

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. INTRODUCTION
- II. EXPLANATIONS OF NON-INSTITUTIONAL SPEECH
- III. HOMOSEXUAL CULTURE IN 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY AMERICA
- IV. PUBLIC POLICY
- V. CONCLUSION

### APPENDIX

- A1. CONSERVATIVES, CAPITALISM, AND MONEY
- A2. HOMOSEXUALITY IN 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY AMERICA
- A3. PUBLIC POLICY

Public sentiment is everything. With public sentiment, nothing can fail; without it nothing can succeed. Consequently he who molds public sentiment, goes deeper than he who enacts statutes or pronounces decisions. He makes statutes and decisions possible or impossible to be executed.

Abraham Lincoln  
August 21, 1858  
Ottawa, Illinois  
First Lincoln-Douglas Debate

## I. INTRODUCTION

Private society controls America; government does not. The dominant reason is that government is an institution which means that it must adequately reflect *non-institutional* private society. Otherwise, government will be recreated and its officials will be punished for defying America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including the *Constitution*. Furthermore, that is the result predominantly because of people who first decisively shaped public sentiment in their favor and against institutional officials by openly communicating the truth, reason or logic they established in non-institutional private society. They also proved and reaffirmed that America's salvation is not conceived in institutions, and that the dominant component of victory for America's tradition of real freedom in struggles with enemies, opponents, and uncertainties of every kind is non-institutional speech.

## II. EXPLANATIONS OF NON-INSTITUTIONAL SPEECH

1. It's difficult or impossible to learn what's happening in the depths of non-institutional private society by listening to public officials. The dominant reason is that public officials routinely speak and behave either least offensively or far less offensively than they otherwise could to each other and to the rest of America. Consequently, we won't learn the fundamental causes of many problems from public officials. In fact, public officials who even openly *search* for fundamental causes might ruin their professional relationships with public officials in opposing parties or of opposing beliefs, and destroy government's ability to function effectively or at all. For example, incestuous homosexual Southern Democrats after the 1860 election who feared Abraham Lincoln partly because in the 1850s he began both openly searching for and communicating about the causes of their irrational, unconstitutional political ideology including their support for the spread of slavery.

Furthermore, *homosexual* public officials make understanding private society even more difficult by communicating or behaving fraudulently. Their goal is to selfishly hide what they believe is actually occurring in non-institutional private society including the worsening condition of homosexuals and the failure of Democratic Party policies, or to avoid appearing too strong or heterosexual which will cause them to be more severely criticized and harassed, or even ostracized, by other homosexuals.

2. Also, we cannot truly understand what's happening in the depths of non-institutional private society by watching, reading or listening to the news primarily because journalists routinely speak either least offensively or far less offensively than

they otherwise could about the issues, events, and people they're covering. Additionally, the modern journalism industry is dominated by homosexuals, especially *incestuous* homosexuals, who will not discuss the participation of homosexuals or the influence of homosexual culture in the issues and events they're covering. A major reason why is that other homosexuals will severely criticize and harass, or even ostracize, them for discussing that information. Consequently, we almost never learn the fundamental cause of a problem from journalists.

Moreover, homosexual journalists grossly and intentionally exaggerate government's, and all other institutions', power, influence, accomplishments, and potential for two major reasons. First, it's exponentially easier and safer for journalists to cover institutional issues, events, and people than it is to delve deeply into non-institutional private society where individuals and groups are battling for control of the nation, some of whom the homosexual journalists are subject to, others of whom consider the journalists their enemies. Second, at least almost all homosexual journalists are either typical collectivists or proponents of some other form of big government, institutional preeminence or institutional control. As a result, homosexual journalists want to make it appear that institutions, institutional officials, and the exercise of institutional power are the focal points for understanding America and the rest of the world. Thus, homosexual journalists take the road more easily and frequently traveled by spending a disproportionate and unrealistic amount of time covering institutional issues, events, and people.

3. Public officials and journalists work together because neither group communicates anywhere near as offensively as it could when it discusses issues, events, and people. However, it's not necessary for public officials or journalists to communicate as offensively as possible while fulfilling their duties. Furthermore, public officials and journalists might transgress their institutional boundaries to the detriment of themselves and their institutions if they communicate more offensively than necessary, even while they're adequately reflecting non-institutional private society. Also, *homosexual* public officials and journalists don't want to be criticized and harassed, or ostracized, by other homosexuals for revealing sensitive information about homosexual sex and culture to heterosexuals. Therefore, America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom depends upon people *outside* of government, of the media, and of all other institutions to openly communicate the most important information about America. Incidentally, institutions which don't adequately reflect that information lose credibility, influence, power, and money.

4. The public policy arena is often emotionally and mentally unsatisfying. The dominant reasons are that public officials don't communicate aggressively enough or

openly confirm enough of what people experience throughout their lives. Consequently, Americans should expect government and all other institutions to provide a *less* offensive, *less* substantive reflection of reality. Furthermore, Americans *shouldn't* expect government, by itself or in combination with any number of other institutions, to be the source for enough of the most important information they need to know to truly understand America.

5. Non-institutional speech is the sun around which all of America's institutions must orbit if the institutions aim to further America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including the *Constitution*. This includes not only government institutions, but also media, academic, and religious institutions. Also, if an institution doesn't adequately reflect what has been established with good intentions or according to America's tradition of real freedom in non-institutional private society, then the institution and its proponents rightfully lose credibility, influence, power, and money.

Additionally, it's not necessary for America's institutions to fulfill the same dominant functions as individuals and groups in non-institutional private society. Instead, each institution needs only to adequately reflect established truth, reason, and logic in non-institutional private society while fulfilling its own governmental, educational, scientific, charitable, religious or other purpose. In fact, I believe an institution that operates differently is operating unconstitutionally.

Lastly, institutions are for the benefit of mankind, not mankind for the benefit of institutions. Nonetheless, in contemporary America institutions are major contributing causes of some of America's most serious problems. For these institutions are led by corrupt officials, in particular *incestuous* homosexuals, who defy non-institutional private society to make something good happen for themselves and other homosexuals, or to establish institutional preeminence or control for collectivist purposes, or to hide the worsening condition of homosexuality in non-institutional private society.

6. Non-institutional speech is the most important component of America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom; it's also the most powerful weapon at the front line of America's struggle against enemies of real freedom. In fact, non-institutional speech at its best advocates America's tradition of real freedom, and proves to America's public officials what is true, reasonable, and logical in non-institutional private society. Consequently, non-institutional speech directs good-intentioned public officials where to legitimately steer public policy including the exercise of military and police power, and fills America's government and all other institutions with the breath of life.

7. Non-institutional speech is the highest form of speech, especially when it truthfully, rationally, directly, and openly judges and condemns wrongdoers for the purpose of furthering America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom. Additionally, one of the most transformative examples of non-institutional speech in American history is the Boston Tea Party which led to the creation of the *Declaration of Independence*. Interestingly, the cause of the Boston Tea Party was not simply requiring the colonists to pay taxes or the amount of tax the colonists were required to pay; it was taxation without representation, or the illegal lack of respect for the colonists, *especially the God-fearing conservative heterosexual* colonists. Stated differently, the cause of the Boston Tea Party was institutional officials who illegally elevated their personal culture above both legitimate public policy *and* established truth, reason, and logic in non-institutional private society.

This must be borne in mind, as also the additional fact that Judge Douglas [U.S. Senator Stephen Douglas – P.R.] is a man of vast influence, so great that it is enough for many men to profess to believe anything, when they once find out that Judge Douglas professes to believe it. Consider also the attitude he occupies at the head of a large party—a party which he claims has a majority of all the voters in the country. This man sticks to a decision [*Dred Scott* – P.R.] which forbids the people of a Territory from excluding slavery, and he does so not because he says it is right in itself—he does not give any opinion on that—but because it has been *decided by the court*, and being decided by court, he is, and you are bound to take it in your political action as *law*—not that he judges at all of its merits, but because a decision of the court is to him a "*Thus saith the Lord*." [Applause.] He places it on that ground alone, and you will bear in mind that, thus committing himself unreservedly to this decision, *commits him to the next one* just as firmly as to this. He did not commit himself on account of the merit or demerit of the decision, but it is a *Thus saith the Lord*. The next decision, as much as this, will be a *Thus saith the Lord*. There is nothing that can divert or turn him away from this decision. It is nothing that I point out to him that his great prototype, Gen. Jackson, did not believe in the binding force of decisions. It is nothing to him that Jefferson did not so believe.

I have said that I have often heard him approve of Jackson's course in disregarding the decision of the Supreme Court pronouncing a National Bank constitutional [*McCulloch v Maryland* – P.R.]. He says, I did not hear him say so. He denies the accuracy of my recollection. I say he ought to know better than I, but I will make no question about this thing, though it still seems to me that I heard him say it twenty times. [Applause and laughter.] I will tell him though, that he now claims to stand on the Cincinnati platform, which affirms that Congress *cannot* charter a National Bank, in the teeth of that old standing decision that Congress *can* charter a bank. [Loud applause.] And I remind him

of another piece of history on the question of respect for judicial decisions, and it is a piece of Illinois history, belonging to a time when the large party to which Judge Douglas belonged, were displeased with a decision of the Supreme Court of Illinois, because they had decided that a Governor could not remove a Secretary of State. You will find the whole story in Ford's History of Illinois, and I know that Judge Douglas will not deny that he was then in favor of overslaughing that decision by the mode of adding five new Judges, so as to vote down the four old ones. Not only so, but it ended in the Judge's sitting down on that very bench as one of the five new Judges to break down the four old ones. [Cheers and laughter.] It was in this way precisely that he got his title of Judge. Now, when the Judge tells me that men appointed conditionally to sit as members of a court, will have to be catechised beforehand upon some subject, I say, "You know, Judge; you have tried it." [Laughter.] When he says a court of this kind will lose the confidence of all men, will be prostituted and disgraced by such a proceeding, I say, "You know best, Judge; you have been through the mill." But I cannot shake Judge Douglas's teeth loose from the Dred Scott decision. Like some obstinate animal (I mean no disrespect), that will hang on when he has once got his teeth fixed; you may cut off a leg, or you may tear away an arm, still he will not relax his hold. And so I may point out to the Judge, and say that he is bespattered all over, from the beginning of his political life to the present time, with attacks upon judicial decisions-I may cut off limb after limb of his public record, and strive to wrench him from a single dictum of the court-yet I cannot divert him from it. He hangs, to the last, to the Dred Scott decision. [Loud cheers.] These things show there is a purpose *strong as death and eternity* for which he adheres to this decision, and for which he will adhere to *all other decisions* of the same court. [Vociferous applause.]

Abraham Lincoln  
Ottawa, Illinois  
August 21, 1858

First Lincoln-Douglas Debate

### III. HOMOSEXUAL CULTURE IN 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY AMERICA

1. All remaining transvestites are *incestuous* homosexuals; hence, the name "transcestite".

2. All adult members of the Episcopal Church are incestuous homosexuals. Furthermore, I believe this is true because the Episcopal Church welcomes transcestite minors into their organization, and all transcestites, and parents of transcestites who approve of their minor children's transcestitism or allow their minor children to live as transcestites, are incestuous homosexuals. Also, all members of religious organizations

who welcome *transcestite* members, other *transcestite* participants, and other homosexuals whose behaviors and dress are nearly as extreme as *transcestites* are incestuous homosexuals. Furthermore, all fraudulent religious organizations whose welcome members are incestuous homosexuals are cults.

Interestingly, homosexuals were monumentally, historically mistaken in what they thought they were achieving by “taking over” genuine religious organizations including the Episcopal Church. For their takeovers didn’t result in any substantial or true victory for homosexuals. The dominant reason is that the homosexuals involved didn’t understand that since the religious organizations are *institutions* the organizations must adequately reflect established truth, reason, and logic in non-institutional private society or else the organizations will lose credibility, influence, power, and money. Consequently, after taking over the organizations, typically or exclusively while they were living as closeted homosexuals, incestuous homosexual members of the organizations first accepted openly homosexuals into their organizations, then supported same-sex marriage and other homosexual rights, and then performed or officiated over same-sex marriages for their members. Now, some of these organizations welcome *transcestites* as members or participants, including minor *transcestites*, and other homosexuals whose behaviors and dress are nearly as extreme as *transcestites*. Thus, after taking over the genuine religious organizations incestuous homosexuals led the organizations in the opposite direction that *non-institutional* private society was going partly because they misunderstood, and gave too much credibility to, homosexual rights laws and public policy in general or did not respect the preeminent influence and position of non-institutional private society.

Thankfully, homosexuals’ “takeover” of genuine religious organizations is an excellent example of homosexuals’ fundamental misunderstanding of both America’s normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom and of human behavior as expressed in institutional versus non-institutional environments. Even better, homosexuals have made it extremely easy for heterosexuals to identify homosexual-led fraudulent religious organizations which are now positively segregated from genuine religious organizations, a result which harms homosexuals even more since homosexuals believe that making good things happen for themselves requires interacting much more closely with heterosexuals.

3. Institutional policy often reflects the exact opposite of established truth, reason or logic in non-institutional private society. As expected, homosexual culture, especially *incestuous* homosexual culture, is the dominant or most common reason.

For example, if a heterosexual participant in an institution that is controlled by homosexuals is outspoken against homosexuality, or speaks about homosexuality in a manner that adequately reflects non-institutional private society, it will cause the

institution's homosexual officials to make the institution more homosexual by making homosexual culture more obvious in the operation of the institution, hiring more homosexuals, and hiring more homosexuals with more homosexual or near extreme physical appearances including more masculine lesbians or more effeminate gay men. The outspoken heterosexual might also cause existing homosexual employees of the institution to change their physical appearances to be more obviously homosexual.

Interestingly, a major reason for this increased homosexuality of the institution is that homosexuals within the institution will receive more negative attention or criticism from other homosexuals because of the outspoken heterosexual. Therefore, the institution's officials and other participants respond by being more homosexual, or showing more support for homosexuality, or making the institution more homosexual to make it appear that's business as usual, that society in general is moving in a more pro-homosexual direction, and to both receive greater support from and ally themselves with similarly-situated homosexuals in like-kind institutions.

Also, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that it's not a genuine interest in transitioning to a more homosexual institution that explains the transition; it's a defiant policy caused predominantly by an outspoken heterosexual. In fact, homosexual institutional officials, like almost all other homosexuals, prefer that they *not* have to become more homosexual because it actually makes their lives and institutions worse especially by destroying their credibility or influence. Furthermore, since fewer heterosexuals will associate closely with them as they become more homosexual, the result is increasingly fewer opportunities to get something going on or to make something good happen for themselves *with* heterosexuals.

Incredibly, until recently at least a majority of homosexual institutional officials believed that the increased homosexuality of their institutions were victories for homosexuals because it apparently increased homosexuals' institutional power in America while doing what heterosexuals didn't want them to do. In reality, however, this is another excellent example of homosexuals' fatal misunderstanding of America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom and of human behavior as expressed in institutional versus non-institutional environments.

Finally, outspoken heterosexuals *within* institutions are not the only cause of increased homosexuality of institutions. In fact, outspoken heterosexuals in non-institutional private society also cause increased homosexuality within institutions including government institutions. Not surprisingly, the best modern example of this is homosexual rights laws. For, in reality, homosexual public officials continue to unconstitutionally utilize government institutions to further homosexual rights in reaction to anti-homosexual events and anti-homosexual truth, reason, and logic in non-institutional private society. In other words, homosexual public officials are pitting government institutions against non-institutional private society to disguise the bad

and worsening condition of homosexuals in non-institutional private society, which is obviously unconstitutional.

4. Homosexual journalists' coverage of government and of all other institutions is intentionally designed to make institutions appear dominant, and to diminish the preeminent influence and position of non-institutional private society.

5. Government, all other institutions, technology, and select scientific or medical advances deserve the most credit for improving peoples' lives; at least, that's what homosexual journalists want you to believe. The primary reason is that homosexual journalists and at least almost all other homosexuals working in institutions don't want to give any importance to what conservative heterosexuals are achieving in non-institutional private society. For non-institutional private society is where the most important achievements on behalf of America's tradition of real freedom, and for improving quality of life in America, occur. That explains why Americans can watch, listen to, and read homosexual journalists 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, week after week, month after month, year after year, and still not learn what America, the rest of the world or any part of it, are truly about. Obviously, homosexual journalists are not communicating or reflecting enough of the truth, reason, and logic that are already established in non-institutional private society.

6. Homosexual journalists disproportionately cover the institutional side of American life and try to make it appear that institutional events, issues, and people are the most important to both present to and discuss with their audiences. This reminds me of homosexual public officials who exaggerate pro-homosexual or pro-collectivist government "achievements" while refusing to adequately reflect non-institutional private society. For example, some homosexual public officials say that "America is already great" *when referring to homosexual rights laws and anti-capitalist monetary policies* even though these laws and policies are "benefitting" people who are irreversibly headed for ultimate extinction.

7. The non-institutional level of reality is the most important to understand, *not* the institutional levels of reality in which the most important information to know is typically either not provided or not expressed directly or offensively enough. Consequently, conservative Americans shouldn't be concerned that they're not getting the media coverage that reflects the importance of what they're accomplishing and of what is actually occurring in non-institutional private society. For in the battle of good versus evil this lack of coverage is not important.

Consider Jesus: He lived in the flesh; yet, there was so little coverage of His life from the media of His time, so little government or other institutional documentation of His existence; however, that hasn't mattered at all throughout the last nearly two thousand years. The same is also true for a multitude of other Biblical figures whose words and actions were too powerful or controversial to receive coverage from the media of their times or to be officially documented in a government or other institutional record. Ironically, some people erroneously believe and propagate that since Biblical figures and events didn't receive coverage in the media of their times or get officially documented in government or in other institutions those figures and events must have never lived or happened or must have lived or happened far differently than described in the *Bible*. In reality, this erroneous, absurd, backwards belief is another example of institutional preeminence or control, for it is contrary to easily observable human behavior as expressed in institutional versus non-institutional arenas.

Additionally, I believe homosexuals working in the popular media have never adequately covered or reflected the most important issues and events in non-institutional private society. Instead, these homosexuals always favor institutional issues, events, and people primarily because what occurs in non-institutional private society is too powerful or anti-homosexual for them to proclaim from the rooftops or to even adequately cover or reflect. Nevertheless, both homosexuals and heterosexuals working in the media or in any other institution, whose intent is to lead others away from truth, reason, and logic, are still losing the war of good versus evil as importantly as they did two thousand years ago.

8. Conservative heterosexuals own the historical record partly because of what homosexuals intentionally leave out, and have always left out, of the record. Additionally, homosexuals' dishonesty, selfishness, and lack of patriotism are major reasons why both academic and media institutions have been *rapidly* declining in credibility, power, and influence over the last 8 years and were steadily declining for decades before that. Thankfully, however, their declines have reaffirmed the preeminent influence and position of non-institutional private society.

Now, my friends, I ask your attention to this matter for the purpose of saying something seriously. I know that the Judge [U.S. Senator Stephen Douglas – P.R.] may readily enough agree with me that the maxim which was put forth by the Saviour is true, but he may allege that I misapply it; and the Judge has a right to urge that, in my application, I do misapply it, and then I have a right to show that I do *not* misapply it. When he undertakes to say that because I think this nation, so far as the question of slavery is concerned, will all become one thing or all the other, I am in favor of bringing

about a dead uniformity in the various States, in all their institutions, he argues erroneously. The great variety of the local institutions in the States, springing from differences in the soil, differences in the face of the country, and in the climate, are bonds of Union. They do not make "a house divided against itself," but they make a house united. If they produce in one section of the country what is called for by the wants of another section, and this other section can supply the wants of the first, they are not matters of discord but bonds of union, true bonds of union. But can this question of slavery be considered as among *these* varieties in the institutions of the country? I leave it to you to say whether, in the history of our Government, this institution of slavery has not always failed to be a bond of union, and, on the contrary, been an apple of discord, and an element of division in the house. [Cries of "Yes, yes," and applause.] I ask you to consider whether, so long as the moral constitution of men's minds shall continue to be the same, after this generation and assemblage shall sink into the grave, and another race shall arise, with the same moral and intellectual development we have-whether, if that institution is standing in the same irritating position in which it now is, it will not continue an element of division? [Cries of "Yes, yes."] If so, then I have a right to say that, in regard to this question, the Union is a house divided against itself; and when the Judge reminds me that I have often said to him that the institution of slavery has existed for eighty years in some States, and yet it does not exist in some others, I agree to the fact, and I account for it by looking at the position in which our fathers originally placed it-restricting it from the new Territories where it had not gone [which occurred prior to the signing of the *Constitution* – P.R.], and legislating to cut off its source by the abrogation of the slave-trade thus putting the seal of legislation *against its spread*. The public mind *did* rest in the belief that it was in the course of ultimate extinction. [Cries of "Yes, yes,"] But lately, I think-and in this I charge nothing on the Judge's motives-lately, I think, that he, and those acting with him, have placed that institution on a new basis [in particular, the *Kansas-Nebraska Act* – P.R.], which looks to the *perpetuity and nationalization of slavery*. [Loud cheers.] And while it is placed upon this new basis, I say, and I have said, that I believe we shall not have peace upon the question until the opponents of slavery arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction; or, on the other hand, that its advocates will push it forward until it shall become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new, North as well as South. Now, I believe if we could arrest the spread, and place it where Washington, and Jefferson, and Madison placed it, it *would be* in the course of ultimate extinction, and the public mind *would*, as for eighty years past, believe that it was in the course of ultimate extinction. The crisis would be past and the institution might be let alone for a hundred years, if it should live so long, in the States where it exists, yet it would be going out of existence in the way best for both the black and the white races. [Great cheering.]

Abraham Lincoln  
Ottawa, Illinois  
August 21, 1858  
First Lincoln-Douglas Debate

#### IV. PUBLIC POLICY

1. The legalization of same-sex marriage by the U.S. Supreme Court is not an important legal, governmental or historical achievement which benefits homosexuals. In particular, I believe the five homosexual judges who comprised the majority in the decision that legalized same-sex marriage, and all or almost all same-sex homosexuals who've married each other, are *incestuous* homosexuals. Thus, same-sex marriage is part of incestuous homosexuals' strategy to defy conservative heterosexuals and Biblical morality, to try to make something good happen for themselves and homosexuals in general, and *to make it look like* homosexuals have their foot in the door of America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including the *Constitution* and as a result must be tolerated and reckoned with.

Also, both heterosexuals and non-incestuous homosexuals weren't supposed to know that incestuous homosexuals comprise all or almost all of the participants in same-sex marriages, all of the U.S. Supreme Court judges whose majority opinion legalized same-sex marriage, and all other judges in the federal or state courts who legalized same-sex marriage. Even worse, I believe that since legislation, court decisions, and other public policy supporting same-sex marriage and other homosexual rights are so absurd, irrational, and fraudulent they reveal that at least almost all of the public officials responsible for the public policy are incestuous homosexuals *who are either still participating in incestuous sex or participated in it close to when they created or supported the public policy*.

Additionally, unlike the legalization of rights for women and racial minorities, the legalization of homosexual rights is not for the sake of exercising those rights; it's for the sake of *making it look like* homosexuals are achieving important objectives to disguise how bad conditions truly are for incestuous homosexuals in non-institutional private society, and to dispirit and defy heterosexuals. Simply stated, the important appearance of legalizing same-sex marriage and other homosexual rights, which was propagated by *both* incestuous and non-incestuous homosexuals, is only one part of homosexuality's vast fraudulent exterior.

Therefore, the legalization of same-sex marriage by the U.S. Supreme Court is not an important legal, governmental or historical achievement which benefits homosexuals. For the extent of incestuous homosexuals' quest for legal rights and other

government power is proportionately related to the bad and worsening condition of incestuous homosexuals in America, especially in non-institutional private society, or the extent to which incestuous homosexuals' ship has already sunk. Ironically, government is illegally granting homosexuals rights, and other institutions are illegally increasing privileges for homosexuals, *after* non-institutional private society irreversibly set homosexuality on the path to ultimate extinction. More importantly, these rights and privileges are excellent examples of the vast institutional corruption in America, and of how far much of government and of all other institutions are unconstitutionally behind non-institutional private society or not adequately reflecting non-institutional private society.

2. When enough Americans wanted the *Constitution* to apply to blacks as much as it applied to whites they amended it.

When enough Americans wanted the *Constitution* to apply to women as much as it applied to men they amended it.

Likewise, if enough Americans want the *Constitution* to apply to homosexuals as much as it applies to heterosexuals they are required to amend it. Not surprisingly, however, Americans who favor equal benefits for homosexuals will never succeed in achieving the support necessary to amend the *Constitution* for that purpose. For I believe approximately ninety-percent or more of Americans disfavor homosexuality and equal rights for homosexuals. Furthermore, this lack of support explains why homosexual public officials are still trying to make it appear as if *less than* amending the *Constitution* is both legally sufficient to achieve equal rights for homosexuals and consistent with America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom. For example, the U.S. Supreme Court's legalization of same-sex marriage. Consequently, the result is a collection of statutes, decisions, and other public policy that defies what is obviously true, reasonable, and logical in non-institutional private society, and is therefore unconstitutional.

3. The Founders created the Supreme Court and included it in the *Constitution* for important reasons. Nonetheless, a decision by the Supreme Court or any other court is binding only if the decision is reasonable. Interestingly, it's often repeated that the Supreme Court determines "what the law is". More importantly, however, individuals and groups determine what America is and in which direction America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom should move by establishing truth, reason, and logic in non-institutional private society. Consequently, the Supreme Court's interpretation of the normal heterosexual *Constitution* must adequately reflect non-institutional private society.

Therefore, with the preeminent influence and control of non-institutional private society in mind, how should America's public officials treat homosexuals? Should they extend equal rights or equal protection of the law to homosexuals, homosexual culture, and homosexual sexual conduct? Of course not, for homosexuals deserve only humane treatment under the law for three important reasons. First, homosexuals cannot establish themselves with good intentions, or within America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom, in non-institutional private society, and it's not because heterosexuals are breaking the law or acting outside of America's tradition of real freedom to accomplish that. Second, homosexuals cannot achieve the support necessary to amend the normal heterosexual *Constitution* to make homosexual sex and culture legally permissible, which would consequently end America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom. Third, if we unconstitutionally allow homosexual culture to significantly influence America's public policy without first amending the *Constitution* America's tradition of real freedom will perish.

