "fell in love" with his laptop may not be as far-fetched as it sounds. Sex researcher Andrea Kuszewski told *New York Magazine* that when people have orgasms, their brains release a potent mixture of dopamine and oxytocin, the two chemicals responsible for pleasure (and addiction), and emotional bonding, respectively. Studies have shown that the dopamine rush acts like a drug, leading porn users to crave their next fix. But the oxytocin gives them a powerful emotional bond to the source of the increased flow.

---

[88] Those risks include: (1) pushing the State's existing child- centric marriage culture toward a more adult- centric model; (2) more fatherless and motherless parenting; (3) reduced birth rates; and (4) increased social strife." Allowing me to marry a machine poses no greater risk than allowing Call to marry Archer.

[89] My marriage to a machine is an emotional bond that is not less equal to that of the Archers' emotional bond with Call. My desire to marry a machine is equal to a man's desire to marry a man. Who can measure the feelings in my heart? My marriage to a machine does not undermine Tennessee's social norms any more or less than Archers marriage to Call, even if I am in a greater minority class group than the gays because I do not have the same voice in the liberal media, which is not liberal enough apparently. My feelings are not unequal to the feelings that a husband has towards his wife.

[90] When a man has sex with his wife, their commitment is reinforced upon orgasm based on the straight forward science of dopamine. (See Palov's dogs; See Tim Keller, "The Meaning of Marriage"). (Sex and bonding deals with neuro-transmitters such as dopamine, oxytocin, serotonin, beta-fosb, and the reward cycle. Homosexuality is not something one is born with as the Petitioners pretend, it is something that is cultivated through acting on urges and impulse. In order to not become "homo-sexual" one should not open the door to it in the same way that they should not open the door to using meth, if they don't want to become a meth addict. Otherwise, the person might come to understand what Katy Perry meant, when she sang, "I kissed a girl and I like it." The same is true when a person has sex with an inanimate object, animal, or a member of the same sex. (Sex and marriage involves classical conditioning that reinforces the bond of commitment. This is why infidelity is grounds for divorce in every state with default standards.

Normally, that's another human being. But for porn users, Kuszewski told *NY Mag*, it's the porn itself. "You're bonding with it," she said. In Sevier's case, he claims he bonded with his computer at the expense of his marriage to his wife – a sad but all-too-common occurrence, based on the multiple public testimonies of men who have said the same thing.[91]

Accordingly, those who have an emotional problem with my request to intervene have a problem with empirical brain science have a problem with objective truth. Although Christianity and prayer has been banned from our public schools due to an objective emotional problem that this Country has with the truth and misunderstanding of "fairness," I am pretty sure that neurology and science has not be barred at this time. The fact that credible science supports Christianity does not mean that it too should be discarded because it too promotes unquenchable truth like the Bible does.

XVII. GENDER MATTERS

I feel that I should quickly address gender matters. Men and women are equal but different. The Petitioners redefining marriage in genderless terms would increase the likelihood that a child will be raised without a father or a mother. If gender differences to marry are not important for same-sex couples, gender differences between man-machine couples does not matter either. *See*, *e.g.*, *Nguyen v. I.N.S.*, 533 U.S. 53, 73 (2001) (Kennedy, J., for the Court). In fact, the machine that I have elected to marry is neither male nor female; it is gender neutral. So this is more reason for the Court to allow me to intervene because the case law generously provided by the Petitioners demonstrates as much.[92] My request to marry a machine is closer to

[91] https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/former-jag-officer-highlights-absurdity-of-gay-marriage-by-suing-to-marry-h

[92] The Petitioners should not even be allowed to object to my intervention due to the fact that allowing me to marry an inanimate object will not pose a greater threat to children and social norms than will Tanco's marriage to Jesty. If anything, my marriage to a machine poses less of a risk, since a possible acrimonious divorce proceeding could be avoided, if the marriage fails. Allowing my marriage to go forward will not adversely impact the fertility rate any more or less than a same sex couples. If there is a risk that is posed to traditional marriage and children, both man-man couples and man-machine couples pose it equally. Imagine this scenario: two men plan a bank robbery. The day before

meeting the existing definition than the Petitioners request because I am one man seeking to marry one gender neutral object with female type characteristics.

XVIII. THE MODERN DAY SLAVERY ISSUE IS NOT "GAY RIGHTS" IT IS HUMAN TRAFFICKING

The Court is in a position to undo the progress it made in the civil rights movement by crafting this matter as the modern day slavery in being too eager to leave its mark on history, when human trafficking is the modern day slavery issue due to the pornification of society in light of filterless devices.[93] I ask that the Court take my *Apple* and *Google* cases when they come up on appeal from the 6th Circuit; due to a personal injury, I hope to give the Court the opportunity to cure COPA, since Congress has completely left the Court out to dry after crawling in bed with the Tech companies and pornographers.[94]

XIX. LEVELING WITH THE COURT

"If we ever forget that we are One Nation Under God, then we will be a nation gone under." - Ronald Reagan

In the military,"we want the bottom-line upfront." In deciding this case, the Court should chiefly consider how its decision will impact our children and Constitution.[95] If the Court is for

---

they get married, just because they can. They subequently get caught and invoke the spouse exception to the rule of evidence and avoid accountability.. See Fed. R. Evid. 501.

