No.: 14-574

In the Supreme Court of the United States

GREGORY BOURKE and MICHAEL; DELEON; I.D. and I.D., minor children, by and through their parents and next friends, GREGORY BOURKE and MICHAEL DELEON;

and JIMMY LEE MEADE and LUTHER; BARLOWE; RANDELL JOHNSON, and PAUL CAMPION; T. J.-C., T. J.-C, D.J.-C. and M.J.-C., minor children, by and through their parents and next friends, RANDELL JOHNSON and PAUL CAMPION;

and KIMBERLY FRANKLIN and TAMERA BOYD

(Petitioners)

v.

STEVE BESHEAR, in his official capacity as Governor of Kentucky;

and

JACK CONWAY, in his official capacity as Attorney General of Kentucky

(Respondents)

CHRIS SEVIER
Intervening Plaintiff-Petitioner

MOTION TO INTERVENE AS A PARTY PETITIONER

"Make a career of humanity. Commit yourself to the noble struggle for equal rights. You will make a better person of yourself, a greater nation of your country, and a finer world to live in." Rev. King March for Integrated Schools, April 18, 1959.

TABLE OF CASES

OTHER AUTHORITY

APPENDIX

App(i)- Pornography, Obscenity, Homosexuality And Sexual Orientation

App(j)-Apple Litigation Provoked Responsiveness Of the British Prime Minister; Easy Accessible Pornography and Homosexuality link.

App(k)-

App(l)-Motion To Intervene In North Carolina; order denying motion to intervene, motion for reconsideration.

App(m)-Order From the District Judge In Florida Denying Motion To Intervene

App(n)-Motion To Intervene Before The USSC a case on Appeal from the 10th Circuit

App(o)-Media confirms the scientific validity of the intervention motion regarding this action.

App(p)- Order from the District Court in Arizona

I. INTRODUCTION

NOW COMES, I, Chris Sevier, former Judge Advocate, 27A, combat veteran of Operation Iraqi Freedom, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 21, F.R.C.P. 24(a), and 24(b) imploring the Honorable Court to read this motion and make the parties respond to this motion before making a decision that could otherwise constitute abuse of discretion. This motion to intervene is different than the one filed in *Tanco* 14-562, which the Court denied without explanation.[1] I respectfully remind the court 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). Beyond any reasonable doubt, I have earned the right to intervene in this action.[2] Respectfully, the Court's integrity is equally on trial as is the definition of marriage and the stability of the Constitution. As a litigant with equal standing to the same-sex couples, having been faced with express denial of the Kentucky's clerk's office in light of my "different" marriage request, I move to intervene as an ambassador and member of the true minority of sexual orientation classification here. Previously, I attempted to intervene in the District Court of Kentucky and in the 6th Circuit Court of Appeals, but was shy of the 30 day threshold. See App. (c)(d)(e). Before moving to intervene, I asked the Petitioners for permission to intervene in light of the local rules and consistently with their "race based equality arguments" asserted under the equal protection clause, having myself directly relied upon arguments that serve as the foundation of their position. Despite having asserted "tolerance" and sexual orientation as a

---

[1] After the Tennessee clerk's office denied my request to wed my spouse of choice; I travel to and relocated in Kentucky, where my request was also denied. The Fourteenth Amendment protects the liberty of individuals to travel throughout the nation, uninhibited by statutes, rules, or regulations that unreasonably burden or restrict their movement. This right guards against interference with citizens' rights "to migrate, resettle, find a new job, and start a new life." *Shapiro* v. *Thompson,* 394 U.S. 618, 629 (1969).

[2] Even Prez Hilton, a self-established justice of the court of public opinion, indirectly concedes that I should be allowed to intervene. http://perezhilton.com/tag/chris_sevier/

suspect class parallel to the race classification, the Petitioners response to my intervention request was a single dehumanizing word - "Nope." (see Exhibits). Accordingly, for better or worse, my request to intervene forever establishes in the public record the horse faced hypocrisy and fraud of the Petitioners, which threatens all of the minor classifications of sexual orientation. For a party to equate their plight to race, when they really don't mean it is an act of incredibly racism, and to refuse to acknowledge that is an overt refusal to see and think. The Court cannot simply sweep the implication of the Petitioners response under the rug without tarnishing its legacy and the civil rights movement itself. This is more than just a "got ya game." I have presented a direct omission of fraud by a party within the record. I am greatly concerned with the Courts integrity and the Constitutions as well, and demand that the Court not flippantly write me off their, as it did in denying the request in *Tanco* just because my request may be unpopular or culturally progressive. After all, "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).[3]

There is no doubt that the members of true minority of sexual orientation are being left behind in light of the Petitioners flippant "nope" response. Yet, I admit with that traditional marriage is set apart and stand alone, but my request to marry an inanimate object is no less implausible, meritless, or insane than Bourke's request to marry Deleon and call Deleon his wife. At least three pro-gay marriage Federal District Courts have confirmed as much to me directly in

[3] But if the position in *Virginia* , 518 U.S. 515, at 557 is true for the Petitioners, it is completely true for me and my preference because I too am excluded more so than they are. 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, his faithful canine, or his low maintenance pet gold fish.(see https://www.realdoll.com). In terms of statistics, the evidence shows that there will be fewer divorces and less instances of domestic violence between man-machine couples than between man-man or man-woman ones. Such marriage unions, to include my own, have an equal chance of procreation as Bourke and Deleon. Therefore, the other true minority classes of sexual orientation should not be treated unequally.

similar proceedings, as these.[4] Those District Courts who flippantly rejected my request failed to connect the dots that by declaring my different marriage request was "removed from reality" and "frivolous," they were also indirectly saying the same thing about Franklin's request to marry Boyd. If the Court writes me off, the evidence shows that it could subsequently be creating problems for itself. The Country cannot afford for the Honorable Justices United States Supreme Court to be so short sighted, as several District Courts have been, and I should be allowed to intervene for the benefit of several lower Courts in pending litigation.[5] I should not be barred from intervention because my request makes a controversial request more controversial and crunchy. If anything, my request is less disturbing and savage, and is closer to the existing legal definition of marriage. The Court's job is not to invent truth but to find truth, and my request to intervene will better help the Court find the truth. The rule of law, not the ends justify the means

[4] *General Synod of The United Church of Christ v. Cooper*, 3:14-cv-213; *Brenner v. Scott*, 2014 WL 1652418 (2014); *Cuomo et al,* 14-cv-5380. App(f), (m), (l).