Sadly, U.S. Supreme Court justice Anthony Kennedy, an incestuous homosexual, wrote the following in one of the majority decisions he authored:

"The petitioners [both of whom are homosexuals – P.R.] are entitled to respect for their private lives. The State cannot demean their existence or control their destiny by making their private sexual conduct a crime."

This is obviously nonsense, in addition to being incestuous homosexual fraud and corruption. For once it is established in non-institutional private society that a particular sexual orientation or sexual activity is a result of incest or of any other subjective culture which conflicts with America's tradition of real freedom, the sexual orientation or sexual activity can and should be criminalized. Also, homosexuals cannot establish themselves in non-institutional private society according to America's tradition of real freedom or achieve the support necessary to amend the normal heterosexual *Constitution* in their favor. Furthermore, heterosexuals in non-institutional private society already demeaned homosexuals' existence and control homosexuals' destiny because the heterosexuals legally and with good intentions put homosexuality and all of collectivism on the path to ultimate extinction, *a reality which government and all other institutions must adequately reflect to comply with America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including the Constitution*. In fact, except for their own minor children and other close minor blood relatives whose parents are homosexuals, homosexuals have not induced any heterosexuals into homosexuality since 2009 predominantly because heterosexuals so effectively demeaned homosexuality in the minds of all other heterosexuals. Therefore, the government should not demean *conservative heterosexuals'* existence, or control *conservative heterosexuals'* destiny, or fail to adequately reflect non-

institutional private society by providing homosexuals any right, privilege or benefit beyond humane treatment while homosexuals undergo their involuntary extinction, which is a form of execution, from the human race.

4. Neither the Supreme Court, nor Congress, nor the President can overcome the *Constitution's* codification of normal heterosexual culture or the fact that normal heterosexual culture continues to run with the *Constitution*. In fact, only a constitutional amendment can overcome it. As a result, the three branches of government must always further normal heterosexuality until such an amendment is ratified. Otherwise, their actions are unconstitutional *and* against America's tradition of real freedom.

Practically speaking, the *Constitution* is the sole occupant of the highest heaven in America's government including the legal system which, in reality, are a normal heterosexual government and legal system, *not* a "white, Anglo-Saxon" government and legal system. Furthermore, the three branches of government occupy the next highest heaven below the *Constitution*. Thus, for public officials in any of the three branches of government to enter the highest heaven and interpret the *Constitution* according to homosexual or collectivist heterosexual culture, they must first amend the *Constitution*. More importantly, for the amendment to also further America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom it may be passed only after the truth, reason or logic that supports the amendment is first established in non-institutional private society, which will never happen since the amendment does not further normal heterosexual culture.

Finally, I insist, that if there is ANY THING which it is the duty of the WHOLE PEOPLE to never entrust to any hands but their own, that thing is the preservation and perpetuity, of their own liberties, and institutions. And if they shall think, as I do, that the extension of slavery endangers them, more than any, or all other causes, how recreant to themselves, if they submit the question, and with it, the fate of their country, to a mere hand-full of men, bent only on temporary self-interest. If this question of slavery extension were an insignificant one---one having no power to do harm---it might be shuffled aside in this way. But being, as it is, the great Behemoth of danger, shall the strong gripe of the nation be loosened upon him, to entrust him to the hands of such feeble keepers?

I have done with this mighty argument, of self-government [U.S. Senator Stephen Douglas's fraudulent, bad-intentioned application of the principle of self-government or democracy to the *Kansas-Nebraska Act* - P.R.]. Go, sacred thing! Go in peace.

But Nebraska [the *Kansas-Nebraska Act* - P.R.] is urged as a great Union-saving measure. Well I too, go for saving the Union. Much as I hate slavery, I would consent to the extension of it rather than see the Union dissolved, just as I would consent to any GREAT evil, to avoid a GREATER one. But when I go to Union saving, I must believe, at least, that the means I employ has some adaptation to the end. To my mind, Nebraska has no such adaptation.

"It hath no relish of salvation in it."

Abraham Lincoln  
October 16, 1854  
Peoria, Illinois

5. "It's not lawful for you to have her".

Just as John the Baptist condemned the Herodians for practicing unlawful marriage, so we condemn the "herodians" of our time, the incestuous homosexuals, for their unlawful marriage practices. Sadly, the "herodians" of contemporary America tried to "behead" those who condemned incestuous homosexual practices by labeling them as haters or un-American, and by establishing homosexuality in all branches of government and throughout all other institutions. Nonetheless, the front line in this struggle is not among incestuous homosexual public officials and their heterosexual petitioners, or among incestuous homosexual and non-incestuous heterosexual opponents in any other of America's institutions. In fact, the front line in this struggle is among individuals or groups in non-institutional private society who destroy the credibility, influence or power of any government or other institution opposed to them, or who make "statutes and decisions possible or impossible to be executed."

6. Support for same-sex marriage, like support for trans~~ce~~stite restroom privileges, should have been "firebells in the night" for all homosexuals. The dominant reason is that both incestuous homosexuals and non-incestuous homosexuals attempted to use homosexual rights laws as a means to make something good happen for themselves *by making it appear as if* homosexuality is on the rise in America even though they were defrauding heterosexuals. Also, homosexuals knowingly failed to both establish themselves with good intentions or improve their condition in non-institutional private society including by increasing public sentiment in their favor.

In hindsight, homosexual rights laws in general have served as an "act of suicide upon" homosexuality and as "treason against the hopes of the" homosexual community. Furthermore, homosexual rights laws worsened the condition of homosexuals in America including by worsening relationships between homosexuals

and heterosexuals and consequently driving public sentiment farther away from homosexuals. Interestingly, in deciding what to do with homosexual rights, homosexual public officials had “the wolf by the ears”; they could “neither hold him, nor safely let him go”. However, they let the wolf go; then it turned on them and is now tearing them to pieces along with the hopes of all homosexuals. Therefore, homosexuals in contemporary America and in other nations, especially *incestuous* homosexuals, are the “sons” whose “unwise and unworthy passions” destroyed the hopes of homosexuals across the world.

7. As the evidence against the genuineness of homosexuality and viability of homosexuality without reliance upon organized criminal activity increases, homosexuals’ fraud and defiance also increases. Sadly, homosexual public officials are trying to keep pace with conservative heterosexuals by attempting to unconstitutionally exercise government power in a manner that’s at least as forceful, one-sided, and convincing as the tremendous amount of truth, reason, and logic against homosexuality that is radiating from non-institutional private society. In fact, homosexuals are hoping to achieve both government and other institutional “victories” that make homosexuality appear at least as much on the rise as it is in reality a sinking ship in the sea of non-institutional private society. However, like the collectivists in the former Soviet Union, homosexuals cannot compete with conservative heterosexuals. Therefore, homosexuals will ultimately lose the contemporary struggle to define America’s identity, even with support from tens of millions of collectivist heterosexuals.

8. Interestingly, what many homosexuals didn’t realize is that homosexual officials in government and in all other institutions made-up their own rules for *making it look like* homosexuality is on the rise in America. Furthermore, they followed those rules and, in their opinion, achieved victory with homosexual rights laws and privileges which they both propagated as and equated to getting their foot in the door of conservative heterosexuals’ control of America’s identity.

More importantly, by behaving as they did homosexual public officials proved something very important about themselves and at least most homosexuals in America: they believed that by achieving homosexual rights laws without first either amending the *Constitution* or establishing the truth, reason or logic in non-institutional private society which would prove they are furthering America’s normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom they were not only defying conservative heterosexuals but also accomplishing something truly important and truly good for homosexuals. As a result, homosexual public officials revealed their ignorance of America’s normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including the *Constitution*, of America’s government including

its legal system, and of human behavior especially as it is expressed in institutional versus non-institutional environments.

Finally, now that homosexuality is exposed in great detail it's obvious that incestuous homosexuals, who are almost single-handedly responsible for homosexual rights laws, are the dominant proponents of unconstitutional policy in government and in all other institutions. Not surprisingly, incestuous homosexuals are on the fastest track to ultimate extinction, and are the worst people in America.

9. On August 18, 2015, President Obama hired the first openly *transcestite* staff member at the White House to serve as an outreach and recruitment director for presidential personnel in the Office of Personnel. The dominant reason the President made this irrational, absurd, and immoral decision is the worsening condition of *transcestites* in America caused predominantly by the revelation that all remaining *transvestites* are incestuous homosexuals; hence, the name "*transcestites*". Additionally, both heterosexual and non-incestuous homosexual Americans now know that all or almost all remaining *transcestites* continue living as *transcestites* because their incestuous homosexual family members require them to as part of their family's incestuous homosexual culture. Incidentally, *transcestites* can't make as much money prostituting themselves to non-family members as a result of these revelations.

More importantly, the President's fraudulent, unpatriotic decision to hire the first openly *transcestite* staff member reveals one of incestuous homosexuals' most important strategies: when conditions worsen for incestuous homosexuals, especially in non-institutional private society, incestuous homosexuals are supposed to *make it look like* their condition is improving. For example, hiring or promoting incestuous homosexuals in government and in other institutions, increasing incestuous homosexuals' legal rights including allowing *transcestites* to use the restroom that corresponds to their "gender identity" instead of the one that corresponds to their birth sex and allowing *transcestites* to serve in the military, and giving incestuous homosexuals more awards, medals or other recognition from government agencies or private organizations that are controlled by incestuous homosexuals. In other words, incestuous homosexual officials in government and in all other institutions respond to the worsening condition of incestuous homosexuals by unconstitutionally pitting government and all other institutions against non-institutional private society. More importantly, this is the same response from incestuous homosexuals in previous centuries which led to both the Revolutionary and Civil Wars.

10. All homosexual public officials should immediately either resign or be removed from office, at least as quickly as conservative heterosexual replacements are found. The dominant reason is that homosexual public officials don't put America first or respect

the preeminent influence and position of non-institutional private society. Instead, they put homosexual culture first, including by supporting homosexual rights laws, which is obviously contrary to America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including the *Constitution*. Furthermore, even homosexual "Republicans" submit to subjective homosexual culture by fraudulently and duplicitously promoting themselves as genuine conservatives or Republicans while supporting homosexual rights laws.

Alternatively, even though these homosexual public officials can't change the past they can change their opinions on homosexual rights, abortion, gun control, taxation, and many other important issues. Therefore, they should immediately destroy the unconstitutional public policy they adopted or furthered in the past, or which was adopted or furthered by other homosexual public officials, by supporting public policy that reflects established truth, reason, and logic in non-institutional private society. Interestingly, I'm reminded of Abraham Lincoln's following appeal to proponents of the *Kansas-Nebraska Act* who abandoned America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including the *Constitution* by, first, fraudulently interpreting the *Constitution* in a manner that defied the Founders' intention that the *Constitution* become *entirely* normal heterosexual, second, unconstitutionally operating government as if America was a democracy instead of a republic, especially by abandoning the spirit of compromise that enabled America to move forward as a republic and become more normal heterosexual without trampling the *apparent* "rights" of slaveholding Americans, and, third, fracturing the Union:

The Missouri Compromise ought to be restored. For the sake of the Union, it ought to be restored. We ought to elect a House of Representatives which will vote its restoration. If by any means, we omit to do this, what follows? Slavery may or may not be established in Nebraska. But whether it be or not, we shall have repudiated---discarded from the councils of the Nation---the SPIRIT of COMPROMISE; for who after this will ever trust in a national compromise? The spirit of mutual concession---that spirit which first gave us the constitution, and which has thrice saved the Union [the *Missouri Compromise* and the two compromises of 1850 – P.R.] ---we shall have strangled and cast from us forever. And what shall we have in lieu of it? The South flushed with triumph and tempted to excesses; the North, betrayed, as they believe, brooding on wrong and burning for revenge. One side will provoke; the other resent. The one will taunt, the other defy; one agrees [aggresses?], the other retaliates. Already a few in the North, defy all constitutional restraints, resist the execution of the fugitive slave law, and even menace the institution of slavery in the states where it exists.

Already a few in the South, claim the constitutional right to take to and hold slaves in the free states---demand the revival of the slave trade; and demand a treaty with Great Britain by which fugitive slaves may be reclaimed from Canada. As yet they are but few on either side. It is a grave question for the lovers of the Union, whether the final destruction of the Missouri Compromise, and with it the spirit of all compromise will or will not embolden and embitter each of these, and fatally increase the numbers of both.

But restore the compromise, and what then? We thereby restore the national faith, the national confidence, the national feeling of brotherhood. We thereby reinstate the spirit of concession and compromise---that spirit which has never failed us in past perils, and which may be safely trusted for all the future. The south ought to join in doing this. The peace of the nation is as dear to them as to us. In memories of the past and hopes of the future, they share as largely as we. It would be on their part, a great act---great in its spirit, and great in its effect. It would be worth to the nation a hundred years' purchase of peace and prosperity. And what of sacrifice would they make? *They only surrender to us, what they gave us for a consideration long, long ago; what they have not now, asked for, struggled or cared for; what has been thrust upon them, not less to their own astonishment than to ours.* [in particular, the spirit of concession and compromise which is normal heterosexual culture, and which both preceded the *Constitution* and ran with the *Constitution* in Lincoln's day; italics added – P.R.]

Abraham Lincoln  
October 16, 1854  
Peoria, Illinois

11. Generally speaking, the legitimate exercise of military and police power must adequately reflect what is true, reasonable or logical in non-institutional private society. Thankfully, non-institutional private society is still great because conservative heterosexuals control it; they're also dragging a substantial part of government and of all other institutions along with them as they take the next logical step forward in America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom. Therefore, it's easy for conservative heterosexual public officials to determine how to exercise military and police power in a manner that adequately reflects what conservative heterosexuals have established with good intentions in non-institutional private society.

12. Public policy is most offensive when it involves exercising military or police power including fighting a war, using deadly force, and carrying out the institutional death penalty. Interestingly, public officials who exercise government power most offensively typically communicate either less offensively or far less offensively than they otherwise could about the exercise of government power including its fundamental cause. For example, public officials don't publicly discuss the homosexual orientations of domestic terrorists, members of the Islamic State in foreign nations, or all Americans who perpetrate murder or mass murder in America even though homosexuality is the fundamental reason for exercising military or police power against those homosexuals.

Additionally, Abraham Lincoln communicated more offensively about slavery and related issues before his first campaign for the presidency began than he did for the rest of his life, even though as President he most offensively exercised government power to enforce his beliefs. Thus, when Lincoln changed from private society to the Office of the Presidency he substituted offensive anti-slavery speech with diplomatic anti-slavery speech coupled with the offensive exercise of military and police power.

Nevertheless, the Civil War neither vanquished, nor solved the problem of, defiance in the hearts and minds of pro-slavery homosexual Democrats, which brought them in conflict with America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including the *Constitution*. However, the Civil War brought freedom to millions more people, and made America and the rest of the world safer for republics.

13. President Lincoln strongly punished both racist homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals in the Civil War. However, it took more than 100 years after the Civil War ended before America's public policy finally caught up with the truth, reason, and logic that Lincoln first established in non-institutional private society of 1850s America and which he openly communicated to his fellow Americans. Practically speaking, it took so long to catch up with Lincoln because conservative heterosexual Americans did not understand how sexual orientation and other human behavior influenced slavery and racism in America. Now, because we understand so much more about sexual orientation and human behavior generally, homosexuals' ability to significantly influence public policy will end as early as the middle of next decade. Thus, from the beginning of the exposure of homosexual culture in non-institutional private society in late-2008, to the day when homosexuals can no longer significantly influence public policy, is a far smaller span of time than the more than 100 years that began with Lincoln's communications in non-institutional private society of 1850s America and ended with the conclusion of America's Civil Rights Era.

14. The Warren Court's decisions on racial issues represent the conclusion or near conclusion of part of what the Founding Fathers began in the Revolutionary Era and part of what Lincoln furthered beginning in the first half of the 1850s. Furthermore, I believe that if Lincoln would not have been assassinated it probably would have taken far less time for black Americans to achieve the rights and privileges which the Warren Court eventually extended to them.

Additionally, the Warren Court's racial decisions are different than successor Courts' decisions favoring abortion and homosexuality. For the successor Courts' decisions are the products of predominantly or entirely incestuous homosexual judges fraudulently interpreting the *Constitution* according to incestuous homosexual culture, or elevating their incestuous homosexuality above America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including the *Constitution*, which is obviously unconstitutional.

15. America's Founders and Abraham Lincoln aimed to both *contain* slavery and *hasten* its extinction. Additionally, if slavery could be *legally* contained and made extinct, which they believed it could be, they would avoid violating the *Constitution* in light of their understanding of human behavior, which was of primary importance to them. Consequently, the Founders and Lincoln utilized public sentiment in non-institutional private society as their dominant weapon to responsibly contain slavery and hasten its extinction within America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including an almost entirely normal heterosexual *Constitution*. Furthermore, based upon their speeches and other communications it's obvious they also substantially *shaped* public sentiment. Lincoln, in particular, both shaped public sentiment and utilized public sentiment as his dominant weapon until the circumstances ripened for the legitimate, deserving, and good-intentioned use of military and police power.

Ironically, both the Founders and Lincoln continue to be frequently accused of behaving timidly towards slavery and consequently legitimizing it. For example, Lincoln is often quoted as saying that he attacked slavery only where it did not exist, not where it did exist, and because the *Emancipation Proclamation* freed the slaves in only 10 states all of which were in the South. Also, some of the Founders are criticized for allowing some slavery in the Territories. Thomas Jefferson, in particular, is criticized for being against the *Missouri Compromise* because in his opinion the *Compromise* unconstitutionally restricted the spread of slavery. Nonetheless, I believe the fatal mistake made by both the Founders' and Lincoln's critics is exaggerating the influence of government upon slavery, especially the spread of slavery in the 1850s. For, in reality, *conservative heterosexuals in non-institutional private society caused pro-slavery incestuous homosexuals to react to them by unconstitutionally exercising government power more aggressively to spread slavery*. This is no different than how conservative

heterosexuals in non-institutional private society in contemporary America irreversibly placed homosexuality on the path to extinction even though homosexual rights laws and privileges are increasing and spreading throughout America. *For conservative heterosexuals in non-institutional private society are causing homosexuals, especially incestuous homosexuals, to irrationally and unpatriotically resort to exercising government power to pass homosexual rights laws, and to make it appear as if homosexuality is on the rise, will continue to spread, and is now a permanent part of American society.* In reality, conservative heterosexuals in non-institutional private society are causing homosexuals to exercise government power in a manner as illegal as “taxation without representation”, as unconstitutional and as contrary to the Founders’ intentions for America to be a republic instead of a democracy as the *Kansas-Nebraska Act*, and as unconstitutional as secession.

Additionally, normal heterosexual public sentiment in non-institutional private society of 1850s America, shaped in large part by Abraham Lincoln and many of his contemporaries, was so anti-slavery that it paved the way for Lincoln to win the presidency, to legitimately and with good intentions exercise government power to fight the Civil War, and to make slavery illegal in ten Southern states. Practically speaking, Lincoln took the Founders’ accomplishments one step further in a manner that I’m sure would please the Founders, especially Jefferson. Specifically, in the 1850s Lincoln began to delve into the causes of incestuous homosexuals’ irrational political ideology and extreme practice of slavery while simultaneously advocating for compromise between pro-slavery and anti-slavery Americans. Conversely, in the late 18<sup>th</sup> Century and early decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century, the Founders remained on a more impersonal, less offensive level of criticism and communication partly if not predominantly because of the real or perceived fragility of their young nation. Also, regardless of the criticism against it, the *Emancipation Proclamation* was an adequate reflection of non-institutional private society at the time it was enacted because it did not abolish slavery in most of the states since Lincoln and many of his contemporaries believed that practicing slavery remained a constitutional right in the states to which the *Emancipation Proclamation* did not apply.

Therefore, the Founders and Lincoln were *not* timid towards slavery. Furthermore, by respecting the *Constitution*, a nation of laws and not of men, and the rule of law, and by relying upon non-institutional private society as their dominant weapon to both contain and hasten the extinction of slavery and racism, they “legitimized” slavery as much as contemporary conservative Americans are “legitimizing” homosexual rights and collectivism by respecting the *Constitution*, a nation of laws and not of men, and the rule of law, and by relying upon non-institutional private society as the dominant weapon to both contain and hasten the extinction of homosexuality and collectivism. In fact, what contributed to making the

Founders and Lincoln so successful, and what is contributing to making contemporary conservative heterosexuals successful, is respect for America as a nation of laws and not of men, as a nation that genuinely practices the rule of law, the *Constitution* being the highest example, but *not* as a nation which respects or practices *justification* by law. Incidentally, in a nation that respects or practices the latter public sentiment has little or no use; and we need only consider homosexuals', collectivist heterosexual Democrats', and other messed-up heterosexuals' exercise of government power in contemporary America to prove that. For all of these groups, to differing extents, exercise government power without adequately reflecting non-institutional private society or without respecting the preeminent influence and position of non-institutional private society. More importantly, I believe the results of this absurd, unconstitutional public policy are always self-destructive to the public officials who supported it and, at least in most cases, to the most favored intended beneficiaries of the policy.

Thankfully, the Founders, Lincoln, and many of their contemporaries adhered to the Biblical method of improving the world including furthering mankind's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom by giving great effort to first change relationships within an existing system through public sentiment. Jesus behaved this way when he instructed to give unto Caesar the things that belong to Caesar and unto God the things that belong to God, and when He instructed his followers to love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your mind...and your neighbor as yourself. The Apostle Paul behaved this way when he instructed slaves to be obedient to their masters and for masters to treat their slaves humanely. The Founders and Lincoln behaved this way by respecting the *Constitution* and, to a lesser extent, the institution of slavery, while communicating more offensively against slavery in non-institutional private society to increase public sentiment in their direction. This explains the often criticized, apparent insensitivity of Thomas Jefferson when he wrote that slaves' "... Diffusion over a greater surface would make them individually happier, and proportionally facilitate the accomplishment of their emancipation, by dividing the burden on a greater number of coadjutors". What Jefferson meant is that the public sentiment against slavery would increasingly, negatively affect the slaveholders and slavery as a whole in every state and territory into which slavery spread. Conversely, Jefferson believed the unconstitutionality of the *Missouri Compromise* might actually help the slaveholders and sustain slavery by turning the public sentiment that was moving away from the slaveholders in the slaveholders' direction because the *Compromise* violated what was perceived even by many opponents of slavery as the slaveholders' constitutional right. Furthermore, Lincoln repeatedly provided the logic that shaped public sentiment in his favor and proved he was coming from within America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom, which was all the evidence necessary to welcome a new birth of freedom and ideologically supersede the

*Constitution* of his day. Additionally, both the Founders and Lincoln respected the *Constitution* in light of their understanding of human behavior while constantly trying to shape public sentiment in their directions to contain and extinguish slavery. Practically speaking, the Founders and their immediate successors kept the young nation together long enough for Lincoln and other conservatives in his generation to decisively shape the public sentiment which justified the Civil War and led to real freedom for millions more people in America. For with slavery the Founders had “the wolf by the ears, and “could “neither safely hold him, nor let him go. Justice” was “in one scale, and self-preservation in the other”. But in Lincoln’s case, the truth, reason, and logic that he and other normal heterosexuals established and openly communicated in non-institutional private society of 1850s America, first, exposed and destroyed incestuous homosexual public officials’ strategy to perpetuate and nationalize slavery by unconstitutionally operating America’s governments as if America were a democracy instead of a republic and, second, caused pro-slavery homosexual Democrats to selfishly, defiantly, and irrationally transgress the *Constitution* including the Founders’ intentions for America to become more normal heterosexual, especially by seceding from the Union when the homosexual Democrats’ fraudulent arguments failed to determinatively shape public sentiment. In other words, by openly communicating the truth, reason, and logic they established in non-institutional private society, Lincoln and many of his contemporaries let the wolf go, then hunted and killed it. Furthermore, the dominant justification for conservative heterosexuals’ aggression is that the incestuous homosexual Democratic Party public officials and other incestuous homosexuals did not adequately reflect established truth, reason, and logic that was openly communicated in non-institutional private society and which was relevant to slavery and related issues.

Moreover, I’m confident that Lincoln’s revolutionary Ottawa speech, with its mention of “Thus saith the Lord”, “purpose strong as death and eternity”, and “conspiracy”, spoken in front of a crowd of people and reprinted for the rest of the nation to enjoy, in addition to everything else he spoke against slavery in non-institutional private society in the preceding and succeeding years, judged and condemned slaveholders and was a big part of why pro-slavery homosexuals reacted by unconstitutionally seceding from the Union. Additionally, in his Ottawa speech, Lincoln saw darkly as through a mist when he questioned and evaluated the intentions of America’s incestuous homosexual slaveholders and responsibly brought to light what his spirit told him was in the depths, or behind the scenes, of his enemies’ and opponents’ irrational political ideology including their unconstitutional support for the spread of slavery. Practically speaking, Lincoln’s words and his open search for fundamental causes were so offensive that when Lincoln assumed the Office of the Presidency incestuous homosexual Democratic Party public officials would not face

him even though he and his contemporaries didn't understand nearly as much about human behavior as we understand today, especially the behavioral motivations of his incestuous homosexual political opponents.

Thankfully, the Biblical strategy of giving great effort to first change relationships within an existing system through public sentiment, *even if it resulted, by necessity, in temporary Union with bad-intentioned, morally inferior people*, instead of perpetrating "an act of suicide" or "of treason against the hopes of the world", remains the same powerful weapon as it was in the 18<sup>th</sup> – 20<sup>th</sup> Centuries. This is true even though homosexuals, unlike slaveholders at least most of whom I believe were homosexuals, had no "constitutional right" to exist or to spread slavery by using the *Constitution* as the fraudulent exterior for their attempt to destroy America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom or stop the completion of the next logical step forward in that tradition, and even though the Founders and Abraham Lincoln saw darkly as through a mist. For the public sentiment that Lincoln had a substantial role in shaping beginning in the first half of the 1850s in non-institutional private society made it impossible for pro-slavery homosexual Democrats to execute the laws as the pro-slavery homosexual Democrats desired including unconstitutionally spreading slavery with little or no resistance and with no serious consequences. Nevertheless, in hindsight, and contrary to conventional thought from the adoption of the *Constitution* until recently, the pro-slavery incestuous homosexual Democrats *did not have* the constitutional right to practice or to spread slavery because the pro-slavery incestuous homosexual Democrats were defrauding Americans by being closeted homosexuals and consequently hiding the influence of incestuous homosexual culture upon slavery, and were exercising "constitutional rights" with bad intentions or not in accordance with America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom. Furthermore, slavery would never have been a constitutional right if the Founders, and later Lincoln and his contemporaries, knew that the dominant proponents of slavery were incestuous homosexuals defrauding heterosexual Americans and attempting to destroy America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom before it progressed any farther. Practically speaking, even though the *Constitution* by necessity temporarily allowed the practice of slavery, the pro-slavery homosexuals' bad intentions beginning prior to the signing of the *Constitution* consequently destroyed that right without having to first amend the *Constitution*.