[93] I will enable the Court to curb the modern day slavery issue when *Sevier v. Google et. al.* 3:14-cv-01313 and *Sevier v. Appl*e 3:13-cv-00607 arrive from the 6th Circuit. Unregulated distribution of pornography is driving the demand side of human trafficking, violence towards women, and child pornography. This case is per se evidence of the sexual holocaust that the United States is in the midst of. Those actions relate to this one.

[94] *Ginsberg v. New York,* 390 U.S. 629, 639–40, 88 S.Ct. 1274, 20 L.Ed.2d 195 (1968) and *Am. Civil Liberties Union v. Reno*, 31 F. Supp. 2d 473, 476 (E.D. Pa. 1999);; also aff'd, 217 F.3d 162 (3d Cir. 2000) vacated sub nom. *Ashcroft v. Am. Civil Liberties Union*, 535 U.S. 564, 122 S. Ct. 1700, 152 L. Ed. 2d 771 (2002)

[95] I am filing as exhibits parts of the Apple and Google litigation that I am quarterbacking in District Court in Tennessee, which deals with the injurious distribution of pornography, so that the Court can see what happens to children in the area of sexuality, when the wrong policies are in place thanks to selfish adults. See the compliant, motions, and declarations from Fight The New Drug filed as exhibits. Children have suffered because of the Court's rejection of COPA, but Congress has not passed filter legislation, like the UK is doing.

same sex marriage because it is under the influence of secular humanism promoted by Hollywood and is pro-gay because it is swayed by the cultural winds of the moment, then by all means, bar my request.[96] If the Court is against homosexuality and for traditional marriage, then by all means allow me to intervene and send us to the same final destination in establishing that traditional marriage is stand alone.[97] Or if the Court is a proponent of tolerance and the Constitutional integrity, the Court should allow me to intervene and rule in favor of the Petitioners and I. [98] Despite the mass media's distortion of reality for years there are no such thing as "gay people" anymore than there are "machine people" or "straight people." There are only "people." President Lincoln was right: "all people are born equal." We are all "born equally broken" into a fallen world that is in need of a savior.[99] But not all of our lifestyle choices are equal, and discrimination on the basis of lifestyle choice is not a vice, (see all state and federal criminal law).[100] Just ask a victim of human trafficking. While the world is terrible, God is good.

---

[96] I recommend that whatever the Court decides that it not lose sight of the implication of *Cuomo* case pending in District Court in New York. I am no normal intervenor, who can be brushed off.

[97] The same-sex marriage proponents complain of being bullied by proponents of traditional values, but this does not give them the right to bully people who hold traditional values.

[98] Either (1) we will be reduced to a Nation that hypocritically enforces the equal protection and due process clause to suit the interest of the largest minority, which yields discrimination against the true minority classes of sexual orientation, causing hypocrisy to undermine foundation laws, yielding instability; (2) we will remain a Christian Nation that protects traditional marriage, as a relationship set apart because it has the potential of bearing life between two people, who are in a legally binding relationship, who have naturally corresponding sexual organs with the exclusive potential to produce children with DNA that matches their own; which, of course, makes that relationship both scientifically and factually distinct from all others - religious considerations aside; or (3) we will progress into a Nation that gives equal protection to all classes, as we always have, on the basis of sexual orientation, allowing everyone to marrying anyone and anything to suit their sexual appetite in the name of "tolerance," "equality," and "love," since we have the right to define those terms as we see fit apparently.. There is no other possible alternative.

[99] We have a spiritual crisis of the heart on our hands.

[100] The law should be crafted to encourage the healthiest lifestyle choices, as an act of love, not to be a "kill joy."The human heart is the true problem with the world. But most importantly, the law must be based on a stable bedrock, not a whimsical feeling of the cultural moment.

And God gave us the Bible, and from the Bible our founders cultivated the Constitution. And it is the intent of our founders to not mandate Christianity but that our policies parallel it. There is a nexus between homosexual conduct, human trafficking, pornography, abortion, organized crime, strip clubs, and suffering. There is continuum between traditional marriage, the church, charitable organizations, grace, sacrifice, selflessness, character, and authentic love. If the Court sides with the first nexus, it must also all ALL persons to marry anything and everything they want, or it will be rightfully said that Constitution is no longer in control of this Country and neither is the rule of law. Otherwise, the homosexuals will accomplished what no terrorist organization ever could. We will be finished and so will the Constitution. If the Court on the other hands decides to go with the selfless nexus, then my request to marry an inanimate object should be equally rejected as the homosexuals request to marry one another. [101]

May the Court have the courage and valor to advance the truth for the good of our Nation so that we may be free. I have confidence that the Court will make the right decision and either put "a stake in the heart" on the assault on traditional marriages and Christianity or that it at least allow everyone to marry anything and anyone, as the Constitution requires. I should be allowed to intervene because Dr. King was right: *"true peace is not merely the absence of tension; it is the presence of justice."* May God Bless the United States Supreme Court and our grandchildren for generations to come.