[5] The problem with the world is the human heart, the second problem is our failure to recognize that. And this case deals with the science of dopamine, not morality, because whatever a person chooses to have sex with, they bond with. Justice warrants that I be allowed to intervene to push the "new rights" of man-machine, man-animal, man-family member, man-woman-woman marriage, not just, man-woman, man-man, and woman-woman marriage. Given the importance of this case in how it has the potential to impact everything else, this action cannot merely be reduced to a game of linguistics and semantics.

should be dominating the United States Supreme Court. [6] If the Court is not interested in seeing the complete picture the question becomes, well why not?[7] [8] [9]

---

[6] The Right Choice Should Be The Easy Choice: Neither the Court nor the American public should have to endure teleological or cosmological (deductive analysis), when traditional marriage, between one man and one woman, is intrinsically superior in light of pragmatic factors like "procreative potential" and "complementary chemistry;" we all know that it inherently is. We are not accidental particles, a bundle of chemicals, or animated pieces of meat, we know that our minds work. The Court must consider how its decision here will impact children. This case is a glorified domestic action were the best interest of children must come first. The Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (UCCJEA). Not just the children of Petitioners or my child, but the interest of all American children. Perhaps it is best that the United States not open the door to little Billy thinking that the says that someday marrying little Tommy or little Sally are equally viable options when they are inherently not. People are not born gay anymore than they are born attracted to blow up dolls. Those attachments have to be cultivated by influence and action. The science of dopamine establishes that whatever a person has sex with they bond with. The law should not reward citizens who act on urges that are bad for them and everyone else. The policies of the United States must make the "right choice, the easy choice," without overly dehumanizing others who make the wrong one.. The right choice would be for the law to push men and women into each others loving arms and stay there. See fault divorce; covenantal marriage act in Louisiana, child support laws. But the next right choice is to allow anyone to marry one or anything and in combinations in keeping with their cultivated sexual taste no matter how savage because all divisions of sexual orientation must have equal protection, not just the largest minority and the majority.

[7] To encourage our citizens to enter into a lifestyle that violates the givenness of our nature is not only subversive to human flourishing for us as a people group, it is an act of immense cruelty, especially towards impressionable children, whose paths in life are influenced and shaped by our laws. If sexual orientation is a suspect class, all variations of sexual orientation must have equal protection under the 14th amendment, not just the largest minority and the majority in a suspect class. If the Court says otherwise in defiance of logic, the Court will gut the 14th amendment, cultivate instability, and inspire division. The integrity of the Constitution is at stake.

[8] The real question here is what set of truth claims should the laws of the United States be based on? What defines right and wrong and sanity itself? The answer is the New Testament. The master narrative of the Constitution is the New Testament. All other set of truth claims are exclusive, narrow, inferior, outdated, and disastrous. Even atheist must agree that Christianity is the best set of unproven faith based assumptions to base our laws on because the second the Court establishes that "truth is relative," there is ultimately nothing to stop anyone from hurting anyone else, since the feelings of the majority will have become the basis of law. Making the law up off the tops of our heads as we go along is a recipe for instability and collapse. Relying on the feelings of those in power as the basis of law is a disastrous idea.

[9] Love vs Truth : Certain factions in the public have attempted to frame this controversy in terms of either "love wins" or "truth wins." Of course, the idea that "love is love" is way too simplistic. The Petitioners are on the side of so called "love" and the respondents are on the side of the "truth." The respondents should support my request to intervene because I make the slippery slope argument a reality instead of a hypothetical. The Petitioners should support my request to intervene so that they do not undermine their equality argument, since all suspect class of sexual orientation warrant equal protection or none at all. The Court should support my request to intervene so that it has the complete picture of what recognizing sexual orientation as a classification must look like everyone should have the right to marry anyone and anything in combinations in keeping with their sexual appetite or traditional marriage is the only union that any state in the United States should recognize. All existing same sex marriages should be invalidated. The degree of my feelings in my heart towards my object of affection is as irrelevant as Johnson's feelings in his heart towards Campion. The unexamined assumption of the superiority of our cultural moment is at the root of this action. The Honorable Supreme Court of the United States must be able to rise above our cultural moment to hand down decisions is in synch with transcultural universal law in order to keep its integrity and respectability in tact, along with our Country's stability. Perhaps, it is true that in seeking to marry a nonmember of the opposite sex, the Petitioners and I do not even understand what love is. For if a man loves a man, perhaps he will help his brother become a better man

I. SECTION ONE
COMING TO TERMS WITH THE FACT THAT THE LAW INESCAPABLY MANDATES MY INTERVENTION FOR BETTER OR WORSE

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? 1 Corinthians 1:20

A. CLASS PROTECTION IS AN ALL OR NOTHING AFFAIR

"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

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. [10] Therefore, by

---

so that he may someday be a better man of virtue to love and serve his different yet equal spouse. That is what the respondents seem to be arguing in keeping with common sense and the reasonable person standard.

[10] 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.

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. This is of course only true if "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 in keeping with the frightening notion of judicial fiat.[11] However, when those courts found sexual orientation to be a class, they were not considering the complete picture and were clearly influenced by the unexamined superiority of our cultural moment advanced by institutions like the mass media, which is a sort of megachurch of its own.[12] On the basis of the terms offered by the Respondents, my intervention takes a hypothetical slippery slope feared by both parties 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, as demonstrated in the next two sections.

B. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF "NOPE"

The tongue has the power of life and death, and those who love it will eat its fruit. Proverbs 18:21

For better or for worse, the email exchange between the Petitioners and myself in relation to my intervention request is so significant that it stands to single handedly destroy their case with a single word. If I am not allowed to marry my preferred spouse, which is also, outside the definition of traditional marriage, then the same-sex marriage request must equally be denied. On

---

[11] In only considering the "gay orientation," 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.