I particularly object to the NEW position which the avowed principle of this Nebraska law gives to slavery in the body politic [Senator Stephen Douglas's fraudulent, bad intentioned application of the principle of self-government or democracy to the *Kansas-Nebraska Act* - P.R.]. I object to it because it assumes that there CAN be MORAL RIGHT in the enslaving of one man by another. I object to it as a dangerous dalliance for a few

[free?] people---a sad evidence that, feeling prosperity we forget right---that liberty, as a principle, we have ceased to revere. I object to it because the fathers of the republic eschewed, and rejected it. The argument of "Necessity" was the only argument they ever admitted in favor of slavery; and so far, and so far only as it carried them, did they ever go. They found the institution existing among us, which they could not help; and they cast blame upon the British King for having permitted its introduction. BEFORE the constitution, they prohibited its introduction into the north-western Territory---the only country we owned, then free from it. AT the framing and adoption of the constitution, they forbore to so much as mention the word "slave" or "slavery" in the whole instrument. In the provision for the recovery of fugitives, the slave is spoken of as a "PERSON HELD TO SERVICE OR LABOR." In that prohibiting the abolition of the African slave trade for twenty years, that trade is spoken of as "The migration or importation of such persons as any of the States NOW EXISTING, shall think proper to admit," &c. These are the only provisions alluding to slavery. Thus, the thing is hid away, in the constitution, just as an afflicted man hides away a wen or a cancer, which he dares not cut out at once, lest he bleed to death; *with the promise, nevertheless, that the cutting may begin at the end of a given time* [italics added – P.R.]. Less than this our fathers COULD not do; and NOW [MORE?] they WOULD not do. Necessity drove them so far, and farther, they would not go. But this is not all. The earliest Congress, under the constitution, took the same view of slavery. They hedged and hemmed it in to the narrowest limits of necessity.

In 1794, they prohibited an out-going slave-trade---that is, the taking of slaves FROM the United States to sell.

In 1798, they prohibited the bringing of slaves from Africa, INTO the Mississippi Territory---this territory then comprising what are now the States of Mississippi and Alabama. This was TEN YEARS before they had the authority to do the same thing as to the States existing at the adoption of the constitution.

In 1800 they prohibited AMERICAN CITIZENS from trading in slaves between foreign countries---as, for instance, from Africa to Brazil.

In 1803 they passed a law in aid of one or two State laws, in restraint of the internal slave trade.

In 1807, in apparent hot haste, they passed the law, nearly a year in advance to take effect the first day of 1808---the very first day the constitution would permit---prohibiting the African slave trade by heavy pecuniary and corporal penalties.

In 1820, finding these provisions ineffectual, they declared the trade piracy, and annexed to it, the extreme penalty of death. While all this was passing in the general government, five or six of the original slave States had adopted systems of gradual emancipation; and by which the institution was rapidly becoming extinct within these limits.

Thus we see, the plain unmistakable spirit of that age, towards slavery, was hostility to the PRINCIPLE, and toleration, ONLY BY NECESSITY.

Abraham Lincoln  
October 16, 1854  
Peoria, Illinois

16. From one perspective conservative heterosexuals in contemporary America are resuming where Lincoln left off because we answered the questions that Lincoln left unanswered, and explained what Lincoln couldn't explain, in the Ottawa debate and elsewhere in the 1850s and 1860s. Furthermore, we are providing important information that Lincoln was missing but desired to know, the underlying reality he referred to, struggled for, puzzled over, and tried to describe in Ottawa and elsewhere. We're also finishing the thoughts, expanding on the ideas, and confirming the suspicions of Abraham Lincoln and many of his contemporaries.

Additionally, there is no doubt that Lincoln's communications in non-institutional private society of 1850s America were very offensive and threatening to incestuous homosexual public officials and their incestuous homosexual supporters. Similarly, Americans who now advocate for America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom, for taking the next logical step forward in that tradition, and for the rule of law as it is most powerfully expressed through America's normal heterosexual *Constitution* are also opposed most aggressively by incestuous homosexual public officials and their incestuous homosexual supporters.

Interestingly, in 1821 Thomas Jefferson expressed

".... a hope that the human mind will some day get back to the freedom it enjoyed 2000 years ago. This country, which has given to the world the example of physical liberty, owes to it that of moral emancipation also. For, as yet, it is but nominal with us. The inquisition of public opinion overwhelms in practice the freedom asserted by the laws in theory."

Obviously, Jefferson accurately believed there were substantial differences between the spirit of the laws and the cultures practiced by some Americans including in non-

institutional private society. Consequently, some people might make the mistake of thinking that the difference between law and private society or culture that Jefferson referred to is an appropriate reason for the criticism often heaped upon the *Declaration of Independence* and *Constitution* as being examples of conservative heterosexual Christian *idealism*, as if the founding documents do not reflect enough of what is true in relationships among people in non-institutional private society and in normal human behavior generally, especially for women, homosexuals, and racial and ethnic minorities. Even worse, homosexuals have often made a similar argument as a reason why heterosexuals should tolerate homosexual culture and allow homosexual culture into their interpretations of the existing *Constitution*.

However, these criticisms are absolutely wrong. For any significant difference that exists between non-institutional private society and public policy created at least predominantly by normal heterosexuals is a result of not knowing enough about human behavior but does not necessarily indicate that the public policy is bad, idealistic, or destructive. In fact, the Founders, Abraham Lincoln, and many of their contemporaries were absolutely correct in recreating government and relationships even though they didn't have important information about the behavioral causes of their enemies' and opponents' irrational, bad-intentioned political ideology and resulting public policy. The dominant reason is that their enemies conflicted with established truth, reason, and logic in non-institutional private society which was relevant to the issues. Furthermore, it's wrong to criticize the Founders' and Lincoln's public policies as idealistic or selfish when in fact those policies substantially furthered both America's tradition of real freedom and real freedom throughout the rest of the world.

17. Interestingly, the fact that the Founders' opinions on government, public policy, and the rule of law are so prolific and popularly discussed is one of the dominant reasons why people exaggerate the Founders' opinions on the importance and influence of government. In other words, based upon a misunderstanding of America's Founders, some people wrongly believe America's government including the legal system is the most important component of America's identity and tradition of real freedom, instead of non-institutional private society. However, despite the fact that the Founders aimed to create the most effective government for America, it must be remembered that even the Founders' communications were a less offensive version of what was communicated in non-institutional private society of their day. Even the Founders were obligated to adequately reflect non-institutional private society in creating a new, normal heterosexual government. More importantly, because they were normal heterosexuals they enthusiastically fulfilled their obligation, and the result was a big step forward in mankind's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom dating back

thousands of years. In reality, as important as the Founders' contributions to government were, the Founders in fact codified normal heterosexuality and reflected normal heterosexuality as it was more powerfully expressed in non-institutional private society.

Finally, homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals frequently praise the unconstitutional exercise of government power by judiciaries, legislatures, executives, and bureaucracies especially for furthering the homosexual and collectivist agendas, and government's and all other institutions' roles in "improving" America. Interestingly, I'm reminded of Lincoln's advocacy for established truth, reason, and logic in non-institutional private society as expressed in the *Declaration of Independence*, which he utilized to counter incestuous homosexual slaveholders' bad intentioned, fraudulent praise of institutional power and self-government or democracy as the reason why the *Kansas-Nebraska Act* furthered America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including the *Constitution*. Consider the following:

Let no one be deceived. The spirit of seventy-six and the spirit of Nebraska [Senator Stephen Douglas's fraudulent, bad intentioned application of the principle of self-government or democracy in his promotion of the *Kansas-Nebraska Act* – P.R.], are utter antagonisms; and the former is being rapidly displaced by the latter.

Fellow countrymen---Americans south, as well as north, shall we make no effort to arrest this? Already the liberal party throughout the world, express the apprehension "that the one retrograde institution in America, is undermining the principles of progress, and fatally violating the noblest political system the world ever saw." This is not the taunt of enemies, but the warning of friends. Is it quite safe to disregard it---to despise it? Is there no danger to liberty itself, in discarding the earliest practice, and first precept of our ancient faith? In our greedy chase to make profit of the negro, let us beware, lest we "cancel and tear to pieces" even the white man's charter of freedom.

Our republican robe is soiled, and trailed in the dust. Let us repurify it. Let us turn and wash it white, in the spirit, if not the blood, of the Revolution. Let us turn slavery from its claims of "moral right," back upon its existing legal rights, and its arguments of "necessity." Let us return it to the position our fathers gave it; and there let it rest in peace. Let us re-adopt the Declaration of Independence, and with it, the practices, and policy, which harmonize with it. Let north and south---let all Americans---

let all lovers of liberty everywhere---join in the great and good work. If we do this, we shall not only have saved the Union; but we shall have so saved it, as to make, and to keep it, forever worthy of the saving. We shall have so saved it, that the succeeding millions of free happy people, the world over, shall rise up, and call us blessed, to the latest generations.

But the principle of the Nebraska bill abolished slavery in several of the old States [that is, Senator Stephen Douglas's fraudulent, bad intentioned application of the principle of self-government or democracy in his promotion of the *Kansas-Nebraska Act*, which Douglas claimed was responsible for abolishing slavery in some of the states – P.R.]. Well, it is true that several of the old States, in the last quarter of the last century, did adopt systems of gradual emancipation, by which the institution has finally become extinct within their limits; but it MAY or MAY NOT be true that the principle of the Nebraska bill [self-government or democracy – P.R.] was the cause that led to the adoption of these measures. It is now more than fifty years, since the last of these States adopted its system of emancipation. If Nebraska bill is the real author of these benevolent works, it is rather deplorable, that he has, for so long a time, ceased working all together. Is there not some reason to suspect that it was the principle of the REVOLUTION, and not the principle of Nebraska bill, that led to emancipation in these old States? Leave it to the people of those old emancipating States, and I am quite sure they will decide, that neither that, nor any other good thing, ever did, or ever will come of Nebraska bill.

Abraham Lincoln  
October 16, 1854  
Peoria, Illinois

I suppose that Judge Douglas will claim in a little while, that he is the inventor of the idea that the people should govern themselves: [cheers and laughter]; that nobody ever thought of such a thing until he brought it forward. We do remember, that in that old Declaration of Independence, it is said that "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." There is the origin of Popular Sovereignty. [Loud

applause]. Who, then, shall come in at this day and claim that he invented it. [Laughter and applause.]

Abraham Lincoln  
Chicago, Illinois  
July 10, 1858

18. America progressed in a very normal heterosexual direction from the time the Europeans left their home countries for the New World until King George III and his supporters broke the law by forcing taxation without representation upon the colonists. Furthermore, after the God-fearing, conservative heterosexual colonists conquered the incestuous homosexual king and his supporters America progressed in a very normal heterosexual direction until the passage of the *Kansas-Nebraska Act* which was unconstitutional partly because it was fraudulent and bad intentioned since its origin was incestuous homosexual culture. Afterwards, incestuous homosexuals and their supporters more importantly transgressed America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including the *Constitution* by seceding from the Union.

As expected, the dominant cause of secession was Lincoln's and other normal heterosexuals' communications in non-institutional private society beginning around the time of the passage of the *Kansas-Nebraska Act*, which resulted in incestuous homosexuals' fear of a Lincoln presidency. Additionally, I believe progressing capitalism including both widespread monetary prosperity for conservative heterosexuals and the decline of slavery is the dominant cause of the *Kansas-Nebraska Act*.

19. According to some people America's Founders intentionally avoided offending religious Americans by *pretending* America's founding including victory in the Revolutionary War was supernatural, *not* because the Founders truly believed the Almighty played a direct role in America's founding. In reality, however, the exact opposite of the Founders is true. For the Founders were religious people who directly experienced the supernatural because they willingly and enthusiastically accepted the leadership positions the Almighty created for them.

Additionally, the Founders did not want religion to have a default status or position in government. That explains their support for the *Establishment Clause* of the *Constitution* and, to differing extents, their belief in the "wall of separation" between church and state, both of which are merely different ways of preventing harmful and unnecessary religious collectivism and culture *that normal heterosexuals and all or virtually all other conservative heterosexuals in America do not practice*. Therefore, the *Establishment Clause*, like every other part of the *Constitution*, is pro-normal heterosexuality, another

example of normal heterosexuality, and must be interpreted and applied according to normal heterosexual culture. Incidentally, the reasoning behind the *Establishment Clause* and the “wall of separation” between church and state also applies to homosexual collectivism and culture and to every other collectivism or culture *except normal heterosexual culture*. For the Founders were normal heterosexuals, America’s founding documents are codifications of normal heterosexuality, and all contemporary normal heterosexual culture continues to run with the *Constitution*.

Also, a contemporary example of what the Founders feared would happen if religion were given a default status or position in government is how homosexual public officials giving homosexual culture a default status or position in government and in other institutions in America contributed to homosexuality’s and collectivism’s ongoing extinctions and destroyed the credibility of homosexual institutional officials. As a result, by not giving religion a default status or position in government, I believe the Founders confirmed that *government is secondary* to non-institutional private society. The dominant reason is that they did not attempt to force belief in the Almighty or recognition of the Almighty upon their fellow citizens through public policy even though they knew the Almighty was responsible for America’s Founding and that the Almighty’s influence upon people in non-institutional private society is the dominant force in furthering America’s normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including recreating for the better government’s form and function. Instead, the Founders made *good intentions* the standard for being qualified to exercise government power, *not* practicing a *Bible* religion, any other religion, or any culture *except normal heterosexual culture*. Furthermore, this in no way demeans religion because government is secondary to non-institutional private society, and the *Declaration of Independence*, the *Constitution*, and so much more of the Founders’ political beliefs and actions confirm that fact. For example, Thomas Jefferson’s strong faith in the power of public sentiment in non-institutional private society to undermine and destroy slavery, in contrast to his fear of the pro-slavery consequences of overreaching public policy including the *Missouri Compromise*, and Lincoln’s belief that public sentiment is everything. Moreover, making “good intentions” the standard means requiring government power to be exercised as a normal heterosexual would exercise it or according to normal heterosexual culture *which obviously includes belief in a Creator and Biblical morality*.

Similarly, government speech will probably always or almost always be less religious and specific than non-institutional speech. The major reasons are that government and other institutions are secondary to non-institutional life, and because it’s best to include as many good-intentioned people as possible on the institutional level, not just those who share the same religion or holy text. In fact, normal heterosexual institutional speech or policy is rightfully aimed at gathering all good-intentioned people, that is, people who are capitalists, practice good moral standards,

and believe in a Creator. Therefore, to achieve that goal we exclude certain spiritual or supernatural principles of our religions from public policy. Nevertheless, that in no way makes government or any other institution superior to those principles or to non-institutional private society. In fact, excluding certain principles of our religion or personal culture confirms government's secondary or lesser role by limiting the information available to constitute public policy, information which in non-institutional private society has an important or determinative role in forming the truth, reason, and logic which directs where public officials must lead public policy although in a less offensive or aggressive version than in non-institutional private society. More importantly, in America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom, when public officials fail to follow those directions closely enough, government is recreated *for the benefit of God-fearing conservative heterosexuals*, and corrupt government officials and their supporters are strongly punished.

20. Like the *Establishment Clause*, the Electoral College is also pro-normal heterosexuality and another example of normal heterosexual culture. Thus, many contemporary Democrats' complaints that the Electoral College is "undemocratic" are nonsense, and reveal their lack of understanding of America's normal heterosexual *Constitution*. Apparently, the Democrats are troubled that the Electoral College lessened the importance of America's largest population centers in the 2016 elections, which are obviously collectivist and pro-homosexual, in favor of the rest of America that more adequately reflects established truth, reason, and logic in non-institutional private society. Stated differently, the Electoral College is furthering America's true identity as a republic, *not* a democracy, which is exactly what the Electoral College is supposed to achieve.

Incidentally, the Democrats' unpatriotic, ill-informed behaviors are a reminder that it's probably more accurate to call the Democratic and Republican parties the Democracies and the Republics. For Democrats are wrongly and fraudulently interpreting the *Constitution* as if America is a democracy, just like the incestuous homosexual Democrats wrongly and fraudulently interpreted the *Constitution* in the 1850s especially by passing the *Kansas-Nebraska Act*. Conversely, Republicans are interpreting the *Constitution* according to America's true identity as a republic, just like Abraham Lincoln and many of his contemporaries interpreted it during the 1850s.

Similarly, Checks and Balances, or equal branches of government, furthers America's true identity as a republic instead of a democracy provided it is practiced according to normal heterosexual culture as the *Constitution* requires. Thankfully, one example of how Checks and Balances is supposed to work, *including in one of the most important periods in America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom*, is provided in Lincoln's response to the *Dred Scott* decision:

I have expressed heretofore, and I now repeat, my opposition to the Dred Scott Decision, but I should be allowed to state the nature of that opposition, and I ask your indulgence while I do so. What is fairly implied by the term Judge Douglas has used 'resistance to the Decision?' I do not resist it. If I wanted to take Dred Scott from his master, I would be interfering with property, and that terrible difficulty that Judge Douglas speaks of, of interfering with property, would arise. But I am doing no such thing as that, but all that I am doing is refusing to obey it as a political rule. If I were in Congress, and a vote should come up on a question whether slavery should be prohibited in a new territory, in spite of the Dred Scott decision, I would vote that it should [Applause; 'good for you;' 'we hope to see it;' 'that's right.']

Abraham Lincoln  
Chicago, IL  
July 10, 1858

21. Making unwarranted or irrelevant personal attacks on a political opponent is often an indication that the person making the attack doesn't have truth or reason on his or her side. For example, when a Democratic Party proposal in the U.S. House of Representatives to ban taxpayer money for federal contractors who discriminate against GLBT workers was defeated in May 2016, the incestuous homosexual Democratic Party representatives shouted "shame, shame, shame", and called the Republican Party representatives "bigots and haters" and compared them to the people who stood "...on the wrong side of the march toward Selma, or stand in the schoolhouse door when someone was trying to get an equal education". However, the Democratic Party representatives didn't mention *that the racist people they referred to were all or almost all incestuous homosexuals*. Furthermore, I believe the incestuous homosexual Democrats' proposal and reactions were caused by the worsening condition of incestuous homosexuals in America, which increased with the exposure of incestuous homosexuality that began in non-institutional private society. Also, these unpatriotic behaviors by incestuous homosexual Democrats are additional examples of institutional officials giving or attempting to give homosexuals rights or privileges *after* non-institutional private society irreversibly set homosexuality on the path to ultimate extinction.

Finally, these unpatriotic, incestuous homosexual Democrat public officials remind me of the incestuous homosexual Democrat public officials who've warned conservative heterosexual public officials to "stay out of the American peoples'

bedrooms". Sadly, this fraudulent, bad-intentioned warning disrespects the fact that incestuous sex between a minor and an adult of different generations, other sexual assaults of children, and child pornography happen in bedrooms. More importantly, at least almost all of these horrible crimes are perpetrated by incestuous homosexuals, the same kind of people giving the fraudulent warning.

22. The defiant Democratic Party leadership and its unconstitutional platform aren't adequately reflecting non-institutional private society; that is, they're not reflecting the next logical step forward for America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom based on the truth, reason, and logic radiating from non-institutional private society. Thankfully, the next logical step forward for America's tradition of real freedom includes public policy that reflects the path to ultimate extinction for both homosexuality and collectivism. In contrast, the defiant Democratic Party leadership and its unconstitutional platform reflect what happens to, and how bad it is for, both homosexuals and heterosexuals who defy America's tradition of real freedom. Stated differently, the Democratic Party reflects what happens to people who don't put America first or who elevate their selfishness, bad attitude, jealousy, self-pity, and personal culture *which is not normal heterosexual culture* above America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including the *Constitution*.

Practically speaking, the entire Democratic Party, especially the leadership, has already seceded from America and should be considered in rebellion to America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including the *Constitution*. Furthermore, unlike the pro-slavery Democratic Party leaders, contemporary Democratic Party leaders are participating in a mild form of secession. Specifically, instead of unconstitutionally withdrawing from the Union and claiming territory as their own, contemporary Democratic Party leaders continue to fraudulently transact business without following the *Constitution* including adequately reflecting non-institutional private society. For Democrats don't want to further America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom, and cannot achieve their most important political, economic, and social goals while obeying the *Constitution*. Therefore, these milder, lukewarm Democrats are just as much illegals as the people who've illegally crossed the Mexico border into the United States.

23. I believe all Democrats, especially the Democratic Party leadership, already seceded from America and continue to rebel against America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including the *Constitution*. For Democrats are attempting to build upon normal heterosexuals' foundation with statutes, decisions, and policies that are not coming from within America's tradition of real freedom and will not further that tradition, all without first amending the *Constitution*. Sadly, there is no resurrection

for America in the Democratic Party; for the walking dead who comprise its leadership and supporters offer no hope for furthering America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom or of securing the blessings of liberty to current and future generations of Americans.

24. Democratic Party leaders and other incestuous homosexual public officials in America are "looping"; that is, they're making the same behavioral and political mistakes that incestuous homosexual public officials in earlier centuries made in similar circumstances. Furthermore, I believe the dominant reason why *almost all* incestuous homosexual public officials are looping is the negative effects of their participation in sexual assault and other abuse of minors.

Interestingly, "looping" provides more evidence that human nature is fixed and predictable, and that real freedom is the same for all good-intentioned people. For example, once incestuous homosexual culture was exposed and Americans learned that all remaining *transcestites* were incestuous homosexuals, President Obama and other incestuous homosexual public officials aggressively pushed *transcestite* restroom privileges and other pro-*transcestite* policy like never before. Also, after the success of conservatives in the 2000 federal elections and of the tax cuts sponsored by President George W. Bush, homosexuals responded with the Mortgage Crisis and failed to implement capitalistic public policy that would have prevented more than a small recession, which consequently caused the Great Recession. Similarly, incestuous homosexual public officials in the 1850s reacted to both progressing capitalism, including the decline of slavery and widespread monetary prosperity, and outspoken anti-slavery heterosexuals in non-institutional private society, first, with the *Kansas-Nebraska Act* which was an unconstitutional, ideologically-driven push to transform America from a republic into a democracy, and second, with secession. Furthermore, I'm confident that incestuous homosexual King George III and his incestuous homosexual supporters' illegal, irrational, and disrespectful behaviors towards the colonists were in reaction to the normal heterosexual progression of the Colonies including a strong capitalistic spirit.

Incidentally, incestuous homosexual public officials' reactions to the passage and success of the tax cuts sponsored by President Reagan, the decline and fall of communism, and the forward progress of conservative heterosexuality generally, explain at least much of the governmental fraud and corruption, and the retreat from conservative heterosexuality including capitalism and patriotism, in the 1980s and 1990s. However, the severity of the incestuous homosexual public officials' reactions were substantially less than in other periods in American history.

25. Incestuous homosexual King George III's irrational, illegal, and disrespectful behaviors are indicative of the Colonies becoming both far more important to and far more prosperous for the conservative heterosexual colonists than the King and his supporters wanted the Colonies to be. Interestingly, the King's behaviors remind me of

incestuous homosexual Democrats reacting to the Republican Party, Abraham Lincoln, capitalism, and anti-slavery public sentiment throughout the 1850s and after the 1860 elections with the *Kansas-Nebraska Act* and eventually secession;

incestuous homosexual Democrats of last decade reacting to the passage and success of the tax cuts sponsored by President George W. Bush with irrational, absurd, ineffective, and unconstitutional public policy that caused the Great Recession; and

contemporary incestuous homosexual Democratic Party leaders and other incestuous homosexual public officials reacting to the worsening condition of homosexuals in America with homosexual rights laws and other anti-capitalist public policy which are major causes of America's current civil, civil war.

26. America is now headed in the same direction it was heading shortly before both the Revolutionary and Civil Wars, especially in the interaction between much of government on one side and established truth, reason, and logic in non-institutional private society, along with dominant public sentiment, on the other. Nonetheless, incestuous homosexual public officials absurdly and irrationally argue that their interpretations of the *Constitution* are correct, and that collectivism is either a modern furtherance of or just cause compatible with America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including the *Constitution*. Obviously, they're making no sense because homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals are occupying the same positions as the bad guys and losers in both the Revolutionary and Civil Wars who are the reasons why America's governments were recreated *for the benefit of God-fearing, conservative heterosexuals*. Stated differently, homosexuals are arguing that even though Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and the rest of the Founders that substantially contributed to the *Declaration of Independence* or *Constitution* were normal heterosexuals, the documents may be interpreted by homosexuals according to homosexual culture, even *incestuous* homosexual culture, and the result will be consistent with America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including the *Constitution* even though such an interpretation would destroy America's tradition of real freedom, all without having to first amend the *Constitution*. This is obviously illogical primarily because both homosexual and collectivist heterosexual cultures cannot further America's normal

heterosexual tradition of real freedom, and in fact lessen America's real freedom when they have a significant influence in public policy. Consequently, homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals must first amend the *Constitution* to give homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals the authority to interpret it according to homosexual culture or collectivist heterosexual culture.

Nevertheless, America's normal heterosexual *Constitution* may be interpreted and applied by homosexuals, or members of non-*Bible* religions, or people born in foreign nations; however, everyone must interpret and apply the *Constitution* according to normal heterosexual culture. For just as Christians ask themselves "what would Jesus do?", good-intentioned Americans interpreting the *Constitution* must ask themselves "what would a normal heterosexual do?" In fact, to interpret the *Constitution* otherwise first requires an amendment.

27. The Moon is not made of cheese. Consequently, there's no constitutional right to teach otherwise or to enact laws, statutes, and decisions that reflect otherwise.

Why do I mention this?