/s/ Chris Sevier Esq/
mailing: 9 Music Square South #247
Nashville, TN 37203
(615) 500 4411
ghostwarsmusic@gmail.com

[101] Moreover, the credibility of all same-sex marriages should be called into question and Windsor reversed. Furthermore, prayer and the Bible should be authorized in public schools because although the state cannot be in the church, as this case proves, the church will inseparably be in the state, as long as there are Christians in positions of authority.

BPR#026577
Minister License: 7860644
1LT 27A JAG
278th ACR
420 w 42nd
New York, NY 10036
Ghost OP Gator Six
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ty9s2CIPMe8

"[26] Because of this, God gave them over to shameful lusts. Even their women exchanged natural sexual relations for unnatural ones. [27] In the same way the men also abandoned natural relations with women and were inflamed with lust for one another. Men committed shameful acts with other men, and received in themselves the due penalty for their error. [28] Furthermore, just as they did not think it worthwhile to retain the knowledge of God, so God gave them over to a depraved mind, so that they do what ought not to be done. [29] They have become filled with every kind of wickedness, evil, greed and depravity. They are full of envy, murder, strife, deceit and malice. They are gossips, [30] slanderers, God-haters, insolent, arrogant and boastful; they invent ways of doing evil; they disobey their parents; [31] they have no understanding, no fidelity, no love, no mercy.[32] Although they know God's righteous decree that those who do such things deserve death, they not only continue to do these very things but also approve of those who practice them." Romans 1:26-32

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the of 9th December, 2014, a true, correct and complete copy of the foregoing Motion to Intervene was mailed to the Court and to the Petitioners and Respondents at the following addresses. A copy was also email to their address on file with EFC/PACER.

Abby Rose Rubenfeld Rubenfeld Law Office, PC 2409 Hillsboro Road Suite 200 Nashville, TN 37212 (615) 386-9077 Fax: (615) 386-3897 Email: arubenfeld@rubenfeldlaw.com. Asaf Orr National Center for Lesbian Rights 870 Market Street Suite 370 San Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 392-6257 Fax: (415) 392-8442 Email: aorr@nclrights.org. Christopher F. Stoll National Center for Lesbian Rights 870 Market Street Suite 370 San Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 392-6257 Fax: (415) 392-8442 Email: cstoll@nclrights.org. J. Scott Hickman Sherrard & Roe 150 Third Avenue South Suite 1100 Nashville, TN 37201 (615) 742-4200 Email: shickman@sherrardroe.com
John L. Farringer , IV Sherrard & Roe 150 Third Avenue South Suite 1100 Nashville, TN 37201 (615) 742-4563 Email: jfarringer@sherrardroe.com. Maureen T. Holland Holland & Associates, PLLC 1429 Madison Avenue Memphis, TN 38104 (901) 278-8120 Fax: (901) 278-8125 Email: maureen@hollandattorney.com. Phillip F. Cramer Sherrard & Roe 150 Third Avenue South Suite 1100 Nashville, TN 37201 (615) 742-4200 Email: pcramer@sherrardroe.com. Regina M. Lambert Law Office of Regina M. Lambert 7010 Stone Mill Drive Knoxville, TN 37919 (865) 679-3483 Fax: (865) 558-8166 Email: lambertregina@yahoo.com. Shannon P. Minter National Center for Lesbian Rights 870 Market Street Suite 370 San Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 392-6257 Fax: (415) 392-8442 Email: sminter@nclrights.org. William L. Harbison Sherrard & Roe 150 Third Avenue South Suite 1100 Nashville, TN 37201 (615) 742-4200 Fax: (615) 742-4539 Email: bharbison@sherrardroe.com. Martha A. Campbell Tennessee Attorney General's Office P O Box 20207 Nashville, TN 37202-0207 (615) 741-3491 Email: martha.campbell@ag.tn.gov

Kevin Gene Steiling Tennessee Attorney General's Office P O Box 20207 Nashville, TN 37202-0207 (615) 741-3491 Email: kevin.steiling@ag.tn.gov

/s/ Chris Sevier Esq/
mailing: 9 Music Square South #247
Nashville, TN 37203
(615) 500 4411
ghostwarsmusic@gmail.com
BPR#026577
Minister License: 7860644
1LT 27A JAG
278th ACR
420 w 42nd
New York, NY 10036
Ghost OP Gator Six
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ty9s2CIPMe8