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

Wednesday July 23, 2014, I sought leave to intervene from the Petitioners at the sixth circuit level. Here is our exchange:

Request: Seeking Intervention before the 6th Circuit
From: Chris Severe<ghostwarsmusic@gmail.com> Wed, Jul 23, 2014 at 4:32pm
To: Dan Canon <dan.canon@gmail.com>, jean.lin@usdoj.gov, jennie.l.kneedler@usdoj.gov, stephanie.french@louisvilleky.gov, lfarah@whtlaw.com, brian.judy@ag.ky.gov, clay.barkley@ag.ky.gov, gmonge@vmje.com, llatherow@vmje.com, wjones@vmje.com, stan.cave@stancavelaw.com

Hey guys, I'm filing a motion to intervene in this case today. Pursuant to the local rules, do I have your permission to intervene? I am required to seek permission from both sides. I assume you saw my motion to intervene in the lower court that was served through mail and ECF. Thanks so much, Best, Chris

---

Response:

From: Dan Canon <dan.canon@gmail.com> Wed. July 23, 2014 at 5:09PM
To: Chris Severe <ghostwarsmusic@gmail.com>Cc: llatherow@vmje.com, jennie.l.kneedler@usdoj.gov, clay.barkley@ag.ky.gov, stephanie.french@louisvilleky.gov, jean.lin@usdoj.gov, wjones@vmje.com, brian.judy@ag.ky.gov, stan.cave@stancavelaw.com, gmonge@vmje.com, lfarah@whtlaw.com

Nope.

Reply:
From: Chris Severe<ghostwarsmusic@gmail.com> Wed, Jul 23, 2014 at 4:32pm
To: Dan Canon <dan.canon@gmail.com>, jean.lin@usdoj.gov, jennie.l.kneedler@usdoj.gov, stephanie.french@louisvilleky.gov, lfarah@whtlaw.com, brian.judy@ag.ky.gov, clay.barkley@ag.ky.gov, gmonge@vmje.com, llatherow@vmje.com, wjones@vmje.com, stan.cave@stancavelaw.com

Wow, literally that's your response to my request to marry on the basis of my sexual orientation, after equating this plight to race, fundamental rights, immutable traits, you just explained away the explanation to your case in chief as well as mine and demonstrated for the record flagrant racism and absolute imperialistic [sic] hypocrisy through mocking flippant denial. I'll have to immediately address that with the Court. Best, Chris

---

Clearly, by their own omission, the Petitioners do not really believe that sexual orientation is a class, as I do. If the Court does not want to deal with the implications of this response that is part of the record in this case, both the public and history just might. The Court cannot ratify

dishonesty because it is trying to be sympathetic to adults, when the welfare of millions of children standard to be influenced by the Court's decision. This action is a glorified domestic case and the interest of adults is entirely secondary in keeping with the spirit of The Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (UCCJEA).

C. THE PETITIONERS EXPLOITATION OF THE RACE PLIGHT WHEN THEY REALLY DON'T MEAN IT IS INCREDIBLY RACISTS AND A SLAP IN THE FACE TO THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT - THE COURTS MUST NOT STAND FOR IT

These men lie in wait for their own blood; they ambush only themselves! Proverbs 1:18

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 deception into the public record in falsely using the "race card" to accomplish their adult centered ends. In all of the same sex marriage cases that I have moved to intervene in, all of the Petitioners have first equated their plight to the "race fight" in their complaints and motions, as part of an emotional appeal.[13] I then subsequently move to intervene, after sustaining the exact same injury by the clerk's office denials with a minor twist in spouse preference in keeping with my own individual and fundamental rights. I then make the same arguments using the exact same legal authority as the same-sex proponents, 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 keeping with their determining right and wrong on the exclusive basis of "their feelings." In doing so the Petitioners not only "explain away" the "explanation" for 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

[13] On facebook.com millions of people posted the equal sign to show their support to gay marriage 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 culturally brain washed.

plight whatsoever.[14] In fact, the Petitioners' false use of "the race card" as a platform to accomplish selfish ends is entirely racist in and of itself. The African American community should be completely outraged at this flagrant racist exploitation. The Petitioners are literally riding on the backs of persecuted slaves to justify a depraved lifestyle that we all know is vulgar and unnatural. The Petitioners arguments should be completely invalidated for violating the spirit of the 13th Amendment, which was the subject of a civil war which also divided this country and nearly destroyed it, as this case has the potential to do more than one might suspect on the surface. The horse faced hypocrisy by the Petitioners, not only threatens all other variations of the sexual orientation suspect class, it threatens the integrity of the Constitution and offers the added benefit of reopening our Nation's most egregious wound, associated with slavery and racial discrimination. [15] The Court might just manage to undo its accomplishments in *Brown v. Board* of Education of Topeka, 347 U.S. 483 (1954) which would be tragic.

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. Then a hispanic person attempted to intervene, as an ambassador of his race after facing discrimination, and in response, the African American plaintiffs teamed up with white supremacist defendants to say "no the hispanic person cannot intervene because he is a member of the true minority, and

[14] Besides advancing a vulgar lifestyle due to actual ignorance, they come with the extra benefit of being liars.

[15] 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 and perpetual deception. 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.

therefore, his request not to be discriminated on the basis of his race is frivolous and removed from reality." That is exactly what has occurred here, if sexual orientation is found to be a class. I am like the hispanic intervenor, a member of the true minority, the Petitioners are like the African Americans, members of the largest minority, and the Respondents are like the white supremacists majority in the analogy. To stifle or censor my speech in this case is incredibly wrong.

Unquestionably, I deserve a seat at the table in this action no matter who it makes feel uncomfortable, even if it is inconvenient and makes the conflict even more controversial. [16] If fraud is being perpetrated onto the American people - and it is - and my intervention will help expose that, the Court must ratify it. 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. It could very well be the case that the Petitioners and I are really discriminating against traditional married couples and their families, if that potentially life giving relationship is superior. Yet, if sexual orientation is a protected class, my orientation should not be left out in the cold - that would be a hardcore act of discrimination. Just because the culture may not be ready for my request, the laws of the United States are not supposed to fashioned off of the trends in Hollywood, which by and large lacks the ability to even define right and wrong from one moment to the next as shifting feelings may dictate. We know by know that truth is not relative.

---

[16] 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. (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).