The dominant reason is that incestuous homosexual public officials are staying in their sex; that is, their objectives are aimed to please homosexuals who share the same sexual immorality and live by the same cultures, *not* to further America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including the *Constitution*. Furthermore, that explains some of the most irrational, absurd "reasoning" ever offered by America's public officials on many important issues including homosexual rights, abortion, taxation, immigration, race relations, the environment, and gun control. Interestingly, contemporary incestuous homosexual public officials' belief that the Moon *is* made of cheese, that is, their frequent contradictions of both America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including the *Constitution* and of easily observable human behavior, reminds me of incestuous homosexual public officials in Lincoln's day and Lincoln's criticisms of them. Consider the following quote from Lincoln's speech in Peoria, Illinois, on October 16, 1854:

A word now as to the Judge's desperate assumption that the compromises of '50 had no connection with one another; that Illinois came into the Union as a slave state, and some other similar ones. This is no other than a bold denial of the history of the country. If we do not know that the Compromises of '50 were dependent on each other; if we do not know that Illinois came into the Union as a free state---we do not know any thing. If we do not know these things, we do not know that we ever had a revolutionary war, or such a chief as Washington. To deny these things is to deny our national axioms, or dogmas, at least; *and it puts an end to all*

*argument* [italics added – P.R.]. If a man will stand up and assert, and repeat, and re-assert, that two and two do not make four, I know nothing in the power of argument that can stop him. I think I can answer the Judge so long as he sticks to the premises; but when he flies from them, I can not work an argument into the consistency of a maternal gag, and actually close his mouth with it. In such a case I can only commend him to the seventy thousand answers just in from Pennsylvania, Ohio and Indiana.

Sadly, incestuous homosexual public officials reveal their belief that the Moon is made of cheese by selfishly, irrationally, and insanely defying established truth, reason, and logic in non-institutional private society. That is why, like the Sadducees of old, the Democratic Party is having less influence every year that passes, and is leaving conservatism as the only significant political influence in America.

28. Choosing a Supreme Court justice or President or Congressperson should never be as important as it is today. The dominant reason is that all of America's public officials are constitutionally obligated to adequately reflect non-institutional private society, and to interpret and apply the *Constitution* according to normal heterosexual culture regardless of their political party affiliation or political ideology. Conversely, public officials are never supposed to follow any other culture, or selfishly favor their own kind over normal heterosexuals, as they execute their official duties. In fact, government of the people, by the people, and for the people is government which adequately reflects what the people have established with good intentions in non-institutional private society, *not democracy*. Furthermore, any other legitimate government policy will first require a constitutional amendment to implement but will not further America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including securing the blessings of liberty to ourselves and succeeding generations of Americans.

Incidentally, not even voting and winning elections are as important as adequately reflecting non-institutional private society. For even if only one percent or less of the American people voted, public officials would still be obligated to adequately reflect established truth, reason, and logic in non-institutional private society regardless of whether the one percent or less of the people who voted support it. Practically speaking, voting is predominantly for determining who deserves the most influence in working out the lesser issues in public policy. Conversely, voting is *not* for determining who has the right to fabricate reality, or to disregard the truth, reason, and logic emanating from non-institutional private society, or to perpetuate fake identities, or to take government where their sexual immorality or other personal problem or culture which is not normal heterosexual culture demands in spite of what is true, reasonable, and logical in non-institutional private society.

I suppose that Judge Douglas will claim in a little while, that he is the inventor of the idea that the people should govern themselves: [cheers and laughter]; that nobody ever thought of such a thing until he brought it forward. We do remember, that in that old Declaration of Independence, it is said that "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." *There is the origin of Popular Sovereignty.* [Loud applause][italics added; another example of normal heterosexual culture which preceded the *Constitution* continuing to run with the *Constitution* – P.R.]. Who, then, shall come in at this day and claim that he invented it. [Laughter and applause.]

Abraham Lincoln  
Chicago, Illinois  
July 10, 1858

29. Many conservative heterosexuals have for decades wanted to amend the *Constitution* but they haven't had enough support to achieve that goal. Nonetheless, these conservatives haven't resorted to unconstitutional "solutions" to achieve their goals as homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals have with homosexual rights laws, gun control, amnesty for millions of illegal aliens, abortion, and anti-capitalist policies. Thankfully, America's conservative heterosexual public officials are not behaving selfishly, unconstitutionally or irrationally. For they understand their function to respect the preeminent influence and position of non-institutional private society, unlike the institutional preeminence crowd led by incestuous homosexuals, and supported by tens of millions of messed-up collectivist heterosexuals, who unconstitutionally attempt to operate America as a democracy instead of as a republic.

30. Additionally, one of the biggest mistakes that both homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals made is that they believed exercising government power to achieve collectivist objectives is the most important component of moving America in their directions, instead of first either establishing themselves with good intentions in non-institutional private society or amending the *Constitution*. Practically speaking, they defied America's normal heterosexual *Constitution* by wrongly behaving as if America is a democracy instead of a republic. Furthermore, homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals believed that securing legal rights or other public policy "victories" would prove they established themselves in America, derailed conservatives' most important political and economic practices, and meaningfully altered the course of

America's identity and destiny in a pro-collectivist direction. Nevertheless, the result is that while incestuous homosexuals have been piling-up at the bottom of society like sediment, and homosexual recruiting apart from their own minor children and other close minor blood relatives whose parents are homosexuals has gone from bad to non-existent, homosexual rights laws and privileges in government and in other institutions have been increasing.

More importantly, many homosexuals believed that with homosexual rights laws homosexuals achieved important objectives. However, homosexuals apparently didn't comprehend that America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom is the origin of the *Declaration of Independence*, the Revolutionary War, the *Articles of Confederation*, the *Constitution* including the *Bill of Rights*, the Civil War, the *Emancipation Proclamation*, the XIII Amendment which ended slavery, the XIV Amendment, and everything else that is truly good in America. Thus, it's no surprise that as homosexual rights laws and privileges increase homosexuals are simultaneously being defeated time and time again in non-institutional private society because they cannot establish themselves therein with homosexual culture according to America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom.

31. America's public policy must not provide any rights for homosexuals beyond humane treatment. The dominant reasons are that homosexuals have not and cannot establish themselves with good intentions in non-institutional private society or achieve the support necessary to amend the *Constitution* for anything beyond humane treatment. In fact, homosexuals fail to establish themselves in non-institutional private society because heterosexuals are intolerant of homosexual culture and respond to it in ways that worsen the condition of homosexuals. More importantly, heterosexuals are not breaking the law or violating America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom as they defeat homosexuals' attempts to establish themselves in non-institutional private society. In contrast, homosexuals in past centuries broke the law *and* violated America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom by denying racial minorities and women their rightful places in both the public and private realms.

Now, my friends, I wish you to attend for a little while to one or two other things in that Springfield speech [Springfield, Illinois, June 16, 1858 – P.R.]. My main object was to show, so far as my humble ability was capable of showing to the people of this country, what I believed was the truth—that there was a *tendency*, if not a conspiracy among those who have engineered this slavery question for the last four or five years, to make slavery perpetual and universal in this nation. Having made that speech principally for that object, after arranging the evidences that I thought tended to prove my proposition, I concluded with this bit of comment:

"We cannot absolutely know that these exact adaptations are the result of preconcert, but when we see a lot of framed timbers, different portions of which we know have been gotten out at different times and places, and by different workmen-Stephen, Franklin, Roger and James, for instance-and when we see these timbers joined together, and see they exactly make the frame of a house or a mill, all the tenons and mortices exactly fitting, and all the lengths and proportions of the different pieces exactly adapted to their respective places, and not a piece too many or too few -not omitting even the scaffolding-or if a single piece be lacking, we see the place in the frame exactly fitted and prepared yet to bring such piece in-in such a case we feel it impossible not to believe that Stephen and Franklin, and Roger and James, all understood one another from the beginning, and all worked upon a common plan or draft drawn before the first blow was struck." [Great cheers.]

Abraham Lincoln  
August 21, 1858  
Ottawa, Illinois  
First Lincoln-Douglas Debate

## V. CONCLUSION

America remains a great nation because non-institutional private society controls America and is once again leading it through the next logical step forward in its normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom. However, a substantial part of government and of all other institutions are far from great and operating unconstitutionally because the institutions are not adequately reflecting *non-institutional* private society. The *dominant* reason is the influence of incestuous homosexuals within the institutions, who are too corrupt, incompetent, and morally inferior to further America's tradition of real freedom, and who are now deservedly chained to the historical record as universally evil while they undergo homosexuality's ultimate extinction from the human race.

Additionally, the negative effects of incestuous homosexual culture including, for at least *almost all* incestuous homosexual public officials, past participation in sexual assault and other abuse of minors, gave birth to a purpose as strong as death and eternity:

Destroy America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom by unconstitutionally exercising government power to subject America to their evil, collectivist culture.

Obviously, incestuous homosexual public officials are defying their constitutional obligation to adequately reflect established truth, reason, and logic in non-institutional private society. Consequently, non-institutional private society's purpose to begin both recreating government and punishing the evildoers is once again the life of the party. Interestingly, I'm reminded of Queen Esther replacing Queen Vashti because Vashti defied the King's command to display her beauty at the King's celebration. Thankfully, this replacement led to the destruction of those who aimed to perpetrate fraud through the King and illegally exterminate the Jews from the kingdom. Furthermore, this victory began with the efforts of Mordecai in non-institutional private society, the results of which comprised Queen Esther's bold, unorthodox, and potentially deadly appearance before the King.

Therefore, like Queen Esther, America's conservative heterosexual public officials must adequately reflect non-institutional private society. In particular, *incestuous* homosexual public officials should be strongly punished for intentionally elevating their defiant, evil, collectivist culture above the *Constitution* and the rest of America's tradition of real freedom, much like Haman illegally elevated his defiant, evil family culture above the King and the good of the kingdom. Incidentally, Haman, his ten sons, hundreds of other government officials, and tens of thousands of people in private society were legally, deservingly, and with good intentions executed.

Finally, there is nothing more important for America's public officials to do than to create public policy which adequately reflects established truth, reason, and logic in non-institutional private society. Furthermore, adequately reflecting non-institutional private society also reflects the *Bible*. For in the *Scriptures* the prophets are the most powerful, important, and influential people, *not* institutional officials.

The right of the people of Kansas and Nebraska to make themselves *superior* in political power and privilege to the individual citizens of the Free States [specifically, the *Kansas-Nebraska Act* and Senator Stephen Douglas's fraudulent, bad intentioned application of the principle of self-government or democracy – P.R.], was thus effectually riddled, exposed and exploded by Mr. Lincoln, and the hearty and long continued plaudits of his great audience of freemen, showed how truly he had touched chords of their hearts.

Thus perished every vestige of excuse, offered by Mr. Douglas for the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. The act [the *Kansas-Nebraska Act* – P.R.] remained before Mr. L., Judge Douglas, and the audience, a naked humbug, a foul wrong, perpetrated under false pretences, sustained by weak inventions and afterthoughts, justified by the most miserable sophistries, and under the cloak of the right of the people of the territories to decide the slavery question for themselves, seeking to degrade the citizens of the Free States into mere atoms or fractions of American citizens, whose "rights" in the premises

are, to be lorded over by a population outvoting them (through their negroes,) and to kiss the hand that thus humiliated them.

We cannot follow Mr. Lincoln further to-day. His remarks about Union saving were sound and patriotic, and his appeal to the Southern States for moderation and forbearance, fraternal and eloquent. He did not set so much store on the restoration of the Missouri Compromise by act of legislation, as he did on the immediate and effectual restoration of it by popular sentiment [that is, by following normal heterosexual culture, or established truth, reason, and logic in non-institutional private society, which runs with the *Constitution* – P.R.]. This last was possible. Let the decided demonstration of the Free States secure it. That being done, the Union would again be safe and the people happy.

Summary of Abraham Lincoln's Speech  
On October 4, 1854, in Springfield, Illinois,  
Given In the *Illinois Journal* of October 5, 1854

## APPENDIX

### A1. CONSERVATIVES, CAPITALISM, AND MONEY

1. America is much more than capitalism, or picking oneself up by one's bootstraps, or hard work, or good laws, or the rule of law, or federalism, or checks and balances, or the Bill of Rights, or voting, or any combination of these components. Nonetheless, America is almost entirely the result of conservative heterosexuals who fought against homosexuality and prevailed.

2. The *Declaration of Independence* achieved tremendous credibility, popularity, and influence not because it was well-written but because it judged and condemned defiant people, which we know is a necessary component of America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom. Additionally, the *Declaration of Independence* is offensive, aggressive, explicit, religious, mystical, moral, capitalistic, supernatural, warlike, and deadly. Even better, it doesn't include trash talking or information that the Founders were not confident was true or reasonable, which also makes it a normal heterosexual document.

3. Homosexuals fatally misjudged conservative heterosexuality in many areas of life. For example, it's very difficult to get conservative heterosexuals to take to the

streets in large numbers. As a result, many homosexuals believed that conservative heterosexuals in general weren't energetic, organized or intelligent enough to stand up for conservatism by publicly demonstrating in large numbers for important issues.

Not surprisingly, however, these homosexuals were wrong. For if conservative heterosexuals believe conservative heterosexuals are winning or will prevail, or do not believe that taking to the streets will actually make a significant difference in the outcomes of issues and events, then it will be impossible to get more than a small number of conservative heterosexuals to take to the streets. Conversely, homosexuals publicly demonstrate in larger numbers *to make it appear as if* homosexuals are united in an important, genuine cause or that the demonstrating homosexuals represent a substantial percentage of Americans, either of which is supposed to demoralize conservative heterosexuals. Also, many homosexuals have nothing better to do than to take to the streets to try to get something going on for themselves. Interestingly, homosexuals hope this kind of participation will bring homosexuals attention and criticism from heterosexuals and consequently help homosexuals locate the right heterosexuals to defy and antagonize. Furthermore, homosexuals want *to make it look like* homosexuals understand the importance of public demonstrations or of capitalizing on the First Amendment's right to petition and peaceably assemble, even though homosexuals don't have a constitutional right to demonstrate in most if not all occasions since the identities homosexuals assume while demonstrating, and the arguments on the issues and events homosexuals are demonstrating about, are fraudulent. As expected, virtually all conservative heterosexuals will not behave similarly because they believe these public spectacles are unnecessary.

4. Normal heterosexuals practice humane, professional, and Good Samaritan behaviors towards all people, regardless of how much we detest our enemies and opponents or how corrupt, criminal, and unpatriotic those enemies and opponents truly are. Nevertheless, these normal heterosexual behaviors do not constitute tolerance of homosexuality or of collectivism. Additionally, when normal heterosexuals practice these behaviors they are furthering America's tradition of real freedom.

5. Many people question conservative heterosexuals' political leadership and ideology because they think collectivists have achieved many important legislative and other political "victories" and, in particular, because homosexual rights laws are increasing. Some of these critics believe that conservative heterosexual public officials must either fight fire with fire, that is, exercise government power more "liberally" even if they're not truly *solving* problems and adhering to conservatism, or risk losing relevancy in contemporary America. In reality, however, the exact opposite is true of conservative heterosexuals and of conservatism in general.

Incidentally, I'm reminded of the story of the two women in *1 Kings* whose competing intentions for the same baby would result in either a gruesome death or life for the baby. In fact, I believe this "splitting of the baby" account accurately reflects how differently homosexuals and conservative heterosexuals in America behave with respect to America's freedom and future. For homosexuals are like the woman who will allow the baby to be split in half if she doesn't achieve total possession or control of it, the woman whose actions and ideology have "no relish of salvation". Conversely, conservative heterosexuals focus on furthering America's tradition of real freedom, and do not irrationally or irresponsibly react to the temporary unconstitutional influence of both homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals upon real freedom. The dominant reason is that conservative heterosexuals do not believe that homosexuals will win the battle for America's real freedom or, like the bad-intentioned woman in *1 Kings* who is willing to destroy the baby, ruin the further development of America's real freedom with their temporary negative influence or caretaking.

Additionally, many people have wrongly accused conservative heterosexuals of falling asleep within and without government and other institutions, which consequently allowed ownership and control of America's freedom and future to be stolen by both homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals and replaced with a dead or lifeless freedom and future. As expected, this misperception is based upon homosexuals' and collectivist heterosexuals' lack of understanding of America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom, and of human behavior especially as it is expressed in institutional versus non-institutional environments.

Therefore, in their struggle for control of America's freedom and future, homosexuals and conservative heterosexuals are much like the two women in *1 Kings* fighting over the same baby.

6. Non-institutional private society is the head of America; it's also the frontline of contemporary conservative heterosexuals' struggle against collectivist threats to real freedom. Furthermore, this is the same struggle against collectivist threats to real freedom that existed throughout the Civil Rights Era, in pre-WWII 20<sup>th</sup> Century, in post-Civil War 19<sup>th</sup> Century, during the Civil War and in the 1850s, in the Revolutionary Era, and which was fought by the Europeans who bravely and wisely chose to leave Europe for the New World so they could continue to genuinely practice their genuine religion.

Thankfully, normal heterosexuals and conservatism in general are winning, and will ultimately win, the contemporary struggle for America's identity. Much like the Pharisees went on to dominate Judaism and its development after the decline and fall of the Sadducees, the Republican Party or real conservatism will rule America's governmental, and other institutional, development after the decline and fall of homosexuality, collectivism, and the Democratic Party, which are now progressing at a

moderate pace. Practically speaking, there's hope in the Republican Party because its platform still includes resurrection for America.

7. Nothing is wrong if truth leads to the extinction of all white people or black people or people of any other color; or to the extinction of all homosexuals or all transcestites in particular; or to the extinction of any nationality or ethnicity; or to the extinction of any religion or philosophy. Nor is there anything wrong if truth leads to the extinction of any languages, or forms of government, or boundaries between nations, or worldwide organizations. In fact, for the purpose of procreating, an equal or near equal number of conservative heterosexual men and women is all that deserves, or needs to be, preserved.

8. Homosexuals constantly misrepresent the influence that monetary prosperity has on both the individuals who achieve it and on those who don't, without revealing homosexual participation and the influence of homosexual culture in the events that are allegedly negatively influenced by the monetary prosperity. Homosexuals also emphasize the alleged dangers or dark side of money and capitalism because that's part of their strategy to take more money away from those who have more of it. For example, I'm reminded of television programs and news stories focusing on homosexual lottery winners suffering ill treatment at the hands of other homosexuals who will not give the lottery winners the same treatment the lottery winners formerly received because of the other homosexuals' jealousy or because the winnings changed the relationships between the homosexual winner and other homosexuals around the winner.

Nonetheless, one of the greatest of all of capitalism's benefits is to create jobs and other monetary opportunities that help individuals achieve independence from people who would otherwise be a hindrance to them.

9. Capitalism is the reward that conservative heterosexuals deserve for the fundamental, substantive work we're accomplishing in non-institutional private society, including battling homosexual culture, heterosexual collectivism, and other immorality. But capitalism and monetary prosperity won't create a satisfying life. However, when conservative heterosexuals fulfill the fundamental, substantive objectives that further America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom and make life satisfying we want monetary prosperity to be our secondary reward.

10. If *Das Kapital* were written today the author would be a homosexual because heterosexuals don't hold the political and economic beliefs of the book's author, Karl Marx. Therefore, since human nature was the same in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Centuries as it is

today, I believe Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, all or almost all of the rest of communism's founders, and communism's earliest strongest proponents including Vladimir Lenin, were homosexuals.

11. Sadly, I believe what explains at least the large majority of incestuous homosexuals' adherence to extreme collectivist political ideology despite the overwhelming amount of incontrovertible evidence against the veracity and rationality of collectivism is past or present participation in sexual assault and other abuse of minors. For incestuous homosexuals know that the sexual assault and other abuse against minors they've participated in has caused themselves tremendous suffering, and is regularly used against them by other incestuous homosexuals including their own family members who know about their immoral and illegal behaviors and who have also participated in the same or similar behaviors.

Also, any incestuous homosexual who moves in a genuinely capitalistic direction knows it will bring more intense criticism and harassment, or even ostracism, from at least almost all other incestuous homosexuals. Incidentally, that's one of the dominant reasons why I believe only a tiny percentage of incestuous homosexuals vote for the Republican Party. Furthermore, incestuous homosexuals who want to appear as conservatives instead of collectivists must still take political positions that either will or could destroy conservatism in America, including supporting homosexual rights laws.

Therefore, the shame and guilt associated with participating in sexual assault and other abuse of minors, or the fear of other incestuous homosexuals' reactions to being a genuine proponent of conservatism, keeps almost all incestuous homosexuals from supporting the Republican Party.

Now I could ask the Republican party after all the hard names that Judge Douglas has called them by---all his repeated charges of their inclination to marry with and hug negroes---all his declarations of Black Republicanism---by the way we are improving, the black has got rubbed off---but with all that, if he be endorsed by Republican votes where do you stand? Plainly you stand ready saddled, bridled and harnessed and waiting to be driven over to the slavery extension camp of the nation [a voice ``we will hang ourselves first" ]---just ready to be driven over tied together in a lot--to be driven over, every man with a rope around his neck, that halter being held by Judge Douglas. That is the question. If Republican men have been in earnest in what they have done, I think they had better not do it, but I think that the Republican party is made up of those who, as far as they can peaceably, will oppose the extension of slavery, and who will hope for its ultimate extinction. If they believe it is wrong in grasping up the new lands of the continent, and keeping them from the settlement of free white laborers, who want the land to bring up their families upon; if they are in

earnest, although they may make a mistake, they will grow restless, and the time will come when they will come back again and re-organize, if not by the same name, at least upon the same principles as their party now has. It is better, then, to save the work while it is begun. You have done the labor; maintain it--keep it. If men choose to serve you, go with them; but as you have made up your organization upon principle, stand by it; for, as surely as God reigns over you, and has inspired your mind, and given you a sense of propriety, and continues to give you hope, so surely you will still cling to these ideas, and you will at last come back again after your wanderings, merely to do your work over again. [Loud applause.]

Abraham Lincoln  
Chicago, Illinois  
July 10, 1858

12. Any racists who vote Republican are homosexuals, which means that the racists are not truly conservatives or Republicans. Additionally, there is no such thing as “conservative racism”. For in order to be truly conservative today, as was also required in the 18<sup>th</sup> – 20<sup>th</sup> Centuries, a person must practice real capitalism and not use race as a reason to hinder others from practicing real capitalism.

Also, slavery and all truly racist cultures that existed in America from the end of the Civil War to the end of the Civil Rights Era are examples of homosexual collectivism, *not* conservatism of any kind. Furthermore, just because collectivist homosexuals in past decades and centuries used conservatism as their fraudulent exterior doesn’t mean they were truly conservatives. In comparison, many collectivist homosexuals in contemporary America use conservatism as their fraudulent exterior even though they openly support homosexual rights laws. Also, many collectivist homosexuals in contemporary America use the *Bible* religions as fraudulent exteriors even though it’s impossible for homosexuals to be Christians, Jews, or Mormons.

Therefore, if a frying egg represents a human brain on drugs, then judicial opinions blaming poll taxes and other forms of racially inspired voter intimidation and discrimination on *conservative* racism represent a human brain on incest, homosexuality, and abortion. Furthermore, these opinions exhibit a fatal misunderstanding of American history, human behavior, and the *Bible* religions, and are also attempts to defraud the American people. More importantly, incestuous homosexual judges and other incestuous homosexual public officials whose brains produced such irrational, fraudulent, and unpatriotic opinions or other policy should immediately resign or be removed from public office.

13. In 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Centuries America local, state, and federal governments denied rights to women and racial minorities that women and racial minorities truly wanted.

More importantly, these past discriminations are excellent examples of homosexuality, *not* of conservative heterosexuality or of government power as America's Founders wanted it to be exercised.

14. America's tradition of real freedom is a normal heterosexual tradition, *not* a "white, Anglo-Saxon" tradition. Consequently, if you are a normal heterosexual or conservative heterosexual of any kind you support America's tradition of real freedom regardless of your race, ethnicity, nationality, gender, religion, disability or income level.

Additionally, the so-called white, Anglo-Saxon legal tradition and tradition of real freedom generally are simply white people pursuing and achieving normal heterosexual freedom over the objections of their predominantly or exclusively homosexual, or homosexual-led, collectivist opponents. Furthermore, their white, Anglo-Saxon identities were of secondary importance in the traditions.

Likewise, the African-American civil rights movement is simply black people pursuing and achieving normal heterosexual freedom over the objections of their predominantly or exclusively homosexual, or homosexual-led, collectivist opponents. Furthermore, their black identities were of secondary importance in that movement.

Similarly, the Latino-Chicano farm workers movement to restrict immigration in the 1940s – *early*-1960s is simply brown people pursuing and achieving normal heterosexual freedom over the objections of their predominantly or exclusively homosexual, or homosexual-led, collectivist opponents. Furthermore, their Latino or Chicano identities were of secondary importance in that movement.

Conversely, the homosexual rights movement is simply fraud. For example, none of the homosexuals in same-sex marriages truly believes the marriages are serious, loving or committed relationships *especially since each spouse is still having incestuous sex with close blood relatives*.

15. The *Bible* prohibits racism. Ironically, some homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals criticize the importance or relevance of religion in America's founding because of the significant amount of racism that was present among the Revolutionary generations of Americans. Nonetheless, I believe all or almost all of the true racists who associated, or allied themselves, with America's Founders were homosexuals.

Additionally, some homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals criticize the fact that many racist homosexuals and other slaveholding Americans attended church in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. But this doesn't diminish the importance or positive influence of religion in America's founding. The dominant reasons are that the homosexual attendees were fraudulent practitioners of Christianity and their homosexual-controlled houses of worship were fraudulent too, just like many racist homosexuals and other

homosexuals in modern America fraudulently attend worship services in fraudulent houses of worship. Also, were it not for the influence of homosexuals, I believe slavery in America would probably have been banned as early as the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century, approximately 100 years before the Civil War ended. Finally, I believe that all or almost all human traffickers in contemporary America are incestuous homosexuals, just like all or almost all slave traffickers in America in past centuries were incestuous homosexuals.

16. I believe some of the Biblical Patriarchs were significantly influenced by the homosexual culture practiced by the peoples they lived among. In fact, some of the Patriarchs, and some of both their predecessors and successors, were moderately or severely messed-up heterosexuals. That is why the *Book of Genesis* may rightly be called the book of duplicity. For the duplicity and other bad behaviors practiced by many of the Patriarchs and their family members are characteristic of heterosexuals who are at least moderately messed-up. Consequently, since we know these Patriarchs and others in their families were not homosexuals it's clear that they were heterosexuals who were at least moderately messed-up and who were at least partly influenced by the homosexual culture they lived among. Thus, anybody who genuinely claims to be a Jew, Christian or Mormon shouldn't criticize America's Founders for being slaveholders, for believing in the inequality of the races, or for not knowing for certain whether the races are equal. For the Founders, like the Biblical Patriarchs, were living among and influenced by homosexuals and homosexual culture, which makes the Founders' contributions to real freedom and other achievements in spite of that influence even more praiseworthy.

It may be argued that there are certain conditions that make necessities and impose them upon us, and to the extent that a necessity is imposed upon a man he must submit to it. I think that was the condition in which we found ourselves when we established this government. We had slavery among us, we could not get our constitution unless we permitted them to remain in slavery, we could not secure the good we did secure if we grasped for more, and having by necessity submitted to that much, it does not destroy the principle that is the charter of our liberties. [that all men are created equal, which preceded the Constitution, ran with the Constitution in Lincoln's day, and continues to run with the Constitution – P.R.] Let that charter stand as our standard.

My friend has said to me that I am a poor hand to quote Scripture. I will try it again, however. It is said in one of the admonitions of the Lord, "As your Father in Heaven is perfect, be ye also perfect." The Savior, I suppose, did not expect that any human creature could be perfect as the Father in Heaven; but He said, "As your Father in

Heaven is perfect, be ye also perfect." He set that up as a standard, and he who did most towards reaching that standard, attained the highest degree of moral perfection. So I say in relation to the principle that all men are created equal, let it be as nearly reached as we can. If we cannot give freedom to every creature, let us do nothing that will impose slavery upon any other creature. [Applause.] *Let us then turn this government back into the channel in which the framers of the Constitution originally placed it. Let us stand firmly by each other. If we do so we are turning in the contrary direction, that our friend Judge Douglas proposes---not intentionally---as working in the traces tend to make this one universal slave nation.* [A voice---`that is so."] [italics added – P.R.] He is one that runs in that direction, and as such I resist him.

Abraham Lincoln  
Chicago, Illinois  
July 10, 1858

17. Interestingly, many homosexual, and heterosexual, Americans continue to criticize America's Founders, the *Declaration of Independence*, and *Constitution* because of racism or perceived racism among America's Revolutionary generations. The point of their criticism is that America's founding documents should not be interpreted in an exclusively pro-normal heterosexual way because the Founders didn't know enough about women, racial minorities, and sexual orientation; consequently, an exclusively pro-normal heterosexual interpretation is not realistic, diverse or modern enough.

As expected, however, these criticisms are irrational, absurd and fraudulent. The dominant reason is that America's normal heterosexual Founders improved human civilization and furthered real freedom while living among and compromising with both incestuous and non-incestuous homosexuals. Furthermore, America's normal heterosexual colonists shared causes with some homosexual colonists, *which the homosexual colonists obviously benefitted from especially victory in the Revolutionary War.* Therefore, during the drafting and negotiation of the *Constitution* homosexual contemporaries of America's Founders should have advocated, *at least in the third person*, for improved legal status for homosexuals. Instead, homosexuals chose not to advocate for homosexuality, *even in the third person*, while simultaneously benefitting from normal heterosexuals' leadership and sacrifices during that important period in American history.

More importantly, regardless of a person's race or ethnicity, if the person is a normal heterosexual he or she supports the *Declaration of Independence* and *Constitution* even though people of non-white races or ethnicities had little or no direct influence in the negotiations and adoptions of the *Declaration of Independence* and *Constitution*. Therefore, using racism or perceived racism among the Revolutionary generations as a

reason to criticize the *Declaration of Independence* and *Constitution* is irrelevant nonsense. For all normal heterosexuals and all other conservatives of all races and ethnicities support the *Declaration of Independence* and *Constitution*, but homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals do not. Furthermore, the same argument is true for women: all normal heterosexual women and all other conservative women support the *Declaration of Independence* and *Constitution* even though women had either little or no direct influence in the negotiations and adoptions of the *Declaration of Independence* and *Constitution*, but homosexual women and collectivist heterosexual women do not.

18. At its adoption the *Constitution* was almost entirely a codification of normal heterosexuality. Furthermore, by putting the seal of legislation against the spread of slavery the Founders also put the seal of legislation against both the spread of homosexual culture, especially *incestuous* homosexual culture, and collectivism, *not* against normal heterosexual culture or conservatism.

19. A capitalistic belief common among America's Founders, Abraham Lincoln and his contemporaries, and many other of the most influential conservative heterosexual public officials in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Centuries, is that even though they did not know for certain whether the races were equal or, in some cases, even thought that the races were *not* equal, all of them firmly believed that it was morally wrong, bad intentioned, against the *Declaration of Independence*, and against both the spirit and intent of the *Constitution* to withhold from people the money that people deserve for their own efforts or that other people receive for the same or similar efforts. Furthermore, this capitalistic belief guided normal heterosexuals' public policy decisions despite popular support in the political, scientific, academic, and non-institutional realms for slavery and inequality of the races. Consequently, it was conservative heterosexuals' belief in capitalism including a market economy, or in economic justice, which had the most influence in destroying huge barriers and achieving real freedom for millions more Americans, *not* belief in the equality of the races. Stated differently, it was conservative heterosexuals' Biblical morality expressed through economics that hammered incestuous homosexual, non-incestuous homosexual, and collectivist heterosexual proponents of slavery. Also, in Abraham Lincoln's case, his capitalistic beliefs were a major contributing cause of the Civil War which is obviously the bloodiest, deadliest, and strongest blow to racism in American history, so "that whatever any one man earns with his hands and by the sweat of his brow, he shall enjoy in peace".

Additionally, Lincoln fought the Civil War to bring substantial monetary prosperity to *both blacks and whites*, and knew of the corrosive influence of slavery or slave culture upon that prosperity. Consider the following passage from Lincoln's speech in Peoria, Illinois, on October 16, 1854, which also applies to the corrosive

influence of homosexual culture and homosexual rights laws throughout contemporary America:

“Another important objection to this application of the right of self-government [the *Kansas-Nebraska Act* and Senator Douglas’s fraudulent, bad intentioned application of the principle of self-government or democracy – P.R.], is that it enables the first FEW, to deprive the succeeding MANY, of a free exercise of the right of self-government. The first few may get slavery IN, and the subsequent many cannot easily get it OUT. How common is the remark now in the slave States---"If we were only clear of our slaves, how much better it would be for us." They are actually deprived of the privilege of governing themselves as they would, by the action of a very few, in the beginning. The same thing was true of the whole nation at the time our constitution was formed.

Whether slavery shall go into Nebraska, or other new territories, is not a matter of exclusive concern to the people who may go there. The whole nation is interested that the best use shall be made of these territories. We want them for the homes of free white people. This they cannot be, to any considerable extent, if slavery shall be planted within them. Slave States are places for poor white people to remove FROM; not to remove TO. New free States are the places for poor people to go to and better their condition. For this use, the nation needs these territories.”

20. America’s public officials must always practice enough capitalism to make sense of the rest of their official duties and of the praise and benefits they bestow upon themselves, other public officials, and anyone else working for federal, state or local government. Additionally, public officials must never forget that, along with adequately reflecting truth, reason, and logic in non-institutional private society generally, *nothing* is more important for them to concern themselves with specifically than the monetary prosperity of virtually all conservative heterosexuals in non-institutional private society. In fact, not even

national security,  
the war on radical Islam,  
any other war,  
nuclear weapons,  
illegal immigration,  
ebola, AIDS or other deadly viruses and diseases,

the right to keep and bear arms,  
the right to life,  
the war against poverty,  
space exploration,  
education,  
voting,  
reducing the murder rate,  
preventing child abuse, and  
the environment

are *more* important. In particular, monetary prosperity not only enables good-intentioned Americans in non-institutional private society to improve their quality of life, it also makes it substantially easier for those Americans to provide what institutional officials cannot provide because of the inherent limitations upon human behavior in institutional arenas.

21. America's public officials must always practice enough capitalism to satisfy virtually all conservative heterosexuals in non-institutional private society. Furthermore, America's public officials must never forget the role of capitalism and money in American history. In fact, America's Revolutionary and Civil Wars can accurately be called America's First and Second Capitalist Wars. Similarly, the formal beginning of the war on terror and on religious extremism began on September 11, 2001, with the attack on the World Trade Center which was recognized as one of the most important, if not *the* most important, of America's financial centers. Therefore, 9/11 involved an attack on capitalism and money. Sadly, 9/11 was followed a short time later by the Democratic Party's public policy attack on capitalism, which enabled the homosexual-caused Mortgage Crisis to develop into the Great Recession, and is a major contributing cause of America's current civil, civil war.

22. It's important to consider the timing of the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, the Great Depression, 9/11, and the Mortgage Crisis and Great Recession. For it appears that all of those events happened in reaction to conservatives progressing in their capitalism, advancing the cause of conservative heterosexuality generally, and when monetary prosperity was widespread or substantially increasing. For example, the conservative heterosexual Colonists becoming wealthier and expressing greater ambitions for themselves and the Colonies in general; slavery on the path to extinction prior to the *Kansas-Nebraska Act* and the increasing monetary prosperity for the white population; victory in World War I and the monetary prosperity of the roaring 1920s; and the conservative heterosexual election victories at the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century

followed by the passage and overwhelming success of the tax cuts sponsored by President George W. Bush.

23. One of the major causes of the Great Depression was the Stock Market Crash of 1929. Furthermore, I believe that if we use American history prior to and after the Crash as our guide, then it's safe to say that the Crash was intentional wrongdoing perpetrated at least predominantly by incestuous homosexuals. For it appears that the monetary prosperity and strong capitalistic spirit of the Colonists prior to the Revolutionary War, the monetary prosperity and the decline of slavery prior to the *Kansas-Nebraska Act*, the monetary prosperity of the roaring 1920s, and the passage and overwhelming success of the tax cuts sponsored by President George W. Bush disturbed both defiant collectivist heterosexual and homosexual Americans, especially *incestuous* homosexual Americans. Similarly, with respect to 9/11, I believe the conservative victories in the 2000 elections and ensuing tax cuts disturbed defiant, fraudulent religionist, collectivist heterosexuals based in foreign nations. Sadly, both collectivist heterosexuals and homosexuals were disturbed enough to resort to unconstitutional, immoral, or murderous behaviors to stop capitalism, substantial and widespread monetary prosperity, and other benefits of America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom that threatened their subjective, unconstitutional, evil, and collectivist, including government, aspirations.

Finally, a major difference between the historical events mentioned above is that it was predominantly people in non-institutional private society that caused the Stock Market Crash of 1929, the Mortgage Crisis, 9/11, and the war on radical Islamic terrorists, while it was predominantly government officials who caused the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, and the Great Recession.

Now, it happens that we meet together once every year, sometime about the 4th of July, for some reason or other. These 4th of July gatherings I suppose have their uses. If you will indulge me, I will state what I suppose to be some of them.

We are now a mighty nation, we are thirty---or about thirty millions of people, and we own and inhabit about one-fifteenth part of the dry land of the whole earth. We run our memory back over the pages of history for about eighty-two years and we discover that we were then a very small people in point of numbers, vastly inferior to what we are now, with a vastly less extent of country,---with vastly less of everything we deem desirable among men,---we look upon the change as exceedingly advantageous to us and to our posterity, and we fix upon something that happened away back, *as in some way or other being connected with this rise of prosperity* [italics added – P.R.]. We find a race of men living in that day whom we claim as our fathers and grandfathers; they were

iron men, they fought for the principle that they were contending for; and we understood that by what they then did it has followed that the degree of prosperity that we now enjoy has come to us. We hold this annual celebration to remind ourselves of all the good done in this process of time of how it was done and who did it, and how we are historically connected with it; and we go from these meetings in better humor with ourselves---we feel more attached the one to the other, and more firmly bound to the country we inhabit. In every way we are better men in the age, and race, and country in which we live for these celebrations. But after we have done all this we have not yet reached the whole. There is something else connected with it. We have besides these men---descended by blood from our ancestors---among us perhaps half our people who are not descendants at all of these men, they are men who have come from Europe---German, Irish, French and Scandinavian---men that have come from Europe themselves, or whose ancestors have come hither and settled here, finding themselves our equals in all things. If they look back through this history to trace their connection with those days by blood, they find they have none, they cannot carry themselves back into that glorious epoch and make themselves feel that they are part of us, but when they look through that old Declaration of Independence they find that those old men say that ``We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal," and then they feel that that moral sentiment taught in that day evidences their relation to those men, that it is the father of all moral principle in them, and that they have a right to claim it as though they were blood of the blood, and flesh of the flesh of the men who wrote that Declaration, (loud and long continued applause) and so they are. That is the electric cord in that Declaration that links the hearts of patriotic and liberty-loving men together, that will link those patriotic hearts as long as the love of freedom exists in the minds of men throughout the world. [Applause.]

Abraham Lincoln  
Chicago, Illinois  
July 10, 1858

## **A2. HOMOSEXUALITY IN 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY AMERICA**

1. There is abundant proof that life is getting worse for homosexuals in America.  
First, the number of homosexuals who die each year is disproportionately high compared to the number of heterosexuals who die each year. I believe the primary reasons for this are that all people who commit suicide are homosexuals, at least a large majority of people who die in accidents are homosexuals, at least a large majority of people who die in drug or alcohol related deaths are homosexuals, and at least a large majority of murder victims are homosexuals. Furthermore, because of the large number

of homosexuals who use illegal steroids or other harmful illegal drugs for years or decades, I believe a disproportionately high number of homosexuals die from other health-related causes at least partly due to the unknown or uncertain effect of the illegal drug use.

Second, with the exception of their own minor children and other close minor blood relatives whose parents are homosexuals, I believe homosexuals have not induced any heterosexuals into homosexuality since 2009. Incidentally, it's important to remember that the number of these unrelated heterosexuals participating in homosexual sex and becoming subject to homosexual culture had already reached low levels before 2009 because of the coarsening of homosexual culture caused by the worsening condition of homosexuality in America.

Third, since 2009 far fewer minors, and adults, with homosexual parents have participated, will participate, or will continue to participate in homosexual sex compared to similarly situated minors, and adults, in previous decades predominantly because of anti-homosexual events, and the proliferation of anti-homosexual information, in non-institutional private society. Sadly, some of these minors and adults were sexually assaulted by their incestuous homosexual parents when the minors, and adults, were very young. However, the parents stopped sexually assaulting the minors but continued to hope and believe that the minors would participate in homosexual sex with non-family members because of the negative influence of the sexual assaults upon the minors and because the parents induced or forced their minor children into socializing with homosexual peers.

Fourth, I believe that of the 18 year olds who are eligible to vote for the first time, a declining percentage of them each year that passes are homosexuals. Also, because of the disproportionately high death rate of homosexuals, an additional hundreds of thousands fewer homosexuals are eligible to vote in America every year that passes.

Fifth, in recent years the number of Americans who've left the Democratic Party for the Republican Party is much larger than the number of Americans who've left the Republican Party for the Democratic Party. The dominant reasons are the disastrous monetary policies of incestuous homosexual Democratic Party leaders, and the exposure of both incestuous and non-incestuous homosexual cultures. Incidentally, if no homosexuals would have voted for the Republican Party in the 2016 presidential election, I believe the results of the election would probably be the same.

Sixth, because America is moving in a more conservative direction every year that passes its social welfare system will be substantially smaller in coming years than it is now, which negatively affects homosexuals disproportionately more than heterosexuals.

Seventh, both heterosexuals and non-incestuous homosexuals refuse to hire incestuous homosexuals as often as possible. The result is far less employment

opportunities for incestuous homosexuals than there were a decade ago, and the number of opportunities continues to decrease every year.

Eighth, homosexuals are having, and will continue to have, fewer children than in previous decades because of homosexuals' worsening monetary and employment conditions and because of heterosexuals' disdain and intolerance of homosexuality, the latter of which brings increased scrutiny and criticism upon homosexual parents since heterosexuals believe that homosexuals should not have children.

Ninth, over the last nearly 8 years the number of homosexuals who prostitute themselves for at least the necessities of life has increased substantially. One of the primary reasons is that America's economy has been far worse during the same period compared to almost all of the rest of last decade when the Republican Party had a larger influence on monetary policy. Another primary reason is that perhaps millions more incestuous homosexuals are now either being excluded from or refusing to participate in employment and business opportunities because heterosexuals and non-incestuous homosexuals will not hire them, or because these incestuous homosexuals will not work due to their emotional or mental trauma, embarrassment, and shame caused by the entire country knowing of their incestuous lifestyles. Sadly, I believe the number of homosexual prostitutes in America, incestuous and non-incestuous homosexuals combined, is greater than the largest number of slaves that existed at any time in the Roman Empire. More importantly, because of the negative mental and emotional effects of participating in prostitution, at least many of the participants are far less likely to substantially improve themselves afterwards and live satisfying lives in America.

Therefore, with all evidence considered, it's obvious that the condition of homosexuality in America continues to worsen at a significantly fast pace.

2. Same-sex marriage is another way to identify incestuous homosexuals and the condition of incestuous homosexuals in America. Other ways to identify incestuous homosexuals include political ideology, criminal behaviors, "family" practices, beliefs about the importance of having children, physical features, and behaviors toward non-incestuous people.

First, incestuous homosexuals are typically the most collectivist and the most supportive of homosexual rights and culture compared to their contemporaries. One dominant reason is that they know a large percentage of incestuous homosexuals are suffering socioeconomically because of incestuous homosexual sex and culture and because of heterosexuals' disdain and intolerance of homosexuality. Another dominant reason is that being so collectivist and supportive of homosexual rights and culture lessens the criticism from incestuous homosexual family members and other incestuous homosexuals who know they participated in both incestuous sex and other immoral sex some of which is illegal. Additionally, incestuous homosexuals know that capitalistic

public policy will not give incestuous homosexuals the help they seek which is centralization of power in government and in other institutions, and absolute control over non-incestuous people. Even worse, incestuous homosexuals are the most supportive of amnesty and other rights for illegal aliens because at least a large majority of the illegal aliens are incestuous homosexuals. Also, incestuous homosexuals are the most elitist politically, which is obvious in the fact that all or almost all Democratic Party leaders are incestuous homosexuals.

Second, in contemporary America incestuous homosexuals perpetrate all or almost all of the *worst* crimes. From mass murders to domestic terrorism to severe child abuse and neglect to major political corruption to human trafficking, incestuous homosexuals prove to the entire world the destructive effects of incestuous homosexuality.

Third, incestuous homosexuals have extremely collectivist family practices. The dominant reason is that since the older incestuous homosexual family members induced or forced their minor children and other family members into incestuous sex and other immoral or criminal behaviors they typically tolerate all of the minors' and other family members' bad behaviors that are as bad or not as bad as the ones they practiced or continue to practice. Furthermore, provided their incestuous homosexual family members do not surpass the level of immoral, criminal behaviors they've participated in they will continue to offer substantial monetary and other support to their incestuous homosexual family members. Practically speaking, these extremely collectivist family practices form a "safety net" which explains in part why many incestuous homosexuals behave poorly in public or at work.

Fourth, incestuous homosexuals typically exaggerate the importance of having children because it's part of their strategy to induce both heterosexuals and non-incestuous homosexuals who don't have children to become incestuous homosexuals. In fact, convincing another person to agree with them about the importance of having children or becoming a parent is typically the first step in the incestuous homosexuals' strategy. It's then followed by inducing the other person into homosexual sex with the incestuous homosexual or one of the incestuous homosexual's family members, convincing the other person to either allow a lesbian in the incestuous homosexual's family to impregnate herself with the other person's semen or allow a homosexual man in the incestuous homosexual's family to impregnate the other person with his semen, and, lastly, along with the other person and incestuous homosexual family members, to participate in incestuous sex with the child that is the product of that pregnancy.

Incidentally, most incestuous homosexuals who've had children won't give nearly as much, or any, monetary and other support to incestuous adult family members that either haven't had or won't have children and continue the family's incestuous practices with those children, and will more severely criticize and harass, or

even ostracize, incestuous adult family members that either haven't had or won't have children and continue the family's incestuous practices. Also, because incestuous homosexuals know their incestuous families are extremely immoral, criminal, unpatriotic, and dysfunctional, they often reward themselves by utilizing a fraudulent pro-family, "family values" or "family first" exterior to fool others into thinking their incestuous families are other than extremely immoral, criminal, unpatriotic, and dysfunctional.

Fifth, some incestuous homosexuals develop witchy, devilish, amorphous or other severely negative physical features, some of which are the same as or similar to human-like creatures or monsters represented in stories dating back at least several centuries. Furthermore, some incestuous homosexuals develop ugly, weird, or disturbed facial features that fall short of being witchy, devilish, amorphous or human-like creature or monster in appearance but are still far from normal or pleasant. One dominant cause for these less severe physical features is participation in incestuous sex. Moreover, some incestuous homosexuals develop an abnormal pallor to their skin after participating in incestuous homosexual or incestuous heterosexual sex. Also, all remaining transvestites, and other homosexuals with extreme or near extreme physical features and dress, are incestuous homosexuals; hence, the name "transcestites".

Sixth, incestuous homosexuals behave in the weirdest and most disrespectful ways towards both heterosexuals and non-incestuous homosexuals. One reason is that they're desperate to get something going on in their lives or to make something good happen for themselves, sometimes with a particular person or group of people. In fact, incestuous homosexuals often try to shame, embarrass or put pressure on someone publicly because incestuous homosexuals think that it forces or requires the person to respond, or makes it more likely that the person will respond, to their weird or disrespectful behaviors. Furthermore, the weird and disrespectful behaviors are intended to cause a reaction or response from other people that might lead to something beneficial for the incestuous homosexuals involved and other homosexuals. For example, make a person stop doing or saying something that harms homosexuals or incestuous homosexuals in particular, or induce a person to respond in a way that harms the person including participating in homosexual sex and becoming subject to homosexual culture or falling into disfavor with heterosexuals in alternative ways. Also, incestuous homosexuals are always suffering significant mental or emotional trauma which has a negative effect on their judgment including on how to behave among non-incestuous people. Consequently, because their mental or emotional troubles are caused partly by incestuous sex, or "eating their own kind", I consider their outrageous, bizarre, irrational, disrespectful, selfish behaviors and frequently bad judgment to be a human form of mad cow disease. Sadly, mad cow disease is actually a good name for incestuous homosexuality. For I believe many incestuous homosexuals are actually

eating and drinking what comes out of their own kind to fulfill perverse requirements of their incestuous homosexual cultures. Additionally, I believe incestuous homosexuals use hard drugs including illegal steroids in disproportionately larger numbers than both non-incestuous homosexuals and heterosexuals, which at least partly explains many incestuous homosexuals' weird and disrespectful behaviors. Lastly, incestuous homosexuals' incestuous family members will more severely criticize and harass, or even ostracize, them if they try to get something going on in their lives or make something good happen for themselves with non-incestuous people in more respectable or intelligent ways. The two major reasons are, first, because their family members want them to make the same mistakes their family members made so that it will cost them as much as it cost their family members and enable their family members to treat them better or equally as a result; and, second, because their family members are both jealous of and hate all non-incestuous people.

3. At least a very large majority of incestuous homosexuals carry a substantial amount of guilt, shame, and other negativity for participating in sexual assault and other abuse against minors. Furthermore, the negativity causes these incestuous homosexuals to have a disdain, intolerance, and jealousy of non-incestuous people to the extent that they constantly defy, and discriminate against, non-incestuous people and intentionally make or attempt to make life harder for non-incestuous people in many other ways. In short, these incestuous homosexuals believe that to whatever extent they comply with or benefit non-incestuous people is the extent to which they make escaping the hell-on-earth of incestuous homosexuality that much more difficult.

Also, these incestuous homosexuals reward themselves for the suffering they've experienced with the license to perpetrate the worst kinds of fraud and other illegal, immoral, evil, and unpatriotic activities. Interestingly, as a result of being severely scarred by participating in sexual assault and other abuse against minors, these incestuous homosexuals believe they've earned their fraudulent exteriors, or the right to defraud others, and the right to live as if their lives are movies in which they are the stars and all other people are only extras. Furthermore, whether the fraudulent exterior is

promoting themselves as a super race, or  
fighting for equal protection of the law to marry whomever one "loves"  
regardless of that person's gender, or  
giving a transcestite the legal right to use the restroom that corresponds to his or  
her "gender identity" instead of the restroom that corresponds to his or her birth  
sex, or

calling the fight against incestuous homosexuals' modern-day child sacrifice, *otherwise known as abortion*, a "war on women", or identifying God as a woman's right to have an abortion, or playing the race card as an excuse to riot, murder, and defy America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including the *Constitution*,

makes no difference. For these fraudulent exteriors are predominantly the result of being sexually assaulted and abused in other ways as minors by incestuous homosexuals, or of sexually assaulting and abusing in other ways minors all or almost all of whom are the children of incestuous homosexuals, *and of trying to escape the negative effects of this abuse in ways that benefit incestuous homosexuals*.

Finally, it's important to emphasize that even though incestuous homosexual sexuality and culture have devastating effects upon the participants, the effects have not stopped a disproportionately large percentage of incestuous homosexuals from energetically and purposefully seeking, obtaining, and unconstitutionally exercising government, and other institutional, power even while their condition in non-institutional private society is bad and continues to worsen.

4. The Nazis were only a small part of a larger fight that has existed for thousands of years, and they fought on the losing side that is now on the path to ultimate extinction. Additionally, hell-on-earth is what incestuous homosexual Nazis, non-incestuous homosexual Nazis, and some heterosexual Nazis lived, *not* the suffering and death they inflicted on their enemies. Thankfully, we've learned that it wasn't racial, ethnic, or religious hatred that was the source of the Nazi leadership's and other Nazis' perverse and murderous behaviors; it was defiance caused by incestuous homosexuality. That is, it was Defiance, the worm that doesn't die and the fire that isn't quenched, which both the *Old Testament* and *New Testament* define as hell-on-earth.

Also, I believe that the Nazis and the rest of the Axis powers in WWII were led by incestuous homosexuals; that all of the Axis powers' armies included incestuous homosexuals, non-incestuous homosexuals, and heterosexuals; that the non-incestuous members of the Axis powers didn't know their leaders were incestuous homosexuals; that all of the Axis powers' allies' leaders were homosexuals, all or almost all of whom were *incestuous* homosexuals; and that all Nazis who were fraudulent Muslims or fraudulent Catholics, which were every one of both the true Nazis and Nazi collaborators who called themselves Muslims or Catholics, were incestuous homosexuals.