D. THE TRUE MINORITIES INTEREST ARE BEING LEFT OUT

In their motion for a Preliminary injunction the Petitioners state:

> 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 twist. I seek to marry an inanimate object, not another member of the same sex (we all know it could have just as well been multiple persons or an animal if I had cultivated that orientation instead - so to get hung up on that detail is implausible, given what is at stake). 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" *Zablocki v. Redhail,* 434 U.S. 374 (1978), but they do not consider that I feel the same way about my object of affection too. Perhaps this is perhaps because the Petitioners are as equally "bigoted" as the Respondents, who at least took my intervention request under advisement in good faith. Being married is of immense personal importance the Petitioners, as it is important to me and my object of desire and polygamist and their multiple prospective spouses. 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 Kentucky's refusal to permitted me to marry my object of desire in a

worse way than they have.[17] If the Petitioners feel like "second-class citizens," those of us in the real minority, who want to marry machines, animals, children, family members, multiple persons ect, certainly feel like "third-class citizens," as was unquestionably proven by the response of the Federal Courts in Florida,[18] *Brenner v. Scott*, 2014 WL 1652418 (2014), and in North Carolina, *General Synod of The United Church of Christ v. Cooper*, 3:14-cv-213, as the Court's acted with threats and intimidation to my appropriate motions to intervene. App(m)(l) The Florida and North Carolina Federal Courts demonstrated the same animus as the New York Federal Court in *Cuomo*, as these federal actors discriminated against me on the basis of sexual orientation and nearly trampling the process clause of the 5th Amendment.[19] In response to my

[17] 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.

[18] 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. App(m).

[19] 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.

intervention request, the District Courts asserted that there was something "psychologically" wrong with people who tried to change the Christian definition of marriage. In doing so, these Courts unknowingly gutted the validity of all same-sex marriages and demonstrated that their is something psychologically wrong with themselves, since they were apparently for gay marriage. (See the Dissent App(a) at 45; See App(g). Those District Courts cannot turn around now and say that "they really didn't mean it" anymore than the USSC can pretend that my request to intervene is not directly relevant, since sexual orientation as a suspect class is on the table and I an ambassador of the true minority, who has an even more unpopular orientation.

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 as the rejection of my sound intervention request in Tanco alone proves. *Windsor v. United States*, 699 F.3d 169, 181 (2d Cir. 2012).[20] 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, who at least are making an argument that traditional marriage is superior to all other forms with factual evidence.[21] Perhaps the most evil people in the world are individuals who do not know that they are bad. Perhaps the human race is

[20] To be clear, 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. Many opposite-sex couples have lesser functional relationships than many same-sex couples. 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.

[21] 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.

more wicked than we ever imagined which is even more reason why the laws must parallel transcultural truth in light of our impressionability.[22]

Inferrably, "polygamists," "beastialists", and "machinists" are just as equally a discernible group with non-obvious distinguishing characteristics as gays and lesbians are. [23] Even though the courts do not consist of psychologist, psychiatrist, or priest the *Lawrence* court 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.[24](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."). [25]

---

[22] Our founding fathers set up a system of checks and balances because they knew that the human heart was the problem with the world, and why is it that we cannot see that?

[23] *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

[24] 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?

[25] *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 exact same legal basis that the Petitioners and *Lawrence* advance. Like Bourke and Deleon, who were legally married in another state, I too had a legal marriage ceremony in another state (New Mexico) and another country (India), but the State of Kentucky refuses to recognize my marriage, as it did theirs and that is invalid for the exact same reasons that the Petitioners assert. 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.[26] I have standing here.

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, just as the man-man and woman-woman couples are. Currently, the state of Kentucky has treats my metallic spouse and I as legal strangers in our home for the same reasons that Bourke and Deleon are and that is wrong because the feelings that we allow to dominate us tell us that it is. The State of Kentucky's exclusion of "man-man," "woman-woman," "man-animal," and "man-machine" couples from marriage adversely impacts "man-machine" couples, "same-sex" couples, and all other sexual orientation classes across Kentucky, by excluding us from the many legal protections available to spouses because the law

---

[26] Just like Johnson and Campion, I approached the Kentucky 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 KRS 405.040(2), KRS 405.045 and Ky. Const 233A in the same way that the Franklin and Boyd 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."

is trying to discourage a certain life-style. Allowing me to intervene demonstrates this point in the name of complete equality and actual tolerance, not the partial or self-centered equality as asserted by the dishonest Petitioners. 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*.[27] I do not appreciate being dehumanized any more than they do.

E. MODERN FAMILY VS ANCIENT FAMILY

Kentucky'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 Kentucky equally to all classes of sexual orientation. This discriminatory treatment is subject to heightened scrutiny because it burdens the fundamental right to marry and because it discriminates based on sex and sexual orientation against ALL classes, not just the homosexual class, which is merely the largest minority. 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 man-woman couples distinguishes that group from man-man and man-machine couples, but we are asking the Court to merely disregard that detail, along with

---

[27] 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.

other traditional concepts "like state sovereignty." The Petitioners will apparently monkey with language to get what they want and I should equally be allowed to do the same thing. As a combat veteran, who served outside the wire to advance the rule of law mission with the U.S. attorneys office, I am no less a citizen of the United States than Bourke and Deleon. This case boils down to "modern family vs. ancient family."[28] It is just that for me and others, the homosexuals definition of modern family is not "modern enough" for my appetite that the Federal and state Attorney General's office help to cultivate by its refusal to protect children and families through enforcing existing obscenity laws against the tech companies.

F. <u>THE LEGAL STANDARD REQUIRES INTERVENTION</u>

There will be no delay and prejudice in this action because I will simply join the Petitioners in their briefs with one 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.[29] 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 Kentucky 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

---

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

[29] <u>Past Intervention Attempts In This Case</u>: I moved to intervene in the District Court in this action. The District Court denied the motion. I moved to intervene at the 6th Circuit level but my request was denied without explanation which supports a 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. My 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). At the very minimum, the Court must make the parties file written responses to my motion to intervene and the Court cannot disregard the party omissions in the emails rejecting my request.

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 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). After granting certiorari and after denying the motion to intervene in Tanco, I have moved within the 30 day threshold set by the 6th Circuit to intervene in this case in which I have standing.

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 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).

Additionally, this may be the most important case that has come before the Court in the last several decades. The case has the potential to destroy the Constitution, discriminate against traditional married couples, and shape the trajectory of sexual preference for millions of Americans. Having the greater participation by affected parties and greater airing of the issues can only benefit this Court and parts of the prospectively brainwashed public by providing the widest range of arguments and perspectives available. The Honorable Court should not run away from my request because it heightens the controversy and better exposes the truth.