5. Before, during, and after WWII incestuous homosexual Nazis spread to foreign nations in which they propagated Nazism and incestuous homosexuality. Furthermore,

at least many of these nations either already had or developed reputations as being Nazi havens or sympathetic to Nazis because of the support from incestuous homosexual citizens in those nations. As a result, those nations evolved to being at the forefront of the homosexual rights movement, which is evident in the homosexual rights laws and other collectivist public policy adopted predominantly or exclusively by incestuous homosexuals in those nations.

6. Homosexual culture, especially *incestuous* homosexual culture, includes the element of danger. For example, homosexuals

- illegally run or walk across busy highways and other roads;
- use dangerous illegal drugs;
- use illegal drugs dangerously;
- give illegal steroids and other illegal drugs to dogs including pit bulls;
- leave loaded firearms and other potentially dangerous items where minor children live or play;
- live, travel or participate in sex carelessly even though they're knowingly infected with deadly diseases such as AIDS or Ebola;
- intentionally leave their minor children unattended in automobiles or intentionally expose the children to the elements in other ways; and
- irrationally resist arrest by law enforcement personnel.

Interestingly, the element of danger illustrates many important characteristics of homosexual culture.

First, the element of danger is a way for homosexuals to show other people that they don't like what their own lives are about. Stated differently, it's a way for homosexuals to show that they're not going to live more responsibly because they don't believe homosexuals in their lowly positions should be living more responsibly.

Second, the element of danger shows that homosexuals don't want to behave more responsibly towards others or give others better treatment because it makes life too easy or enjoyable for those other people.

Third, the element of danger reveals homosexuals' belief that behaving more responsibly confirms the heterosexual, moralistic way of living that they believe they will either never live or never make something truly worthwhile happen in their lives following.

Fourth, the element of danger reveals homosexuals' belief that the actual or potential negative effects of living dangerously are not as important or as influential as the hell-on-earth of homosexuality which causes them to live dangerously. Incidentally, one of the reasons why some homosexuals so easily kill themselves in a gruesome way

is because their method of death is not as bad to them as the hell-on-earth of homosexuality they're experiencing.

Fifth, the element of danger is a part of homosexuals' attempts to make something good happen for themselves or to get something going on in life by behaving in a way that causes other people to react favorably to them. In other words, behaving dangerously is a way for homosexuals to get attention from, and interaction with, other people while simultaneously reducing or eliminating the criticism and opposition from some homosexuals that would otherwise occur for interacting more responsibly with other people, especially heterosexuals.

7. Jealousy has a huge influence in the homosexual community, especially among incestuous homosexuals. In fact, jealousy has ruined the lives of countless homosexuals because it caused them to speak and behave disrespectfully about heterosexuals who, in particular, either participated in much-desired normal heterosexual sex or have physical features which are attractive to many members of the opposite sex.

Additionally, jealousy is the reason why incestuous homosexuals are the most common hypocritical narcs. That is, jealous incestuous homosexuals comprise at least a large majority of the people who report to law enforcement the illegal behaviors of others even though the people who make the reports participate in the same, similar or worse illegal behaviors. Sadly, some incestuous homosexuals act as if they're doing other homosexuals a favor by hypocritically reporting the other homosexuals to law enforcement because once the other homosexuals have reputations or criminal records comparable or closer to their own they can associate or communicate more meaningfully or more easily with the other homosexuals.

Finally, I believe it's possible that what partly explains the disproportionately large percentage of some racial minorities convicted of crimes or in prison is the fact that white incestuous homosexuals, who significantly outnumber incestuous homosexuals in other racial groups, are hypocritically narcing on other homosexuals. Consequently, members of those racial minorities are convicted of crimes or sent to prison in disproportionately large percentages compared to whites, *not necessarily because* those white hypocritical narcs are racist but because they're being typical incestuous homosexuals by hypocritically narcing.

8. Many if not most homosexuals don't want other homosexuals to be racist, and obviously don't want to worry about racist cabals within their midst. However, moderately racist homosexuals are tolerated by other homosexuals if the racist homosexuals follow mainstream homosexual culture substantially enough.

Also, the primary reason homosexuals tolerate moderate racism is that homosexuals are not supposed to punish other homosexuals harshly, which is what

severely criticizing and harassing, or even ostracizing, moderately racist homosexuals is considered by most homosexuals. Furthermore, homosexuals fear that if they punish other homosexuals harshly they will weaken the homosexual community because the punished members either won't comply with or will distance themselves from mainstream homosexual culture and enough other homosexuals. Moreover, homosexuals also fear that if they punish other homosexuals harshly they'll be judged as hypocritical since they too have serious problems in their lives that deserve harsh punishment.

9. Homosexuals exaggerate the importance of events and issues that favor, appear to favor or might favor homosexuals or that homosexuals utilize in attempting to defraud heterosexuals. For example, describing these events and issues as "historic", "landmark", or "an idea whose time has come". Additionally, homosexuals continue to use these words and phrases not because they truly believe what they're saying but because they're either trying to defraud heterosexuals or defying heterosexuals by repeating words and phrases they used in failed strategies related to the events and issues, strategies which in some cases brought them substantial criticism or ridicule from heterosexuals. Consequently, homosexuals believe they should keep using the words and phrases to induce heterosexuals to stop criticizing and ridiculing them for their failed strategies, to show their displeasure for how the heterosexuals negatively treated them for their failed strategies, or to show their displeasure for how their attempts to defraud heterosexuals concluded unfavorably for homosexuals.

10. The exposure of homosexual culture that began in non-institutional private society in late-2008 is the official beginning of the extinction of homosexuality which will consequently have a big effect on the Earth's population growth and on mankind's effects upon the environment. Specifically, since homosexuals and homosexual-controlled companies appear to be *at least* a large majority of those responsible for preventable environmental accidents and disasters, mankind can now look forward to an increasingly cleaner, healthier, and safer planet. Furthermore, these accidents and disasters *really* happened, unlike the "hole in the ozone" and "global warming" that are allegedly dangerous to human beings but in reality are fraud perpetrated entirely or almost entirely by homosexuals. More importantly, I believe homosexuals' path to ultimate extinction is a contemporary example of an Almighty-sponsored "natural selection" or "survival of the fittest" that all conservative heterosexuals can both witness and participate in as they enjoy a rejuvenating Earth!

11. Homosexuals routinely attempt to learn important details about a heterosexual without the heterosexual knowing what the homosexuals are doing. For example,

talking to other homosexuals either close or closer to the heterosexual, and illegally using hi-power antennas to listen to, or about, the heterosexual.

Interestingly, one of the major reasons homosexuals don't communicate directly with the heterosexuals they want to learn important details about is that they don't want to give the heterosexuals that much respect or make the heterosexuals feel important. Even worse, the homosexuals want to discover if there is negative information they can use against the heterosexual they're learning more about. For the homosexuals believe that if negative information does exist it might enable them to communicate directly with the heterosexual because it will provide them something with which to make the heterosexual feel less important. Therefore, homosexuals' goal is to use the negative information to minimize, in the heterosexual's mind, the importance of communicating directly with the heterosexual or to minimize the individual's importance when communicating directly with the individual.

12. Many heterosexuals returned to being homosexuals *because* they were sissies. In fact, one of the most common kinds of homosexual sissy is the sissy that actually lives as a heterosexual, typically a *messed-up* heterosexual, for at least a period of years. These are the heterosexuals who participated in homosexual sex, incestuous sex with older generation family members, or both incestuous and non-incestuous sex when they were minors. Furthermore, at some point they decided to stop participating in perverse sex and to begin living as heterosexuals. Not surprisingly, they also aimed to be in an intimate heterosexual relationship and to participate in normal heterosexual sex. However, they were afraid of initiating or participating in such a relationship or sexual activity partly because of the criticism, watchfulness, and possessiveness of other homosexuals around them including non-incestuous or incestuous homosexual family members, former homosexual sex partners, and other homosexuals. Sadly, many if not most of these messed-up heterosexuals never even try, or give substantial effort, to be in an intimate heterosexual relationship or to participate in normal heterosexual sex, and return to being incestuous or non-incestuous homosexuals. In many cases, the heterosexuals who were *incestuous* homosexuals earlier in life first resort to being non-incestuous homosexuals and afterwards return to being incestuous homosexuals to receive certain benefits including money and better treatment from their incestuous homosexual family members. Other heterosexuals who were incestuous homosexuals earlier in life first resort to being incestuous homosexuals and afterwards participate in non-incestuous homosexual sex.

Obviously, being too scared to be in an intimate heterosexual relationship or to participate in normal heterosexual sex, and consequently returning to perverse sex, weighs heavily upon these homosexual sissies. The result is that they spend the rest of their lives trying to make themselves feel like they're anything but sissies, and to make

others think they should be feared, respected or avoided. But their overly-aggressive, irrational, exaggerated, mean-spirited, un-American behaviors can't erase the memory of being too scared to participate in an intimate heterosexual relationship or in normal heterosexual sex, and returning to perverse sexuality and culture as a result. Furthermore, homosexual sissies' lives are even worse when they know that *heterosexuals* know they're sissies and, in at least many cases, prostitutes.

13. In their attempts to defraud and ruin the real freedom practiced by conservative heterosexuals, homosexuals in government, the media, academia, and fraudulent religious organizations resort to witchcraft. Furthermore, their witchcraft includes attempting to both confuse heterosexuals and keep heterosexuals from fully or substantially understanding issues, events, and the different groups of people in America and throughout the world. Even worse, their ultimate goal is to stop conservative heterosexuals from furthering America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom so that homosexuals will have the least difficulty controlling America and, at least in theory, escaping the hell-on-earth of homosexuality.

14. An important difference between Jesus' crucifixion and the difficult circumstances that conservative heterosexual Americans are now experiencing is that *ignorance* was far more prevalent among the people responsible for or in agreement with Jesus' crucifixion than it is among both homosexual and collectivist heterosexual Americans who are responsible for the difficult circumstances conservative heterosexual Americans are now experiencing. In fact, *intentionally bad* behaviors are dominant, and ignorance is virtually non-existent, among both homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals responsible for conservative heterosexuals' hardships. Additionally, this is an important behavioral distinction not simply because it's emphasized in both the *Old Testament* and *New Testament*. For intentionally bad homosexual, and collectivist heterosexual, Americans may be punished more severely than simply ignorant people without conservative heterosexual Americans accurately being accused of harshly judging, being unforgiving or holding grudges.

Additionally, I believe both homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals have never given anywhere near their best efforts to truly understand America. Instead, they care only for learning enough about America to take wrongful advantage of, and destroy, America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom for their own selfish purposes or to make it appear as if they are good-intentioned, patriotic Americans while they practice and further their sinister intentions. Furthermore, they're still attempting to defraud conservative heterosexuals and destroy America's tradition of real freedom including capitalism. Therefore, they're not the kind of people who

received forgiveness, sympathy or any more than humane treatment after Jesus' crucifixion and resurrection, for they can "tell their right hand from their left".

15. Some homosexuals murdered homosexual or heterosexual law enforcement personnel because the murderers believed law enforcement policy in America is too heterosexual and therefore not respectful enough of homosexuals and homosexual culture. Furthermore, many homosexuals believe the extent to which they comply with heterosexual law enforcement policies makes escaping the hell-on-earth of homosexuality that much more difficult. As expected, these homosexual murderers, and members of social-political movements and organizations which favor pro-homosexual law enforcement practices, intentionally don't tell people about homosexuality's influence in murders and justifiable killings involving law enforcement personnel. For example, that all people who murder law enforcement personnel are homosexuals, that all law enforcement personnel who perpetrate murder are homosexuals, and that all or almost all people either murdered by law enforcement personnel or justifiably killed by law enforcement personnel, at least in recent decades, were homosexuals.

Additionally, in contrast to encounters between *homosexual* citizens and heterosexual or homosexual law enforcement personnel, encounters between *heterosexual* citizens and heterosexual or homosexual law enforcement personnel in recent decades have rarely, or never, been violent and have probably never been deadly. The dominant reason is that heterosexual citizens don't defy law enforcement personnel as many homosexual citizens do. Furthermore, even though many heterosexual citizens have expressed their dislike for some of the behaviors of homosexual law enforcement personnel, their reactions to those behaviors don't reach the dangerous levels reached in many interactions between homosexual citizens and homosexual or heterosexual law enforcement personnel.

16. All murderers who eat their victim are incestuous homosexuals. Additionally, I believe at least some if not all incestuous homosexual murderers eat their victim because they don't want the murder to be simple. In other words, the murderers burden themselves with eating their victim to take away from any joy or ease of simply murdering someone which might give themselves too much importance or power, or appear too honorable. Furthermore, eating their victim is another way incestuous homosexual murderers show their dissatisfaction with their own lives. Lastly, considering the evidence the murderers knowingly leave behind or store for later consumption or other purposes, practicing cannibalism with a victim adds an element of danger to the lives of the murderers.

17. Interestingly, I believe homosexual public officials, homosexual family members of victims, and other homosexuals fraudulently promote forgiveness and love for homosexuals who perpetrate murder, mass murder, or domestic terrorism. Furthermore, they often denounce the death penalty as improper punishment for these horrible crimes. Nevertheless, while forgiveness, love, and mercy are genuinely practiced by all good-intentioned people, it's no surprise that homosexuals fraudulently promote these virtues. For a large majority of homosexuals are partly responsible for the horrible crimes since they intentionally did not reveal to heterosexuals the influence of homosexual sex and culture in criminal activity. Also, homosexuals know they will be severely criticized and harassed, or even ostracized, by many other homosexuals for supporting the death penalty because according to mainstream homosexual culture homosexuals are not supposed to punish other homosexuals harshly. Consequently, I believe that explains why substantially lessening the punishments for major and minor crimes generally is a goal for most homosexuals in America, and why homosexuals' promotion of forgiveness and love is another part of homosexuality's vast fraudulent exterior.

18. For homosexuals, "love" means to give other homosexuals more respect and chances than they deserve, to punish other homosexuals substantially less than the other homosexuals deserve, and to fraudulently make or try to make other homosexuals look better to heterosexuals than the other homosexuals truly are. Additionally, the dominant reason for practicing this fraudulent love is to keep the homosexual community together so that homosexuals can control America, destroy real freedom and, at least theoretically, escape the hell-on-earth of homosexuality. As expected, homosexuals also practice fraudulent love to avoid being harshly punished for their own wrongdoings.

Therefore, homosexual love is the opposite of Biblical love, the latter of which means to treat other people as the Almighty wants you to treat them, *not* according to human standards including homosexual culture, collectivist heterosexual culture, or any other culture that's not normal heterosexual culture.

19. From one perspective, collectivism is the belief that government can substantially help people achieve satisfying lives even though these people will not at least strive to be conservative heterosexuals. Additionally, "government" includes the GLBT community, a community of people who are the same race or ethnicity, a religious organization, a family, and a political party, not just the institution of government.

Also, collective *ownership* is not collectivism; it's a symptom or negative effect of collectivism. Furthermore, collective ownership is not a necessary symptom or negative effect of collectivism. In fact, moderate or high taxation are symptoms or negative

effects of collectivism which can substitute for collective ownership and have equally bad monetary or social effects upon a nation.

20. Over the last 8 years the Democratic Party's platform, legislative and other political "victories", and influence in private society substantially increased the number of homosexual prostitutes. Specifically, a significantly higher percentage of adult homosexuals than in previous decades are being supported by homosexuals inside or outside their families in exchange for participating in homosexual sex with the homosexuals outside their families or one or more kinds of sex with the homosexuals inside their families. Even worse, this larger number of prostitutes doesn't include minors who are prostituted to incestuous homosexuals by the minors' incestuous homosexual parents. Sadly, I'm willing to bet that the number of homosexual prostitutes in America is so large that it greatly surpasses the largest number of slaves alleged to have existed at any time in the Roman Empire.

Incidentally, we know that many homosexuals have "taken one for the team" during this Great Recession by prostituting themselves for at least the necessities of life while continuing to vote for the Democratic Party. However, conservative heterosexuals will not resort to prostitution, which is another good reason why we must give all the effort necessary to end the Great Recession with *large* tax cuts and other capitalistic policy as quickly as possible.

21. There are perhaps millions of incestuous homosexuals in America who either secured or were capable of securing legitimate employment 10 years ago but who now cannot or will not secure legitimate employment because they're too disrespected, too emotionally and mentally traumatized, using drugs or alcohol too frequently, physically incapable, or afraid of workplaces where they will be criticized for being incestuous homosexuals. As a result, the incestuous homosexual community's monetary condition is bad, getting worse, and will never be anywhere near as good as it was 10 years ago.

22. Incestuous homosexuals must tolerate the bad behaviors of their incestuous homosexual family members provided the bad behaviors don't exceed their own bad behaviors. The problem with this form of "family" unit or support, however, is that older generations of incestuous homosexuals worked harder and prospered more than younger generations of incestuous homosexuals. The result is that more incestuous homosexuals than ever before are relying upon the support of older incestuous homosexual family members, a condition that will not change for many incestuous homosexuals even after the economy substantially improves. Therefore, after many incestuous homosexuals die their surviving, younger generation incestuous

homosexual family members will no longer benefit from the money, public entitlements, or other assets they shared with their family members in exchange for incestuous sex.

23. Before legalizing same-sex marriage and transcestite rights, incestuous homosexual public officials were already substantially “helping” other incestuous homosexuals by creating or furthering pro-abortion public policy. In essence, incestuous homosexual public officials have been supporting incestuous homosexuals’ use of abortions as a rite of passage, a form of punishment, or teaching tool and, more importantly, have been harming incestuous homosexuals with every abortion obtained.

Additionally, incestuous homosexuals who do not have an abortion will not receive equal treatment from incestuous homosexual family members and other incestuous homosexuals who have had an abortion. Consequently, there is strong support within the incestuous homosexual community to keep abortions legal and inexpensive so that incestuous homosexuals can give other incestuous homosexuals better or equal treatment after the other incestuous homosexuals obtain an abortion. For incestuous homosexuals who’ve had an abortion do not want other people who haven’t had an abortion to hang the abortion over their heads as punishment or to go without experiencing the negative effects of having an abortion. Therefore, those who’ve had an abortion or who continue to have abortions automatically and systematically treat others that haven’t had an abortion or that don’t continue to have abortions less respectfully or kindly than those who’ve had an abortion or who continue to have abortions.

Finally, I believe it’s possible among some incestuous homosexuals that a substitute for having an abortion exists, just as I believe that in some incestuous homosexual families and in other groups of incestuous homosexuals physical abuse is a substitute for sexual abuse.

24. A homosexual who is not receiving equal treatment from other homosexuals he or she associates with should, first, discover if there is an immoral, criminal, or sexual behavior he or she has not participated in that the other homosexuals have participated in and, second, if such a behavior is discovered decide if he or she wants to receive equal or better treatment from the other homosexuals by participating in that behavior. As expected, non-incestuous homosexuals who chose to participate in one or more of these behaviors to fit in with and get equal or better treatment from *incestuous* relatives or from other incestuous homosexuals and, incidentally, didn’t know they were incestuous homosexuals, made their own lives substantially worse.

25. Homosexuals in America sometimes behave like homosexual members of some foreign-based homosexual terrorist organizations including the Islamic State; that is, they attempt to take advantage of the homosexual media's style of coverage by making themselves appear as a force to be reckoned with or much more formidable than they truly are. Interestingly, this reminds me of scalping and other extreme, barbaric, forms of violence and death inflicted by members of some Native American tribes on their enemies in centuries past. Furthermore, I believe these extreme forms of violence, death, and other media-ready behaviors are intended to serve partly as a substitute for advanced weaponry that the people who practiced those behaviors couldn't afford. Also, conservative heterosexuals' reactions to homosexuals' behaviors and communications in the media are supposed to help the homosexuals causing the reactions and other homosexuals determine what to do next or how to further direct their defiance towards conservative heterosexuals.

26. The dominant purpose of the mainstream media is to help homosexuals working in the mainstream media get something going on, or make something good happen, for themselves and for other homosexuals. Furthermore, homosexual professionals working in the mainstream media fraudulently and unfairly cover or analyze events and issues with the intent of benefitting homosexuals socially, politically, and in every other way.

Additionally, homosexual journalists often allow other homosexuals to make the most irrational, irrelevant, unfounded accusations or statements against heterosexuals for two major reasons. First, the journalists are giving the other homosexuals the attention and respect that will further the solidarity and collectivism of the homosexual community. Second, the journalists are giving the other homosexuals the opportunity to get something going on, or make something good happen, for themselves and homosexuals in general at the expense of heterosexuals.

27. A favorite strategy of homosexual journalists, academics, and public officials is to repeat a falsehood while hoping that the falsehood is eventually treated by enough people in the general population as if it were true. For example, that President Reagan, a normal heterosexual, participated criminally in the Iran-Contra Affair, and that Alzheimer's Disease had a significant, negative effect on his decisions; that America's Founders and Abraham Lincoln were deists; that President Jefferson, a normal heterosexual, fathered children with one of his slaves; that President Franklin Roosevelt, a normal heterosexual, had an extramarital affair, and that he authorized the internment and removal of Japanese-Americans during WWII because he was racist.

Additionally, homosexual journalists, academics, and public officials discuss events and issues without revealing the sexual orientations of the people involved. This

is important because the normal heterosexuals involved, for example, all of the presidents named in the preceding paragraph, are often notably *anti-homosexual*. Furthermore, I've noticed that the strongest critics and opponents of these normal heterosexuals are typically incestuous homosexuals, which indicates that the normal heterosexuals' actions or policies had a disproportionately bad impact on *incestuous* homosexuals. Also, I've noticed that homosexual journalists, academics, and public officials emphasize government recognition of, and compensation for, the alleged wrongdoings of normal heterosexuals as if the recognition or compensation gives the allegations more validity. However, because the sexual orientations of both the alleged wrongdoers and victims was not revealed, and because the influence of sexual orientation among the public officials who were most responsible for the government recognition, compensation or redress was not revealed, the government actions should be considered secondary, erroneous, uninformed, incomplete, illegal or fraudulent.

28. Homosexual journalists present stories in which they attempt to make it appear that God failed human beings. For example, some of the stories show people praying after their family members or others have been undeservedly victimized or even killed to emphasize the apparent futility of praying to a God that didn't save the family members or other people. Other stories show people praying outside of a courthouse or other government building for a certain legal or political outcome to make it appear that the homosexual judges or other homosexual public officials who will illegally rule in favor of homosexuals are more powerful than prayer and more influential than God in the direction America is heading.

Additionally, homosexual journalists often present stories in which they try to make religion look like the cause of horrible crimes. In particular, I heard a homosexual journalist mention in March or April 2015 that most of the killings in the world are carried out by "religious extremists". As expected, this is fraudulent journalism, first, because I believe the real cause of the majority of the killings the homosexual journalist was referring to is the homosexual orientation of the perpetrators of the crimes, *not* the perpetrators' fraudulent religious beliefs and, second, because I believe the homosexual journalist intentionally tried to make it appear that religion was the cause of the crimes instead of merely *referring to* the perpetrators' fraudulent religious beliefs. Also, the rest of the killings the homosexual journalist referred to were perpetrated by defiant *heterosexuals* who are not genuine practitioners of the religions they claim to be following. Finally, I believe most of the rest of the murders throughout the world are perpetrated by homosexuals who are neither religious extremists nor genuine practitioners of the religions they claim to follow; instead, like the other homosexual murderers, they're suffering from mental and emotional problems caused by homosexual sex and culture.

29. I believe that until recently at least a majority of homosexuals working in media, academic, or government institutions thought the huge volume of secondary information, half-truths, and fraud emanating from the combined homosexual-owned and -operated mediums would influence heterosexuals to believe that there's too much going on in the world for heterosexuals to admit they understand world affairs or the course of events, or to stick to their conservative, anti-homosexual religious and political beliefs, or to feel confident aggressively promoting those beliefs in both institutional and non-institutional arenas. Ironically, the opposite has happened. Furthermore, homosexuals' selfishness, fraud, and lack of patriotism are the dominant reasons why countless television stations, radio stations, movies, websites, magazines, books, journals, and newspapers will not succeed at significantly influencing public sentiment in homosexuals' favor.

### **A3. PUBLIC POLICY**

1. Heterosexuals should not be embarrassed about the legalization of same-sex marriage, or believe that legalization is a significant loss for heterosexuals, or believe that legalization has a significant negative effect on either the very conservative direction that America is heading or on America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom. For the legalization of same-sex marriage is insignificant for many reasons.

First, it's insignificant because only homosexuals, at least almost all of whom are *incestuous* homosexuals, fought vigorously for same-sex marriage, including the five incestuous homosexual U.S. Supreme Court judges whose majority decision legalized same-sex marriage and the incestuous homosexuals who comprise all other judges in the federal or state courts who legalized same-sex marriage.

Second, the legalization of same-sex marriage is insignificant because both heterosexuals and non-incestuous homosexuals weren't supposed to know that incestuous homosexuals comprise all or almost all of the participants in same-sex marriages, all of the U.S. Supreme Court judges whose majority opinion legalized same-sex marriage, and all other judges in the federal or state courts who legalized same-sex marriage.

Third, it's obvious that the legalization of same-sex marriage is insignificant when we consider that same-sex marriage is not called "incestuous homosexual marriage". However, the reason for this misnomer is not simply that incest is illegal. For homosexuals fought for homosexual rights when homosexuality was illegal. Even worse, many homosexuals fight to legalize prostitution even though prostitution is illegal. Therefore, it's wrong to say that homosexuals either don't want to call or won't call same-sex marriages "incestuous homosexual marriages" *because* incest is illegal.

Furthermore, calling these marriages “incestuous homosexual marriages” is accurate because it *doesn't* mean that the same-sex incestuous homosexual spouses are blood relatives and have incestuous homosexual sex with each other; it means that the same-sex incestuous homosexual spouses who have homosexual sex with each other come from unrelated families and also continue to have incestuous sex with their close blood relatives. Consequently, none of the homosexuals in same-sex marriages believes the marriages are serious, loving or committed relationships.