SECTION II
DETERMINING WHICH SET OF TRUTH CLAIMS OUR LAWS MUST BE SET ON

G. OPENING DOORS V KEEPING THEM CLOSED

Above all else, guard your heart, for everything you do flows from it. Proverbs 4:23

There are certain perceptions, possibilities and mindframes that should possibly never be cultivated by a civilized society and their laws. It is true that a person of the same-sex can have some form of intercourse with a member of the same-sex in the same way that an adult can theoretically have consensual sex with a minor. That does not make either objectively right under the reasonable person standard. It is also true that another human being can cannibalize and devour another human and derive nutrition from the experience.[30] But in terms of keeping the

[30] "Come on Tommy, Ain't no different than the slaughterhouse. Meat's meat, Bone's bone... Get it done." quoting Sheriff Hoyt in the Texas Chainsaw Massacre.

door closed on savagery, perhaps it is best that the United States never open the door to allowing one human to view another as food for the same reason it might be advisable that the law not encourage members to view another member of the same sex, multiple persons, an animal, or a beast as a viable spouse under the law. For example, we could theoretically cook and eat dead people, which would not hurt the decedent. But perhaps as a civilized society, our laws should not open the door to that either so that our citizens do not develop that taste for that form of savagery as well. [31] We all know deep down that cannibalism is vulgar in the same way that same-sex relations are, trying to shoehorn that conduct into the equal protection box does not diminish what a reasonable person of ordinary prudence knows already to be true without having to prove it through deduction or induction - to include semantics.[32] The human heart is capable of fostering incredible deceit, and the Court should decide if the public is better off if the law encourages delusionalism.

---

[31] Facing The Danger: This case is immensely dangerous. Let's say that same-sex marriage is legalized at the exclusion of all other sexual variations. It will mean that the United States is making up the law as "we go along." Our feelings cannot be trusted; just ask the victim of a crime, involving a situation where the perpetrator acted on his feelings in accomplishing injustice. The hearts of men are terribly wicked. While the God of the Bible is great, mankind is far worse than we ever imagined. Post modern western individualist relativist are great to deal with as along you agree with them but the second you don't they are ready to dehumanize and brutalize you effectively the same way that ISIS does to people who disagree with them. This is because they are dominated by their glands having opened the door to decisions that has cultivated an inferior lifestyle. Christianity is the only set of truth claims that orders its followers to love the people who disagree with them, to serve them, to consider them better than themselves. It is the set of truth claims that our laws must be established on. But if the Court in its wisdom elects to disregard the transcending authority of the Bible, it still cannot fail to give all classes of sexual orientation equal protection or our Nation will be in a de facto state of Nature.

[32] The Respondents say "no" and make faith based and logical arguments in support. The Petitioners say "yes" and make emotional appeals based on their feelings and lifestyle decisions. My position is that if the Court decides to open the door, mark my words, I am going to force the Court to open it all the way. If not here, then in other actions. See Sevier v. Cuomo before the 2nd Circuit Court of Appeals. Given my involvement in pornography litigation in 3:13-cv-0607; (Sevier vs. Apple); 3:14-cv-1313; Sevier v. Google) and 2:14-cv-07400 (Sevier v. Comcast), I have seen what happens in the area of "sex" concerning children and families, when the Court gets it wrong. (See the Testimonials from Fight The New Drug). The Court is going to have to not allow itself to be led around by the nose ring of culture and start standing for transcultural truth that the Country was founded on.

H. SEEKING A "NEWER RIGHT"

Claiming to be wise, they instead became utter fools. Romans 1:22

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. The same clerks office in Kentucky denied my "fundamental" and "individual" right to marry the spouse of my choice for the identical legal reasons the Petitioners' requests to marry a person of the same sex was denied. [33] 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 the same kind of "urges" asserted by the Petitioners.[34] 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

---

[33] 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.

[34] 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 The Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (UCCJEA). 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.

wed in other states.[35] I seek a "more modern Constitutional right" than the petitioners. The Petitioners were allowed to marry in states that legally permit same-sex marriage so their request is "old hat."[36] Clearly, the same-sex couples seek "state sanctioned savagery;" I merely seek a deeper form of "state sanctioned savagery" on the basis of the law set forth in their argument exactly. [37] In light of the positions taken by the dissent in the 6th Circuit, where do you draw the line? App.(a) 22-23. My intervention makes the slippery slope argument a reality, not merely a hypothetical. I must be allowed to intervene.[38]

I. EQUAL CAPITULATION TO CHRISTIAN MARRIAGE AS THE PETITIONERS

"For this reason a man will leave his father and mother and be united to his wife, and the two will become one flesh" Ephesians 5:31

Marriage is a Christian institution. To even seek to be married, the Petitioners and I are ratifying the dominating authenticity of Christianity; so in that sense we are better off not even talking.

---

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

[36] 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.

[37] 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.

[38] Denying my request may - alone - prove that the Courts have too much power. The Court should not be afraid of the fact that my presence will make a controversial case even more controversial in keeping with its Article III duties. 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. For the Court to make the wrong decision here could cultivate a form of sexual exploitation against the whole of society itself - especially against children. Since homosexuality blurs the lines between the wrongfulness of other sexual conduct outside of traditional marriage, like child pornography, my intervention could help the Court and the Country to further determine how do we even define "right and wrong" to being with. Prayer in school might be allowed again or the Bible further banded. But it should be one or the other. My intervention enables the Court to better see that changing the definition of marriage blurs lines and pushes us towards us collectively towards dehumanizing lifestyles in the area of sexuality and complete chaos in the name of "love." Of course, I would like that, I just don't want to cheat our way into that position in the way that Petitioners do.

The Bible would define marriage as being between one man and one woman. The Petitioners seek to rewrite that definition because they are threatened by the power of Christianity, and I merely seek to expand the definition further completely relying on their arguments, although I am not the most articulate attorney appearing here and I am not interest in cheating my way into success like the Petitioners. Changing the definition of 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 text - which served as the master narrative of our Constitution. Christians will never buy into the gospel of the state or into anything that advances meaninglessness. We live in a Christian Nation despite my personal beliefs and anyone elses here to include the current Justices presiding. I understand that forcing same-sex marriage, man-machine marriage, and so forth will polarize the Nation further, but if we are to polarize and divide, let's go all the way so that we can at least maintain Constitutional integrity and avoid stepping towards a state of nature.[39] My intervention helps in those respects.

40 41 42 43

[39] 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.

[40] American Christians will never support the lifestyles that the same-sex marriage couples and the lifestyle that I promote because they are one of many discourageable behaviors on a list that includes murder that is accepted as wrong on the basis of the one true faith that is superior to all others by a long shot. From the Christian standpoint, my request to marry an inanimate object may be less moral than Meades request to marry Barlowe; so I am not here to make holier than thou positions. 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, as it embraces meaninglessness. The Court should not be persuaded by the unexamined assumption of the superiority of our cultural moment.The cultural climate is always narrow, exclusive, outdated, and on its way out. The temporal cultural feeling makes for a disastrous basis for law. See the cultural climate in Nazi Germany in the 1930s and 40s.

[41] 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

Given my involvement in *General Synod of The United Church of Christ v. 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 as a result of over conformity to societies messages; I do not think that there is any doubt that this entire campaign by the same-sex couples that is a war against Christianity in the same way the terror in the middle east is birthed out of Islam. Even though the President doesn't have the backbone to admit it, the Court should not see that this case is meant to redefine Christianity first and the definition of marriage second. There is no freedom in living in denial. The hard truth is that by challenging the definition of marriage the same sex couples and I have de facto put Christ Himself on trial - once again. Let's face it,

---

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: (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.

[42] 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).

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

marriage itself is a Christian institution, so it follows logically that it should be defined on Christian terms of a union between one man and one woman. But if it is going to defined in terms of sexual orientation, my peculiar orientation should not be left out in the cold simply because the culture is not ready for that yet. The Constitution is still controlling the US, not the momentary cultural vibe cultivated by a collective shift out from under the truth our country was built upon.

J. TRANSCULTURAL LAW

Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today and forever. Hebrews 13:8

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 sound and sensible decision for the good of the Nation that will reverberate into the future for generations to come.[44] In this action, the Court must give all variations of a suspect class equal protection under the law, if "sexual orientation" is infact a class.[45] Otherwise, the Court must have the backbone to declare that traditional marriage is a "stand-alone relationship" that warrants special protection no matter who it offends. (The Court should be prepared to impeach the integrity of ALL same-sex marriages, if my marriage request is invalid). This is so that our children and grandchildren will

---

[44] *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 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)

[45] 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 our feelings tell us that "it should be." And allowing me to intervene will better allow the Court to determine, if "it should be."

not be led astray by a fraudulent agenda that offend decency, morality, logic, and science by prideful atheistic individuals who just want to do whatever they feel and do not believe in natural law, like John Locke. Either the Petitioners and I are discriminating against traditional married couples by saying that our marriage request are equal to theirs, or proponents of traditional marriage are discriminating against us for wanting to marry something other than a member of the opposite sex. It cannot be both. But the Court cannot allow persons of the same-sex to marry only to turn around and say that a man's request to marry an animal, an object, or multiple persons is unlawful because it fails to meet the definition of marriage. At the point in which the court or a state says that same-sex marriage is valid is the actual moment that the definition of marriage becomes too narrow for all of us in the true minority class of sexual orientation.

K. THE 6TH CIRCUIT INDIRECTLY CONFIRMED THAT I SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO INTERVENE IN ITS FINAL OPINION

The majority in Court of Appeals was indirectly speaking of my intervention request when it stated the following in its final decision:

> 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 discarded. 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 - even if indirectly.[46]

Accordingly, the Dissent in the Sixth Circuit respectfully amounts to an engrossing TED Talk or, possibly, an introductory lecture in Political Philosophy discussing "the ways that post-modern relativist attempt to get on top by arguing that truth is relative, and therefore, no one set of beliefs is superior," which is truth claim is vying for superiority and is itself that is flawed on its own terms. If all truth claims are equal, then no one has to listen to that position either. Although the dissent was hussled by the emotional appeals of the Petitioners, it was clear that the dissent was not sympathetic towards my position to intervene, which smells of judicial hypocrisy, which the Country cannot afford at this time in light of a glaring lack of leadership. A"line in sand" was drawn due to the same bigotry that the Petitioners asserted that the Respondents harbored exclusively. In keeping with the Dissent, I should not be treated as an "abstraction" because I could careless about money and titles. App.(a) 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.[47] 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 - the truth might come out and the Court's job is to find the truth. A sua sponte denial of this motion, itself shows evidence of

[46] I could just as easily be moving to intervene to marry multiple persons or an animal instead of an inanimate object, if I had cultivated a preference for that under a different set of influences.

[47] 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.

bias, prejudice, avoidance, and railroading by a Federal actor which offends my due process rights under the 5th amendment. The Country needs the USSC to show leadership or we could already be doomed, as a Nation and people group.[48]

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

What will you do on the day of reckoning, when disaster comes from afar? To whom will you run for help? Isaiah 10:3

Furthermore, I respectfully recommend that this Honorable Court consider the implications my pending lawsuit, *Cuomo et al,* 14-cv-5380, now before the 2nd Circuit Court of Appeals, which started off in the same New York venue that gave us the breath taking decision in "*Windsor,*" following Eric Holder's unprecedented abuse of process, which the Court ratified. [49] App.(f). If the same-sex couples win here, there will be nothing to stop me from winning there. But even if I lose before the second circuit due to abuse of process, I've got 25 other states that I can relocate to and file similar lawsuits in. All it will take is one truly far left Judge to side with me, and anyone can marry anything and and anyone in combinations. That is one of the takeaways from this case. Imagine this, if I am successful entire gangs can marry one another and claim the spousal exception to the evidentiary rule and not have to testify against one another at subsequent criminal trials. See Fed. R. Evid. 501. I filed a lawsuit against several states that support traditional marriage and same-sex marriage alike, suggesting that their definitions of

---

[48] The Court owes a duty to the Nation to maintain its honorability and to side with the truth after considering all sides of this issue. My voice is as equally relevant as the largest minorities in the sexual orientation classification.