Fourth, the legalization of same-sex marriage is insignificant because the reason why at least most same-sex incestuous homosexuals marry each other is that incestuous homosexual culture is so subjective, immoral, and irrational that same-sex marriage is one of the ways they can try to get something going on for themselves or make something good happen in their lives without doing or appearing to be doing anything honorable which would anger other incestuous homosexuals, especially the ones in their own families, and subject them to more severe criticism and harassment, or even ostracism, from other incestuous homosexuals.

Finally, I believe the legalization of same-sex marriage is insignificant because incestuous homosexuals chose it as a means to try to get something going on for themselves or make something good happen in their lives since they are both jealous of and demeaned by traditional heterosexual families, especially heterosexual parents who genuinely love their children and don't sexually assault them or seriously abuse them in other ways. In fact, many incestuous homosexuals chose to attempt to lessen the importance of traditional heterosexual families because they saw these families as a stronghold for many heterosexuals and something that many heterosexuals truly benefitted from, especially the children, *not* because the incestuous homosexuals love each other.

The sacredness that Judge Douglas throws around this decision [*Dred Scott* – P.R.], is a degree of sacredness that has never been before thrown around any other decision. I have never heard of such a thing. Why, decisions apparently contrary to that decision, or that good lawyers thought were contrary to that decision, have been made by that very court before. It is the first of its kind; it is an astonisher in legal history. [Laughter.] It is based upon falsehood in the main as to the facts---allegations of facts upon which it stands are not facts at all in many instances, and no decision made on any question---the first instance of a decision made under so many unfavorable circumstances---thus placed has ever been held by the profession as law, and it has always needed confirmation before the lawyers regarded it as settled law. But Judge Douglas will have it that all hands must take this extraordinary decision, made under these extraordinary circumstances, and give their vote in Congress in accordance with it, yield to it and obey it in every possible sense. Circumstances alter cases. Do not gentlemen here

remember the case of that same Supreme Court, some twenty-five or thirty years ago, deciding that a National Bank was constitutional? I ask, if somebody does not remember that a National Bank was declared to be constitutional? ["`Yes," "`yes"] Such is the truth, whether it be remembered or not. The Bank charter ran out, and a re-charter was granted by Congress. That re-charter was laid before General Jackson. It was urged upon him, when he denied the constitutionality of the bank, that the Supreme Court had decided that it was constitutional; and that General Jackson then said that the Supreme Court had no right to lay down a rule to govern a co-ordinate branch of the government, the members of which had sworn to support the Constitution---that each member had sworn to support that Constitution as he understood it. I will venture here to say, that I have heard Judge Douglas say that he approved of General Jackson for that act. What has now become of all his tirade about "`resistance to the Supreme Court?" ["`Gone up," "`Gone to the Theatre."]

Abraham Lincoln  
Chicago, Illinois  
July 10, 1858

2. Conservatives shouldn't put much importance on the illegal and irrational decisions of the five incestuous homosexual U.S. Supreme Court judges. For what do the judges' decisions in homosexual rights cases reveal about what's actually happening in non-institutional private society? The answer to that question is the reason why conservatives should be very confident and optimistic about America's future. Thus, conservative public officials are right to put monetary prosperity alongside public safety at the top of their list, including *large* personal, business, and investment tax cuts. For the Great Recession, not homosexual rights and other social issues, is by far the most serious problem, *if not the only serious problem*, that a majority of conservative heterosexuals are experiencing.

3. Practically speaking, both same-sex marriage and *transcestite* rights laws are more "Haman's gallows" designed to defeat opponents of homosexual rights. Ironically, however, the gallows are contributing to destroying homosexuals and the entire homosexual rights movement along with them. In fact, conservative heterosexuals are far less likely to bow to proponents of homosexual rights and collectivism now that they know incestuous homosexuals are leading the charge for homosexual rights and collectivism, and that homosexuals' publicly expressed motives for supporting homosexual rights and collectivism are fraudulent.

Additionally, to whatever extent homosexual public officials allow homosexual culture to influence their policy decisions is the extent to which they hurt homosexuals in general. That explains why homosexual rights laws are not as important and not as

damaging to conservatives as many people once thought, and are in fact some of the worst public policy mistakes, if not *the* worst of all, in American history.

4. Recent legislation, court opinions, and other public policy unconstitutionally legalizing homosexual rights illustrate the need for fundamental constitutional change. Interestingly, some people might argue that fundamental constitutional change is *not* necessary considering that homosexuality and collectivism are on the road to ultimate extinction and when they've reached insignificant levels the existing *Constitution*, interpreted with original intent or according to normal heterosexual culture, will suffice.

However, homosexuality and collectivism have had significant, negative effects on America's real freedom, just as they did in the years preceding the Revolutionary and Civil Wars and throughout the Civil Rights Era. That's important because fundamentally changing the *Constitution* is not limited to *technically* improving government institutions, functions, and procedures; it's also about *removing* significant opposition, or barriers, to real freedom. Therefore, homosexuality, and collectivism or its negative symptoms, should be expressly proscribed in the *Constitution* because *they've already had big, negative effects in America*. Also, for the same reason, the federal government's power to tax, or the amount of tax it can levy, should be at least substantially reduced.

5. Incestuous homosexual public officials are not interested in fulfilling their constitutional obligation to create public policy that secures the blessings of liberty to both existing and future generations of Americans. In fact, incestuous homosexual public officials seek to create "closed-door" policy and consequently control everyone, or freeze everyone in place, so they can more easily determine, at least in theory, how to escape the hell-on-earth of incestuous homosexuality as easily and as quickly as possible.

6. America's Founders didn't practice homosexual culture. In fact, the Founders took big steps forward and improved upon real freedom *because* they were neither homosexuals nor messed-up heterosexuals who allowed their personal problems or cultures to significantly influence their official duties. Additionally, when normal heterosexuals control the founding of a nation the result is the maximum amount of both individual freedom and opportunity for individuals to prosper monetarily that circumstances will allow. Not surprisingly, the *Declaration of Independence*, and almost the entire original *Constitution*, are codifications of normal heterosexuality.

7. America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including the *Declaration of Independence* and *Constitution* is not for the dead; it's for the living. As a result, legitimate interpretations of the *Constitution* benefit people who *don't* at least strive to be heterosexuals, or who are *not* conservatives, or who are *not* furthering America's tradition of real freedom only because all legitimate interpretations are governed by normal heterosexual culture and are almost entirely for the benefit of normal heterosexuals.

8. The *Constitution* must be interpreted through the *Declaration of Independence* and the experiences in private society that led to the creation of the *Declaration* for its interpretation to be legitimate. In other words, the *Constitution* must be interpreted according to normal heterosexual culture. Furthermore, any other interpretation of the *Constitution* first requires a constitutional amendment.

9. America has borders; so does the *Constitution*. Furthermore, both America's geographical borders and the *Constitution's* ideological borders must be protected for America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom to continue. Additionally, both America's geographical borders and the *Constitution's* ideological borders must be solid, not porous. They must also be defined in detail by truth, reason, logic, and the rest of America's tradition of real freedom because the *Constitution* is a codification of normal heterosexuality. Also, both America's geographical borders and the *Constitution's* ideological borders require a wall of separation that clearly distinguishes normal heterosexual culture from all other ideologies or cultures.

Taking up the anti-slavery ordinance of 1787 [which preceded the *Constitution* – P.R.], that had been applied to all the North-west Territory, Mr. Lincoln presented that act of the fathers of our republic, the vindicators of our liberty, and the framers of our government, as the *best* exposition of their views of slavery as an institution. It was also a most striking commentary of their political faith, and showed how the views of those political sages, to whom we owe liberty, government, and all, comported with the new-fangled doctrines of popular rights, invented in these degenerate latter days to cloak the spread of slavery [in particular, the *Kansas-Nebraska Act* and Senator Douglas's fraudulent, bad-intentioned interpretation of the principle of self-government or democracy].

Summary of Abraham Lincoln's Speech  
On October 4, 1854, in Springfield, Illinois,  
Given In the *Illinois Journal* of October 5, 1854

10. President Obama appointed an openly homosexual U.S. Ambassador to the Dominican Republic even though the President knew the foreign nation is strongly Catholic and, like America, culturally disfavors homosexuality. Furthermore, the openly homosexual U.S. Ambassador is in a same-sex marriage which is not legal in the Dominican Republic, and allegedly flew the GLBT flag over the U.S. embassy in that nation. Even worse, the openly homosexual U.S. Ambassador made statements regarding government corruption in the Dominican Republic, which are obviously hypocritical considering homosexuals' widespread corruption throughout America's federal, state, and local governments. Moreover, the Ambassador's statements illustrate the double standard of homosexuals' "human rights" campaigns. For the U.S. Ambassador is an incestuous homosexual and incestuous homosexuals are the leaders of government corruption in America.

Sadly, President Obama's poor choice for U.S. Ambassador underscores that incestuous homosexuals cannot conduct public policy honorably, and that incestuous homosexuals exercise government power in a manner that is self-destructive, ineffective, and rightly subjects homosexual public officials and other homosexuals to ridicule. For the openly homosexual U.S. Ambassador was called a word equivalent to "faggot", including by a Cardinal in the Archdiocese of Santo Domingo. Incredibly, this prompted U.S. Senator Dick Durbin who is another incestuous homosexual Democrat, fraudulently claims to be a Roman Catholic, and is a "personal friend" of the openly homosexual U.S. Ambassador, to write an open letter to the Pope about the Cardinal's criticism of the Ambassador. In his letter, Senator Durbin praised the U.S. Ambassador's "patience and professionalism in light of" the Cardinal's "mean spirited attacks" and claimed that the Cardinal was behaving contrary to the Catholic Church's teaching on tolerance for homosexuals.

Nonetheless, I believe it's obvious that the problem involving the U.S. Ambassador is predominantly an incestuous homosexual campaign to try to make something good happen for incestuous homosexuals by disrespecting the Catholic Church as a whole, increasing the criticism of the Pope if he does not respond to incestuous homosexual public officials as they desire, and making an example out of a lower level Church official. Consequently, incestuous homosexual public officials' anti-Catholic crusade subjected them to increased ridicule at home and abroad, further eroded their credibility and influence, and proved the ineffective results of their overly-personal, un-statesmanlike leadership style.

11. President Obama exemplifies typical incestuous homosexual leadership style. Interestingly, in defying non-institutional private society the President reminds me of General George McClellan. For I believe the general was an incestuous homosexual

whose culture and family obligations made it impossible for him to honorably serve the normal heterosexual President Abraham Lincoln.

Also, like General McClellan, President Obama doesn't want to be truly free or fight for real freedom. Rather, like the general, President Obama aims to frustrate and ruin the plans of normal heterosexuals and consequently cause normal heterosexuals to accept less than total victory by tolerating incestuous homosexual culture. Furthermore, I believe General McClellan feared how other incestuous homosexuals would treat him if he gave his best effort to serving President Lincoln during the Civil War, just as President Obama fears negative treatment from contemporary incestuous homosexuals for adequately reflecting established truth, reason, and logic in non-institutional private society.

12. The entire homosexual rights movement including the legalization of same-sex marriage and transcestitute restroom "privileges" has proven to be an historical, monumental, landmark mistake, perhaps the biggest political mistake in American history surpassing "taxation without representation", the *Kansas-Nebraska Act*, and secession. Furthermore, I believe incestuous homosexuals caused all of those mistakes.

Sadly, however, homosexuals keep pushing for more homosexual rights laws and other government power. One reason is that they believe that if they stop behaving that way they'll be giving in to what heterosexuals think is the right thing for homosexuals to do which is abandon homosexuality in its entirety. Also, homosexuals believe that since homosexuals are being ridiculed and criticized for homosexual rights laws and the failed homosexual rights movement it's good strategy for homosexuals to keep pushing for homosexual rights laws until they escape from the ridicule and criticism. Even worse, if heterosexuals don't treat homosexuals better despite homosexuals' irrational, absurd, and illegal behaviors, then homosexuals will continue to defy heterosexuals and hope that their strategy will at least annoy and frustrate heterosexuals and make life less enjoyable for heterosexuals in other ways.

Finally, at least almost all homosexual public officials, almost all of whom are *incestuous* homosexuals, continue to illegally, irrationally, absurdly, and unpatriotically push for homosexual rights laws partly because they want to fit-in with, and receive better treatment from, other homosexual public officials who've made the same mistake and who've typically participated in the same sexual immorality. Interestingly, these public policy "victories" serve as trophies for homosexual public officials to both distinguish themselves from and ally themselves with other homosexuals, including homosexual public officials in foreign nations, as they establish their positions in the collectivist homosexual community.

13. Both the homosexual rights movement and the Democratic Party's pro-collectivist platform in general have been huge mistakes partly because they revealed incestuous homosexuals as both the leaders and most aggressive proponents of homosexual rights laws and collectivism. As expected, this revelation is not what incestuous homosexuals wanted non-incestuous homosexuals and heterosexuals to know, and not what incestuous homosexuals and non-incestuous homosexuals wanted heterosexuals to know.

14. It appears that a significantly large percentage of incestuous homosexuals are public officials, disproportionately larger than either non-incestuous homosexuals or heterosexuals who are public officials. For example, all or almost all Democratic Party leaders on the federal, state, and local levels are incestuous homosexuals. In fact, I believe the Democratic Party leadership is elitist because they prefer that only incestuous homosexuals serve as the leaders of the Democratic Party, whether as politicians, bureaucrats, judges or in any other official capacity. Even worse, disproportionately high numbers of incestuous homosexuals are also working in academic, religious, or media institutions. However, this disproportion reflects the bad and worsening conditions of both incestuous and non-incestuous homosexuals in non-institutional private society, *not* the ascendance, or tolerance, of homosexuality.

Finally, this disproportion is an important reminder that even though incestuous homosexuality has substantial negative effects in all areas of an incestuous homosexual's life, it does not stop a significantly large percentage of incestuous homosexuals from achieving institutional leadership and the exercise of institutional power to further incestuous homosexual sex and culture including destroying America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom. Furthermore, this is true even though incestuous homosexuals have simultaneously failed to establish their culture in non-institutional private society.

15. Support for amnesty for millions of illegal aliens is a good way to identify incestuous homosexuals. That's why it's safe to assume that at least a large majority of illegal aliens are incestuous homosexuals. Incidentally, I'll bet that it was predominantly if not entirely incestuous homosexual Romans who let the harmful barbarians into the Roman Empire. Similarly, in America it's either predominantly or entirely incestuous homosexuals who favor amnesty for millions of illegal aliens in America, and who are responsible for the illegal safekeeping of illegal aliens.

16. Homosexual public officials' routine strategy, which is also another example of witchcraft, is to make it look like they're solving problems including Americans who don't have health insurance, poverty, or the shrinking middle class, when they're

actually making problems worse. They even adopt or propose government programs which appear to be aimed at solving the problem but, in reality, have no chance of achieving that goal. In fact, their “solutions” are actually fraudulent exteriors to their true aims which are, first, to make life worse for heterosexuals while homosexuals are living the hell-on-earth of homosexuality and, second, to make it look like they beat conservative heterosexual public officials to solving a problem.

Additionally, homosexual public officials behave this way because they cannot fulfill their public duties honorably, and because government programs that truly solve important domestic problems also help heterosexuals, which homosexual public officials believe makes escaping the hell-on-earth of homosexuality even more difficult. In reality, homosexual public officials routinely and selfishly allow serious problems to continue or to worsen instead of either allowing conservative heterosexual public officials to solve the problems or going along with conservative heterosexuals’ solutions to the problems.

Finally, in deciding which problems to pretend to solve, homosexual public officials often resort to mimicry. Specifically, homosexual public officials identify an issue that is truly important to conservative public officials and other conservatives, for example, health care. Then, the homosexual public officials also start giving the issue extra attention primarily *to try to make it look like* the issue is also important to them, or that they are the leaders on the issue, or that they are adequately reflecting non-institutional private society. They also want to see what giving the issue importance will do for them including inducing more Americans to vote for them or making conservative public officials look worse. More importantly, homosexual public officials’ mimicry often results in making life substantially worse for the American people, not better.

17. I’m confident that the exposure of homosexual culture which began in non-institutional private society is the biggest and most important event in American history. For it is the conflict between homosexual and heterosexual cultures which caused the Europeans to leave their homes for the New World, the American Revolution, the Civil War, World War I, the Great Depression, World War II, the Mortgage Crisis and Great Recession, and the current civil, civil war between collectivists and conservatives.

18. The exposure of homosexual sex and culture that began in non-institutional private society explains why some heterosexuals left the Democratic Party for the Republican Party beginning with the 2010 elections. Thus, the switch from Democratic Party to Republican Party by many heterosexuals is not a political revolution in the sense that it started in a political or government institution, or with a particular political

party, or with a particular political candidate or public official, or with non-incestuous homosexual or heterosexual Democrats; for it originated in non-institutional private society, first, with the exposure of homosexuality generally, and, again, with the exposure of incestuous homosexuality specifically.

Additionally, who didn't substantially benefit from the exposure of homosexual culture which began in non-institutional private society?

I believe far more *homosexuals* have benefitted from the exposure of homosexual culture than from what the Democratic Party, the U.S. Supreme Court, or any homosexual rights organization has "achieved" for homosexuals over at least the last 50 years. In fact, all of those groups combined haven't benefitted homosexuals as much as the exposure of homosexual culture which began in non-institutional private society. Practically speaking, what those groups have "achieved" is not beneficial for the majority of homosexuals because those "achievements" are fraudulent, elitist since those groups are controlled predominantly or exclusively by incestuous homosexuals, and only ineffective, defiant reactions to the worsening condition of homosexuals in non-institutional private society. Also, non-incestuous homosexuals have substantially benefitted from the exposure of homosexual culture. The dominant reason is that they learned that incestuous homosexuals were trying to subject them to an existence that would have been far worse than being openly homosexual which is what all non-incestuous homosexuals currently are because of the exposure of homosexuality that began in non-institutional private society. In fact, the only people who haven't substantially benefitted from the exposure of homosexual culture are the worst homosexuals in America including domestic terrorists, murderers, and other deadly, violent, and sexually predatory homosexuals, all or almost all of whom are incestuous homosexuals, and incestuous homosexual public officials, media professionals, academics, and fraudulent religionists.

Finally, the exposure of incestuous homosexuals proves that the majority of homosexuals are substantially benefitting from conservative heterosexuals primarily because only conservative heterosexuals provide the truth, reason or logic which will allow non-incestuous homosexuals to benefit that much. Sadly, almost all homosexuals, and tens of millions of collectivist heterosexuals, continue to vote for the Democratic Party.

19. If you substitute the word "capitalism" for "money" when Democrats and other homosexuals discuss the negative influence of money in politics, then you'll understand what they truly mean at least some of the time. For example, when President Obama said that universal voting would "counteract money more than anything" what he meant was that if all eligible homosexual, and heterosexual, collectivists in America voted for the Democratic Party then capitalism would have either an insignificant

influence or no influence at all, which in turn would make it easier for collectivists to control conservative heterosexuals and destroy America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including capitalism.

20. I believe both the banks that closed because of the homosexual-caused Mortgage Crisis and the banks that were most negatively affected by the Mortgage Crisis but didn't close were operated at least predominantly by homosexual executives who made bad investment decisions and other policy which are not characteristic of real capitalism or of conservative heterosexuality.

Furthermore, the refusal of homosexual Democratic Party public officials to respond to the homosexual-caused Mortgage Crisis with capitalistic policy is the sole cause of the Great Recession that resulted from the Mortgage Crisis.

Sadly, homosexual journalists fraudulently and unpatriotically covered the homosexual-caused Mortgage Crisis and Great Recession in a manner that was designed to help the Democratic Party, homosexuals, and collectivism generally. For the journalists intentionally and illegally chose not to discuss the homosexual identities of bank executives and Democratic Party public officials. Furthermore, along with Democratic Party leaders and other homosexuals, homosexual journalists blamed capitalism in general including Republican Party tax cuts, and President George W. Bush in particular, for the homosexual-caused Mortgage Crisis and Great Recession.

21. Apparently, the best that President Obama and other incestuous homosexual Democratic Party leaders can do to end the Great Recession are loan programs and public works projects that have no chance of providing even minimal recovery. Strangely, in their subjection to incestuous homosexual culture, contemporary Democratic Party leaders appear as sexually perverse, ill-informed, morally inferior, unpatriotic, sissy versions of President Franklin Roosevelt during the Great Depression. Ironically, President Roosevelt was a normal heterosexual and very anti-homosexual in his leadership style including being as aggressive in fighting the Nazis as Presidents Lincoln, Reagan, and George W. Bush were against America's enemies during their presidencies. Roosevelt was also vastly different from incestuous homosexuals like contemporary Democratic Party leaders, and the majority of Democratic Party leaders since the end of WWII.

Incidentally, the incestuous homosexual "religious" crowd wrongly and fraudulently praises the Biblical King David because the King achieved greatness even though the King participated in adulterous sex with a married woman and had many past and present family members with documented sexual problems and other serious problems. Likewise, incestuous homosexual Democratic Party leaders wrongly and fraudulently praise Franklin Roosevelt and his presidency for two major reasons. First,

because Roosevelt utilized the government to combat the Great Depression in a manner that incestuous homosexual Democrats approve of even though Roosevelt's exercise of government power did little or nothing to end the Great Depression; and, second, because Roosevelt has for decades been intentionally and wrongly accused of participating in extra-marital affairs which many Democratic Party leaders intentionally and wrongly treat as true to make Roosevelt appear as sexually immoral and consequently to make it easier for homosexuals to say good things about him. Nevertheless, even though Roosevelt's government programs didn't end or substantially lessen the Great Depression, and he is still wrongly and intentionally accused of participating in extra-marital affairs, he deserves to be called at the very least one of America's very good presidents.

Also, President Franklin Roosevelt's exercise of government power in the Great Depression are not examples of institutional preeminence or control because he and other heterosexual public officials didn't know the behavioral reasons for the Stock Market Crash of 1929 which was a major cause of the Great Depression. Additionally, President's Roosevelt's economic or monetary policies did not stop or substantially reduce the Great Depression, and the government agencies or departments that were created to combat the Great Depression and its alleged causes didn't solve the problem of incestuous homosexual fraud and corruption. However, President Roosevelt's intention was not to establish or further institutional preeminence but to genuinely help the American people through a preventable disaster that I believe was caused predominantly by bad-intentioned incestuous homosexuals.

22. Institutional preeminence or control makes law enforcement personnel and all other Americans less safe. Interestingly, many public officials who practice the institutional preeminence or control ideology have a "love-hate" relationship with law enforcement personnel. In particular, these public officials do not want to adequately reflect established truth, reason, and logic in non-institutional private society which would keep law enforcement personnel and all other Americans as safe as possible. However, these public officials often favor either increasing funding for or increasing the number of law enforcement personnel because law enforcement personnel are government personnel and consequently *institutional* costs, presence, and power increase.

Nonetheless, institutional preeminence makes America either less safe or *not* safer. The dominant reason is that the institutional preeminence or control "solution" does not adequately reflect the established truth, reason, and logic in non-institutional private society which is relevant to the fundamental cause of the increase in funding or personnel. For example, the negative effects of homosexuality, especially *incestuous* homosexuality.

23. It's important to mention that it's not only *homosexual* public officials who practice institutional preeminence or control. For some *messed-up* heterosexual public officials including those that do not support homosexual rights laws also practice this unconstitutional ideology although in exponentially smaller numbers than homosexual public officials, especially *incestuous* homosexual public officials. Furthermore, in some cases these messed-up heterosexuals become even more messed-up as a result of practicing institutional preeminence or control partly because of the criticism that follows.

Additionally, I've observed institutional preeminence or control practiced by a combination of messed-up heterosexuals and incestuous homosexuals in local government. In particular, these local public officials attempted to get something going on, or achieve glory, for themselves by solving a problem institutionally instead of creating public policy that adequately reflected the established truth, reason, and logic in non-institutional private society which was relevant to the problem. Also, the majority of these local public officials were incestuous homosexuals and consequently could not reflect established truth, reason, and logic in non-institutional private society without bringing upon themselves increased criticism and harassment, or even ostracism, from at least a large majority of other incestuous homosexuals. Moreover, I'm sure envy and jealousy of individuals and groups in non-institutional private society who were having a substantial influence on the course of events and related conversations had a significant role to play in the local public officials' bad decision-making. Even worse, after this combination of homosexual and heterosexual public officials were exposed and criticized for practicing institutional preeminence or control they tried to make it appear they were doing nothing wrong, and continued to defy non-institutional private society with more bad policy, partly because of the ongoing criticism they experienced.

Interestingly, even though the homosexual local public officials are very different in many ways from the heterosexual local public officials, especially in their private lives, they practice collectivism in their workplace. Furthermore, their collectivism began with trying to get something going on for themselves or trying to solve a problem with their institutional preeminence or control ideology instead of respecting the preeminent influence and position of non-institutional private society.

As expected, these local public officials who practice institutional preeminence or control are not alone. For the homosexual journalism industry is on their side. In fact, I observed local incestuous homosexual journalists covering these local public officials in a manner designed to make it appear that the local government's actions and decisions were of preeminent importance even though the journalists knew the public officials were not adequately reflecting established truth, reason, and logic in non-institutional

private society. Also, the homosexual journalists gave virtually no effort in their coverage to adequately reflect established truth, reason, and logic in non-institutional private society. Sadly, the incestuous homosexual journalists facilitated the local public officials' practice of institutional preeminence partly because the journalists don't want individuals and groups in non-institutional private society to control or dominate, and would prefer to cover *institutional* events, issues, and people. Furthermore, the incestuous homosexual journalists were already known for disgracefully trying to get something going on, or to make something good happen, for themselves institutionally, long before the combination of incestuous homosexual and messed-up heterosexual local public officials got caught, and were criticized, for doing the same.

24. Both homosexual public officials and some *messed-up* heterosexual public officials react similarly to the worsening condition of like-minded homosexuals or messed-up heterosexuals in government and throughout private society, or to normal heterosexuals and other conservative heterosexual enemies or opponents. Specifically, they try to make it look like they're achieving important public policy objectives that normal heterosexuals and other conservative heterosexual enemies or opponents *don't* support, and that they're simultaneously furthering America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom or behaving with good intentions. Incidentally, that explains why both homosexual and messed-up heterosexual public officials who are very different from each other in many areas of life sometimes agree on an issue or jointly support public policy which does not adequately reflect established truth, reason, and logic in non-institutional private society.