[49] *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 Kentucky's marriage laws even after this case.

marriage were too narrow and outdated. See App(O). If intervention is allowed, I'll nonsuit the claims against the defendants from Kentucky in that pending action. The Honorable Judge Peska from New York, who is a great judge under usual circumstances and who is hailed as a prospective Supreme Court candidate, manifested symptoms of a panic attack in my case before her because I have challenged the Constitutionality of the law in New York 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 in regards to definitions associated with traditional marriage in Kentucky. The only recourse that Judge Peska had was to literally yell at me and threaten me because the law is on my side completely for the same reasons that the Petitioners advance. Judge Peska has no recourse other than intimidation. Although New York's "modern laws" permit same sex marriage, New York's definition is still "too narrow for my taste" in accordance with my taste consistent with the arguments of the Petitioners. (see Marriage Equality Act of 2011).[50]

By allowing me to intervene, the Supreme Court might be able to stop my plans to file individual lawsuits in twenty five different states to expand the definition of marriage further. At least my plight stands to bring uniformity. If the same-sex Petitioners can tell the Southern state of Kentucky how it will define marriage, why can't southerns like me do the same inside the so called "tolerant" Northern states? Either the majority in a state should get to decide how to define

---

[50] 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 feelings" is apparently a "fundamental right" because Hollywood says that it is ok now to make many in that community feel less ashamed about their lifestyle. (Apparently, acting on one's passions in committing murder 2 is not yet a protected right, but acting on one's feelings to engage sexually with a member of the same sex is encouraged by many states - even though rape and prostitution remains to still some how be illegal for the time being.) In *Cuomo*, I rely on all of the arguments advanced by the Petitioners here entirely.

marriage or the Court must make a decision that allows all classes of sexual orientation to marry on the basis of their cultivated sexual orientation in order to keep the Constitution alive. I will make it so there is no middle ground through one measure or another.

M. ACTUAL ANIMUS

Blessed are those who are persecuted because of righteousness, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Matthew 5:10

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 in *Cuomo*. The way that the Petitioners were treated by the state of Kentucky compared to the way that several District Courts have treated me for my different marriage requests in multiple cases makes the state of Kentucky look like Mary Poppins by comparison. Several Courts have threatened to jail me for having the courage to believe in Constitutional integrity and uniformity.[51] 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 District that gave us *Winsor*, which catapulted the quest at work here, found my claims to marry a different kind of nonmember of the opposite sex 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 Military. 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, as they elevate illogical reasoning in conjunction with savagery. 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, spiritual,

[51] Perhaps the liberal bubble needs to be punctured for the same reason that ISIS bubble or my own bubble must. Perhaps bubbles under a doom of false truth claims must come crashing down because there is freedom in the truth.

procreative, scientific, neurological, and biological reasons,[52] but there cannot be any question that my request to marry an inanimate object is not any less "frivolous" or "meritless" than Bourke's request to marry Deleon and call him his wife.[53] On its own terms the request is removed from reality. [54] App().

N. 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

I make no apology for asserting that "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, and with it, so have our hearts. Respectfully, culture have moved so away 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 my own. The significance of "truth" and "freedom" should be considered here. "Freedom" is more complex than we think it is; and

---

[52] 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.

[53] Respectfully, the spirit of the UCCJEA mandates that the Court stop playing footsie with the sensitives of the pro-gay adults, who have been exposed as being grossly dishonest and vulgar, when their are impressionable children at stake. 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.

[54] We Need A Powerful Court In The Absence Of Leadership: The Court cannot allow this action to dissolve into a game of linguistics and semantics because the Petitioners are convinced that their feelings alone are the best trustworthy source of law. 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 and with it the strength of the written law itself. So much for the Court's legacy if that occurs. Given the breakdowns in the other two branches of Government, we need the Supreme Court to be more in tune with the truth and stronger than ever. That can only happen if the Court embraces the superior set of truth claims in humility. As a former combat officer, I respectfully ask that the Court ratify and follow my example in leadership.

"truth" is more important than we think it is. Without the "truth," there is no "freedom."[55] 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 unified people group. [56] 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, division, and cruelty. 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. If the Petitioners and I are equally delusional as the New York District Court indirectly ruled in *Sevier v. 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." [57] [58]

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

But people who aren't spiritual can't receive these truths from God's Spirit. It all sounds foolish to them and they can't understand it, for only those who are spiritual can understand what the Spirit means. 1 Corinthians 2:14

---

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

[56] 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.

[57] The Court should not permit us to languish in continual in what Rev. King called "darkness." After all, "*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.

[58] The Parent Hat vs. The Black Robe: The Honorable justices of the Supreme Court are not merely jurist. They are parents. I ask that the Court members remove the robe and think as parents in deciding this case.

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 likely find our experts' ideas to be primitive, laughable, and plain wrong as well. To suggest otherwise is too simplistic. Prior to Dr. Kinsey's research initiatives that began during War II, 20 years ago the idea of non-traditional marriage was entirely unthinkable. Aristotle spoke of the continuing debate in all societies between "old speech and new speech" in his discourses on rhetoric. This fight is not anything that is new. The struggle between to recognize sexual conduct outside the confines of traditional marriage has always been with us since the fall of man. The United States Supreme Court must come to terms that religion is at bar in Court controversies such as this one, and "without a faith basis, there is no basis for morality, without morality, there is no basis for law." [59]

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

But whoever looks intently into the perfect law that gives freedom, and continues in it--not forgetting what they have heard, but doing it--they will be blessed in what they do. James 1:25

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.[60] The New Testament is the yardstick of reality and the definer of right and wrong. Our laws and Nation were derived on the rock of Christianity. It is

[59] These kinds of truths should be taught in schools.

[60] 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.

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. So many liberals and conservatives love Rev. King. I wish that they would actually listen to what he was saying. Rev. King did not argue that the United States 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. For the proponents of gay marriage to invoke the name of Rev. King is a self-defeating act that supports either traditional marriage or my position of no restrictions on marriage. However, if the Court is to disregard transcultural law, by following philosophers like Lady Gaga and the philosophers at MTV, then the Court must at the very minimum give ALL variations of sexual orientation equal protection. That is, I and others should be allowed "to cash" in the Petitioners adult-centric conquest naturally.

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. [61] 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. The Supreme Court has recognized the secondary harmful effects of pornography.[62] The Court

---

[61] 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.

[62] 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

should recognize the secondary harmful effects of encouraging homosexual lifestyle, since they are both likely spreading false permission giving beliefs in the area of sex and blurring the lines between objective right and wrong.

Q. 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 politicians who are pupils of Sal Alinsky 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 faith and conviction. So, any argument that tradition matters should fail automatically against my request. [63] [64]

---

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.

[63] I am not 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

The state's traditional control over domestic matters could be hijacked in the name of "progress," which must be played out fully in the name of "tolerance," "love," "equality," and "progress." 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). 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 the voting process and the trustworthiness of the law. 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 we are not here to respect tradition, according to the Petitioners and I. *Washington v. Glucksberg,* 521 U.S. 702 (1997). My request to marry an inanimate object does not make state sovereignty a sham any less than Bourke's request to marry Deleon.

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. My plight does bare "adult interest," but it does not bare adult interest any more or less than the

---

adopting the novel principle that marriage is whatever emotional bond any person says it is, as the Petitioners have argued.

[64] 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 Bourke to marry Deleon.

Petitioners. 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. [65] Clearly, I did not file this lawsuit to completely gut and discredit all same-sex marriage, as Lifesite News asserted to the public. However, some parts of the media were correct in offering that science backs my position. As one journalist stated:

"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. 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.[66](See App(o)(h)).

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," neurology and the brain science of dopamine has not be barred at this time because it is true as well. The fact that credible science supports Christianity does not mean that it should be ignored or banned from schools because it is also objectively true. [67]

---

[65] See Pavlov's dog.

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

[67] Gender Matters: We know by now that 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 fortunately, even though I may prefer it to be

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

Defend the weak and the fatherless; uphold the cause of the poor and the oppressed. Psalm 82:3

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 which has a lot to do with the lack of regulation over the tech companies that distribute pornographic materials at will online - having brought pornography above ground and into our homes through cell phones and personal computers.[68] (See App(i)). I ask that the Court take my *Apple, Comcast, Blackberry,* and *Google* cases when they come up on appeal from the 6th, 3rd, 9th and 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.[69] The mental health and medical experts in my cases have attested that accessible pornography on filterless devices has increased sympathy for same-sex relations. It is not difficult to see why Tim Cook, a homosexual, at Apple is fighting me so tenaciously in

---

female because I personally would rather die than consider opening the door to the unthinkable act of homosexual conduct, as a matter of honor, self-resect, respect for my brothers, and respect for members of the opposite sex. 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. My request to marry a machine is closer to meeting the existing definition than the Petitioners request because I am one man seeking to marry one gender neutral object with neither female nor male type characteristics.

[68] 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.

[69] *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)

District Court in 3:13-cv-0607 to resist the filter demand that several Congressional members and the Prime Minister are backing in the here and in the United Kingdom.[70]

T. 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. If an individual justices here are for same sex marriage because they are pro-gay because they are swayed by the cultural winds of the moment, then by all means, they should bar my request and put the Constitutional integrity in peril. If an individual justice is against homosexuality and for traditional marriage, then by all means they should allow me to intervene and send the Petitioners and I to the same final destination in establishing that traditional marriage is stand alone. Or if the individual justice is a proponent of tolerance and the Constitutional integrity, they should allow me to intervene and rule in favor of the Petitioners and I so that the integrity of the equal protection clause can remain in tact. [71] The Court should not pre-decide the case on the basis of its own values and feelings but on the basis of the law. One thing is true, after this case, the Country will not be the same.

---

[70] In response to the pornography litigation in Apple, a news outlet in the United Kingdom asserted, “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. See https://socialreader.com/me/content/XULox

[71] 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.

U. THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS GAY PEOPLE (SEE ONTELOGICAL FALLACY

They exchanged the truth about God for a lie, and worshiped and served created things rather than the Creator—who is forever praised. Amen.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

The idea of "gay" and "straight" is itself an ontological fallacy and a man-made convention that has nothing to do with reality. Despite the mass media's distortion of reality, 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 who can bring us truth and freedom, since the two are tied together. 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). Just ask a victim of human trafficking. While the hearts of man are worse than we could have possibly imagined, the perhaps the God of the Bible greater, wiser, and more awesome than we can fathom. And God gave us the Bible, and from the Bible our founders cultivated the Constitution. It is a Compass to guide our Nation, for our Country is like a ship on the seas at night trying to navigate amongst the rocks in the dark. Our founders intended, not mandate Christianity, but that our policies parallel it so that we may be steered towards a richer freedom. Although the state must never be in the church, the church is already in the state, since all of us will bring the set of values we embrace to the table in this controversy.[72] Christianity cannot be

[72] 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

excluded from the public square for the same reason that other inferior sets of truth claims cannot, which are also as equally exclusive. May the Court have the courage and valor to advance the truth for the good of our Nation so that we may experience a richer freedom as a people group. I have confidence that this Honorable 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 would require if the Petitioners prevail. I should be allowed to intervene because Rev. King was right: *"true peace is not merely the absence of tension; it is the presence of justice.*" May the God who is recognized in the Bill of Rights, at the Lincoln Memorial, and on the Dollar, bless the United States Supreme Court, our Nation, the Petitioners, the Respondents, and our grandchildren for generations to come. May He have mercy on us if we get this wrong.[73]

/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 Kilo Iota

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on Valentines Day, 14th February, 2015, a true, correct and complete copy

---

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.

[73] May God even find the ability to forgive the lawyers - someday.

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.

Daniel J. Canon Counsel of Record Laura Landenwich L. Joe Dunman CLAY DANIEL WALTON ADAMS, PLC101 Meidinger Tower 462 South 4th Street Louisville, KY 40202 (502) 561-2005 x 216 dan@justiceky.com; Steven R. Shapiro James D. Esseks Chase Strangio AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION FOUNDATION 125 Broad Street New York, NY 10004; Jeffrey L. Fisher STANFORD LAW SCHOOL SUPREME COURT LITIGATION CLINIC559 Nathan Abbott Way Stanford, CA 94305; William E. Sharp AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION OF KENTUCKY 315 Guthrie Street, Ste. 300 Louisville, KY 40202; Shannon Fauver Dawn Elliott FAUVER LAW OFFICE, PLLC 1752 Frankfort Avenue Louisville, KY 40206 (502) 569-7710; LEIGH GROSS LATHEROW Counsel of Record WILLIAM H. JONES, JR. GREGORY L. MONGE VANANTWERP, MONGE, JONES,EDWARDS & MCCANN, LLP P.O. Box 1111 Ashland, KY 41105(606) 329-2929 llatherow@vmje.com

/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 Kilo Iota
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ty9s2CIPMe8