25. With respect to furthering America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom, there are no solutions in institutions. Therefore, America's institutional officials must always respect the preeminent influence and position of non-institutional private society. Furthermore, like the wheels with eyes all around the rims in the *Book of Ezekiel*, which moved exactly when and where the living creatures that represented all of creation moved, America's institutional officials must always move with established truth, reason, and logic, or the spirit of truth, in non-institutional private society. For just as the spirit of the living creatures was in the wheels, the spirit of truth must be in America's institutions for the institutions to *both* operate constitutionally and contribute to furthering America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom.

26. Exercising government power without adequately reflecting non-institutional private society is contrary to the *Bible*. For in the *Bible* the prophets are the most powerful, important, and influential people, *not* public officials. Therefore, the Democratic Party is overwhelmingly un-Biblical and Democrats cannot be Christians,

Jews or Mormons because the Democratic Party platform does not adequately reflect established truth, reason, and logic in non-institutional private society. In fact, the Democratic Party aims to consolidate power in government, and promotes a homosexual-centric, collectivist, pro-institutional preeminence platform that defies non-institutional private society.

27. Homosexual public officials address and oppose the death penalty in ways that reveal how homosexuals attempt to defraud heterosexuals by *making it look like* they're accomplishing the most important objectives *institutionally*. Furthermore, homosexual public officials' "victories" abolishing or reducing the application of the institutional death penalty are supposed to *make it look like* America is moving in a "liberal" or homosexual-friendly direction. In reality, however, homosexual public officials and other homosexuals focus on the institutional death penalty, which is a secondary or less important strategy for ridding the world of bad people, because that is the best that homosexual public officials can accomplish. Stated differently, homosexual public officials are only focusing on the sideline skirmishes or fights in the stands of the entire death penalty issue when they emphasize the institutional death penalty. For both firearm self-defense laws and deadly use of force by law enforcement personnel are ridding America of more bad people than the institutional death penalty. Furthermore, I don't believe homosexual public officials and other homosexuals can stop that from happening. As a result, they're attempting to defraud heterosexual Americans into thinking that their "victories" abolishing or reducing the application of the institutional death penalty are of primary importance.

28. The Republican Party platform is anti-homosexual culture partly because normal heterosexual Abraham Lincoln's primary enemy was pro-slavery, collectivist, incestuous homosexuals. Furthermore, to both constitute the Republican Party platform and explain why the Democratic Party's support for slavery and its spread was not furthering America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including the *Declaration of Independence* and *Constitution*, Lincoln relied upon the Founders' intentions and visions for America. This is an important consideration because the Founders' political ideologies and actions as public officials substantially reflected their opposition to, and struggle with, homosexuals and homosexual culture, including their choosing to make America a republic instead of a democracy.

Similarly, in addition to denouncing both the *Kansas-Nebraska Act* and the Democratic Party, Lincoln and many of his contemporaries argued for the continuance of America as a republic including maintaining the spirit of compromise that in fact kept the Union together while moving it forward as a republic, instead of unconstitutionally degrading into a democracy as the Democrats attempted. Not

surprisingly, this same struggle to keep America a republic instead of unconstitutionally degrading into a democracy not only occurred during the Constitutional Convention, the state ratifying conventions that followed the Constitutional Convention, and throughout the 1850s, but is also happening in contemporary America.

29. Adequately reflecting established truth, reason, and logic keeps our republic from being a democracy, and not reflecting them that will unconstitutionally collapse our republic into a democracy. Additionally, it is unconstitutional to operate America as a democracy unless the *Constitution* is first amended. Furthermore, if established truth, reason, or logic is counter to the wishes or plans of the majority of American citizens, a compromise must be made that will keep America moving forward as a republic while not trampling the majority of Americans, provided it's not proven that the majority is acting with bad intentions. In other words, the seal of legislation should strongly disfavor pro-democracy Americans while still treating them humanely, as Abraham Lincoln argued in the 1850s.

Also, the *Constitution* includes many characteristics of a republic including checks and balances, federalism, 2 U.S. Senators for every state or a state-based U.S. Senate in contrast to the population-based U.S. House of Representatives, and the Electoral College. More importantly, however, the Preamble which is the purpose clause of the *Constitution* more obviously *forces* a republic over a democracy, requires a constitutional amendment to operate America as a democracy, and gives truth, reason, and logic the victory over any idea or action to the contrary. For it's impossible to either credibly apply or make sense of the Preamble if America is operated as a democracy instead of a republic.

Finally, compromises between pro-democracy Americans on one side and pro-republic Americans on the other is the glue that keeps the Union together, provided the compromises continue to move America in a substantially more normal heterosexual or pro-republic direction, and far less in a pro-democracy direction, at all times. In fact, such compromises led to the adoption of the *Constitution*, allowed America to successfully grow as a republic until the *Kansas-Nebraska Act*, and are what Lincoln argued for throughout the 1850s. Furthermore, the Democratic Party's failure to respect America's identity as a republic by making such a compromise with the Republican Party, or the Democratic Party's adherence to incestuous homosexual culture, led to the Civil War and the end of slavery.

30. America fought the Civil War because incestuous homosexual Democratic Party leaders did not respect America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom, especially while interpreting the *Constitution*. Specifically, the Democrats abandoned the

spirit of compromise which is normal heterosexual culture, kept America growing as a republic, not as a democracy, and avoided trampling the *apparent* constitutional rights of the slaveholders as slavery walked the road to ultimate extinction. Furthermore, the Democrats' dominant strategy and mistake was abandoning truth, reason, and logic in favor of their selfish culture including institutional preeminence, which they unconstitutionally elevated above America's almost entirely normal heterosexual *Constitution* instead of first amending the *Constitution*. For, in reality, America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom runs with the *Constitution* until the *Constitution* is amended to allow for any other culture to significantly influence its interpretations.

Having given thus the history of *Slavery prohibition*, in this government, showing that it was originated by the founders of the government, applied in '87 [before the *Constitution* was signed – P.R.], enforced ever since, ingrafted in all the great North West States, recognized in the Missouri Compromise, endorsed and approved by all Statesmen up to the present day, and so rapturously lauded by Judge Douglas himself in 1849, in the extract read from his speech, Mr. Lincoln bewailed it as a descending from the high republican faith of our ancestors, to repudiate that principle [the spirit of compromise – P.R.] and to declare by the highest act of our government that we have no longer a choice between freedom and slavery---that both are equal with us---that we yield our territories as readily to one as the other! [in particular, the *Kansas-Nebraska Act* – P.R.] This was ignoble teaching. We were proclaiming ourselves political hypocrites before the world, by thus fostering Human Slavery and proclaiming ourselves, at the same time, the sole friends of Human Freedom.

Summary of Abraham Lincoln's Speech  
On October 4, 1854, in Springfield, Illinois,  
Given In the *Illinois Journal* of October 5, 1854

I suppose that Judge Douglas will claim in a little while, that he is the inventor of the idea that the people should govern themselves: [cheers and laughter]; that nobody ever thought of such a thing until he brought it forward. We do remember, that in that old Declaration of Independence, it is said that "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." There is the origin of Popular Sovereignty. [Loud applause]. Who, then, shall come in at this day and claim that he invented it. [Laughter and applause.][thus, self-government and the *Constitution* in general must be

understood in terms of normal heterosexual culture, the *Declaration of Independence*, and the circumstances that created the *Declaration*, which obviously preceded the *Constitution* – P.R.]

Abraham Lincoln  
Chicago, Illinois  
July 10, 1858

31. Contemporary incestuous homosexual public officials cannot determinatively protect Americans from the criminal behaviors of incestuous homosexuals, just like incestuous homosexual public officials in the 1850s couldn't protect Americans from the unconstitutional spread of slavery. For example, President Obama and other incestuous homosexual Democratic Party leaders favor unconstitutional gun control instead of attacking homosexuality which is the cause of all or almost all crimes in which a firearm is the weapon of death. As expected, these incestuous homosexual public officials intentionally place the entire American population at much greater risk of horrible crimes and tolerate horrible crimes instead of subjecting themselves to more severe criticism and harassment, or even ostracism, from other incestuous homosexuals for attacking the cause of the horrible crimes which is homosexuality.

32. Today's Democratic Party leaders and the Democratic Party's platform are worse than the pro-slavery Democratic Party leaders and Democratic Party platforms of the 1850s and 1860 elections. For example, "since 1968 more Americans in the United States have died from guns than Americans who died on the battlefields of all wars in American history". Furthermore, I believe that since 1968 at least almost all murders, and all mass murders, perpetrated by Americans in America, and in which a firearm was the weapon of death, were perpetrated by homosexuals, and all or almost all people who committed suicide with a firearm were homosexuals. Additionally, according to one source "from 2004 – 2013 36 people were killed in acts of domestic terrorism in America", and I believe all of the perpetrators were homosexuals. Included in that source's number are the following incidents:

"Knoxville church shooting (Tennessee) 7/27/08 [2 murdered]  
Pittsburgh police officers killed (Pennsylvania) 4/4/09 [3 murdered]  
Tiller abortion clinic (Kansas) 5/31/09 [1 murdered at a church, not at the clinic]  
Holocaust Museum shooting (DC) 6/10/09 [1 murdered]  
Fort Hood shooting (Texas) 11/5/09 [13 murdered]  
Plane crash into Austin IRS building (Texas) 2/18/10 [1 murdered]

Fort Stewart Army base killing (Georgia) 12/05/11 [2 murdered]  
Sikh Temple Shooting (Wisconsin) 8/5/12 [6 murdered]  
St. John's Parish police ambush (Louisiana) 8/16/12 [2 murdered]  
Boston Marathon Bombing (Massachusetts) 4/15/13 [5 murdered]  
LAX Shooting (California) 11/01/13." [1 murdered]

Also, I add to these incidents the Planned Parenthood Shooting in Colorado on 11/27/15, in which 3 people were murdered; the Oklahoma City Bombing on 04/19/95, in which 168 people were murdered; the Charleston Church Massacre on 06/17/2015, in which 9 people were murdered; the Unabomber killings beginning in 1978 and ending in 1995, in which 3 people were murdered; the San Bernadino party shooting on 11/02/15, in which 14 people were murdered; and the Orlando gay nightclub shooting on 06/11/16, in which 49 people were murdered. Furthermore, this is not a complete listing of domestic terrorism in America which was perpetrated by homosexuals.

More importantly, the dominant causes for so many gun-related deaths and acts of terrorism are the negative effects of homosexual sex and culture including the fact that homosexuals intentionally didn't tell heterosexuals about the participation of homosexuals, and the influence of homosexual culture, in criminal activity. Even worse, I believe homosexuality is the cause of the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Civil War, World War I, World War II, the Vietnam War, both wars in Iraq, and other wars in which America participated.

Therefore, the empirical evidence easily reveals that Democratic Party leaders and the Democratic Party's platforms over the last 50 years are worse than the pro-slavery Democratic Party leaders and platforms of the 1850s and 1860 elections, and just as bad if not worse than the leaders and dominant party platforms in at least many of the nations which America has gone to war with since 1776.

33. Homosexual, and heterosexual, Americans who united to fight an evil king hundreds of years ago are similar to homosexual, and heterosexual, Americans who are now united in fighting radical Islamic terrorists. For the evil king was an enemy of both the majority of heterosexuals and at least some homosexuals, just as the radical Islamic terrorists are an enemy of the majority of both heterosexuals and homosexuals.

Interestingly, fighting terrorists is one of the few activities that incestuous homosexual public officials share with heterosexual public officials in modern America. The dominant reason is that the condition of homosexuals, especially *incestuous* homosexuals, is so bad that incestuous homosexual public officials believe almost every other major issue they work together, or agree, with heterosexual public officials on will be detrimental to homosexuals and beneficial to heterosexuals. That is why incestuous homosexual public officials irrationally, absurdly, unconstitutionally, and

unpatriotically resist capitalism, realistic criminal justice, respect for human life, sensible immigration policy, and the Second Amendment.

Additionally, after the evil king was defeated the heterosexual, and homosexual, victors united once again to adopt the *Constitution*, and then drifted towards civil war with each other. Similarly, even though homosexual, and heterosexual, Americans have defeated terrorists in every arena, and in every battle, they've been drifting farther apart, fighting against each other in a civil, civil war in which each side realizes it must determinatively defeat the other to prevail in the fight for America's identity.

34. Interestingly, I believe that a public official who becomes substantially duplicitous while serving in public office either participated in incestuous sex for the first time or returned to participating in incestuous sex while in public office. Sadly, I believe many of these public officials thought that having sex with a close blood relative was safer and more beneficial in other ways than having sex with a non-relative. Nonetheless, once the public official participates in incestuous sex he or she soon learns what incestuous homosexual culture is about for public officials, including not being allowed to be as honorable, professional or conservative as he or she was previously. This requirement can be fulfilled by substantially changing one's opinion, or "flip-flopping", on tax policy, social issues, and 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment rights, and even switching political parties.

Also, I believe all examples of American public officials becoming substantially duplicitous involved incestuous homosexual public officials who were either non-incestuous homosexuals or *messed-up* heterosexuals prior to participating for the first time, or prior to returning to participating, in incestuous sex. Furthermore, I've also observed the same duplicity among public officials of foreign nations who I believe either participated for the first time or returned to participating in incestuous sex.

Finally, incestuous homosexual Republicans make their mad cow disease obvious by supporting the Democratic Party's *transcestite* agenda. Furthermore, because the *transcestite* agenda is so politically extreme, anti-scientific, and doesn't adequately reflect established truth, reason, and logic in non-institutional private society, I believe the public officials who support it are not only incestuous homosexuals but also *continue to participate in incestuous sex or participated in incestuous sex within a short time before they supported the transcestite agenda*. Furthermore, my belief is corroborated by incestuous homosexuals in both institutional and non-institutional private society who either still participate in incestuous sex or participated in incestuous sex in the recent past and whose ideology and behaviors are the same as or very similar to the incestuous homosexual public officials that support the *transcestite* agenda.

35. Some people might wonder how it's possible to determine which heterosexuals were induced into homosexuality as late as 2009. Thankfully, studying the public officials who I believe were induced into homosexuality around that time proves very informative. For it appears those formerly heterosexual public officials were predominantly if not exclusively *messed-up* heterosexuals. Furthermore, some of these messed-up heterosexuals had no earlier occurrence of homosexuality in their lives; however, they were obviously messed-up compared to normal heterosexual public official peers. Interestingly, some of these messed-up heterosexual public officials did not have good relationships with normal heterosexual public officials. In fact, in some cases the bad relationships between a messed-up heterosexual public official and his or her normal heterosexual public official peers was known publicly and broadcast in the news. Other of these formerly messed-up heterosexual public officials were incestuous homosexuals earlier in their lives but afterwards lived as messed-up heterosexuals for many years or decades before returning to homosexuality.

Also, the fact that these messed-up heterosexual public officials changed their political ideology and voting behavior *after* they were induced into homosexuality makes it easy to determine that they were in fact induced into homosexuality. Interestingly, this reveals that these messed-up heterosexuals who became incestuous homosexuals not only made big sexual mistakes but, even worse, also tried to make something happen, or get something going on, with their mistakes instead of returning to heterosexuality. In fact, I believe this indicates that the public officials were ashamed and embarrassed of their homosexuality, defiant towards heterosexual peers who no longer treated them as good as they did before they were induced into homosexuality, envious and jealous of heterosexual peers, felt like sissies for not making the sacrifice to return to heterosexuality, and tried to lessen criticism and opposition from homosexual peers for not being homosexual enough. Nevertheless, I believe the formerly messed-up heterosexuals who were induced into homosexuality as late as 2009, and who substantially and duplicitously changed their political ideology and voting behavior with respect to homosexual rights laws, the Second Amendment or other important issues, and in some cases even changed their political party affiliation, are in fact *incestuous* homosexual public officials.

36. Homosexuals are not supposed to criticize or punish other homosexuals harshly, which is one of the reasons why both incestuous and non-incestuous homosexual cultures are so dangerous. For it's not that the large majority of homosexuals want murderous incestuous homosexuals like Adolf Hitler, Saddam Hussein, and members of the Islamic State to win or that they don't care about the murders and mass murders. On the contrary, the large majority of homosexuals want those murderous villains to lose. However, the problem is that homosexuals are not supposed to punish other

homosexuals harshly or appear too strong to other homosexuals including homosexuals in foreign nations. The dominant reason is that they believe lesser punishment contributes to solidarity within the worldwide homosexual community. They also believe inflicting lesser punishment on other homosexuals makes it less likely that they'll bring harsher punishment upon themselves for their own bad behaviors, for standing out too much from other homosexuals and, even worse, for going along with what too many heterosexuals support.

Additionally, President George W. Bush both accurately decided and successfully presided over the war in Iraq. Sadly, what homosexuals in America and throughout the world wanted President George W. Bush to do with Saddam Hussein is similar to Nazi appeasement prior to WWII which was predominantly if not exclusively the result of homosexuals and homosexual culture and was the dominant cause of the murders of millions of Jews and killings of members of the Allied forces. Incredibly, homosexuals' desire for solidarity within the worldwide homosexual community extended even to giving Adolph Hitler and Saddam Hussein respect for being homosexuals. Furthermore, this illusory solidarity is also one of the reasons why homosexuals including homosexual public officials continue to criticize former President George W. Bush, especially for his successful leadership in the war in Iraq.

37. Homosexuals' opinions about 9/11, the second war in Iraq, and the successful tax cuts sponsored by President George W. Bush are proof of their homosexual culture and are symptoms of their "developmental disorder". That is, their intentionally irrational, absurd, false, and fraudulent opinions reflect their adherence to homosexual culture and their willingness to do or say what pleases homosexuals instead of putting America first by being truthful, rational, and patriotic. As expected, their developmental disorder is often a symptom of their fear of other homosexuals.

Stated differently, homosexuals including homosexual public officials criticized President George W. Bush's leadership partly because he is a normal heterosexual and didn't support same-sex marriage. Sadly, many of these homosexuals unpatriotically and fraudulently emphasized that 9/11 happened while he was president, as if he was partly to blame. Consequently, this is evidence that homosexuals are "staying in their sex"; that is, their political ideology is based upon pleasing other people who practice the same homosexual culture that they practice, *not* upon furthering America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom. In other words, all homosexuals are at least substantially following the culture that is particular to people who share the same sexual immorality, even when interpreting the normal heterosexual *Constitution*, which is obviously unconstitutional and defies America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom. In contrast, America's good-intentioned public officials fulfill their duties

without any culture *except normal heterosexual culture* having a significant influence in their decisions.

38. Many public officials, journalists, academics, and other Americans point to 9/11 as the day that modern America changed substantially in many different ways. However, modern America first changed substantially with the election of George W. Bush to the presidency. For his election victory was quickly followed by intense, constant, unpatriotic, fraudulent, evil-spirited criticism against him from homosexuals, especially incestuous homosexuals, partly because he is a normal heterosexual and did not support same-sex marriage. Additionally, homosexuals couldn't contain their anger that at the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, with the condition of homosexuals significantly worse than it was when Ronald Reagan was president, the conservative Republican Party controlled most of the federal government. Furthermore, homosexuals' criticism of President George W. Bush and the Republican Party increased after 9/11 because of the President's accurate responses to the 9/11 attack, his accurately deciding and successfully presiding over the war in Iraq, his positive popularity in the international community, the overwhelming success of the tax cuts he sponsored, his support for a constitutional amendment banning same-sex marriage, and because collectivist homosexuals, especially *incestuous* homosexuals almost all of whom supported the Democratic Party, had to indirectly give respect and support to Saddam Hussein since Hussein was a homosexual.

Moreover, homosexuals' respect and support for America's enemy included unpatriotic, inaccurate, immoral, fraudulent, *and consequently illegal* criticism of the Bush Administration's war policy and counterterrorism measures. In fact, homosexual journalists, public officials, academics, and other homosexuals chose to promote a fraudulent, intentionally wrong, and therefore un-American version of the Iraq War as the dominant means to attempt to detract from President George W. Bush's achievements and decisions. After his presidency ended, homosexuals directed greater effort to promoting a fraudulent, intentionally wrong, and therefore un-American version of the tax cuts he sponsored while president since the Democratic Party's anti-capitalist platform had by then caused the homosexual-caused Mortgage Crisis to become the Great Recession and homosexuals were consequently attempting to place the blame on conservatives.

39. The importance of the *Constitution* is evident when we consider that both homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals are the only people whose interpretations of it are routinely inconsistent with established truth, reason, and logic in non-institutional private society. Furthermore, I believe this is incontrovertible evidence that the *Constitution* is a codification of normal heterosexuality.

40. America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom includes the *Declaration of Independence* and the *Constitution*. Additionally, the *Declaration of Independence* has been an entirely normal heterosexual document since its adoption. In contrast, the *Constitution* was *almost* entirely a codification of normal heterosexuality at its adoption but evolved into an entirely normal heterosexual document *after it was amended*. Therefore, homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals cannot lawfully incorporate their cultures into public policy simply because they want to, or because they control enough government power; for they must first amend the *Constitution*. That is why if homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals do not have enough support to amend the *Constitution* then they must with good intentions comply with the existing *Constitution* and the rest of America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom. Furthermore, if they choose not to comply, then they have no legal right to exist in free society. More importantly, both homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals refuse to comply even after enough truth, reason, and logic that make their refusal irrational, absurd, and illegal have been openly communicated and established in non-institutional private society. Consequently, this means that America is now in circumstances similar to what it was in shortly before the formal beginning of both the Revolutionary and Civil Wars.

Additionally, it's not legally sufficient for opponents of America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom to state that they don't want to follow the tradition, or that they can't follow the tradition, or that they come from families that don't do what either normal or other conservative heterosexuals do and therefore should not be required to follow a normal heterosexual tradition. For regardless of the arguments they choose to hide behind they must either follow America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including the *Constitution*, or amend the *Constitution*, or immediately go to another nation which will accept them.

Practically speaking, both homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals must lower their aim from either destroying America's tradition of real freedom for the purpose of proving that their cultures are superior to normal heterosexual culture or from defiantly and casually seceding from America because in their opinions it's too conservative, to leaving America to live permanently in other nations that will accept them or to establishing separate nations of their own outside of America's boundaries. In other words, if homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals wish to lawfully stay in free society then they must either legitimize their cultures by amending the *Constitution* or abandon their cultures for normal heterosexual culture and consequently contribute to furthering America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including the *Constitution*.

Incidentally, another good reason for speeding-up America's and other nations' recoveries from the Great Recession, including with *large* personal, business, and

investment tax cuts, is that Americans who wish to continue following either homosexual or collectivist heterosexual culture will be much better off if they relocate to other nations which will accept them. The dominant reason is that it is unconstitutional for them to practice cultures which defy America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including the *Constitution*. Consequently, because these collectivists will never gain the support necessary to amend the *Constitution* they must achieve the monetary prosperity to facilitate their relocations to foreign nations.

41. I believe both homosexuals and many collectivist heterosexuals despise the fact that America's conservative heterosexual Founders fought hard and made big sacrifices to achieve real freedom, conquered homosexual and collectivist heterosexual enemies, and established a successful, beneficent republic and an almost entirely normal heterosexual constitutional system. Furthermore, the dominant reason for homosexuals' and collectivist heterosexuals' bad attitude is that they have not achieved such a mighty deed for themselves. However, since America's tradition of real freedom is so highly regarded by conservative heterosexuals, both homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals believe that at least ruining that tradition will accomplish something truly important for themselves including improving their lives generally. Obviously, this isn't true since they aren't at least striving to live as conservative heterosexuals. Stated differently, both homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals are trying to improve their self-worth and what conservative heterosexuals think of them by destroying something that is truly good instead of contributing to something that is truly good or attempting to build something truly good of their own.

42. Both homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals don't want to go along with the next logical step forward in America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom for various reasons. Some of them say they can't avoid doing what they're doing, or that there's no way out of the lives they're living, or that it's too late for them to change their family practices, or that they just don't want what conservative heterosexuals want.

In particular, incestuous homosexual Democratic Party public officials are still "hanging" to their extreme collectivist ideology and unpatriotic, subjective purposes like Judge Douglas and other incestuous homosexual Democratic Party public officials in the 1850s "hanged" to the *Dred Scott* decision. Furthermore, I believe the reasons are shame, fear, hatred of their own lives, and other destructive effects of their incestuous homosexual lifestyles including, for almost all of these incestuous homosexual Democratic Party public officials, participation in sexual assault and other abuse of minors. Even worse, tens of millions of collectivist heterosexuals, and virtually all of both incestuous homosexuals and non-incestuous homosexuals, continue to vote for them.

Therefore, because homosexuals' inhumane, subjective culture is the exact opposite of America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom, conservative heterosexuals are constitutionally obligated to humanely put homosexuals out of their own misery, for homosexuals will not do it themselves. Furthermore, despite homosexuals' irrational adherence to homosexual culture, the cruelty and indignity of homosexual culture conflicts with the very foundation of God-fearing conservative heterosexuals' sense of justice. Interestingly, in thinking about conservative heterosexuals' disdain for the barbarity, immorality, criminality, and inferiority of homosexual culture, and how that disdain is now contributing to the next logical step forward in America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom, I'm reminded of Lincoln's statement regarding conservative heterosexuals' disgust of slavery and slave culture in America:

In the course of his reply, Senator Douglas remarked, in substance, that he had always considered this government was made for the white people and not for the negroes. Why, in point of mere fact, I think so too. But in this remark of the Judge, there is a significance, which I think is the key to the great mistake (if there is any such mistake) which he has made in this Nebraska measure [the *Kansas-Nebraska Act* – P.R.]. It shows that the Judge has no very vivid impression that the negro is a human; and consequently has no idea that there can be any moral question in legislating about him. In his view, the question of whether a new country shall be slave or free, is a matter of as utter indifference, as it is whether his neighbor shall plant his farm with tobacco, or stock it with horned cattle. Now, whether this view is right or wrong, it is very certain that the great mass of mankind take a totally different view. They consider slavery a great moral wrong; and their feelings against it, is not evanescent, but eternal. It lies at the very foundation of their sense of justice; and it cannot be trifled with. It is a great and durable element of popular action, and, I think, no statesman can safely disregard it.

Abraham Lincoln  
October 16, 1854  
Peoria, Illinois

43. Conservative heterosexuals are not attempting to inhumanely force both homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals into America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom. For if homosexuals or collectivist heterosexuals fight a just cause, or have truth, reason or logic on their side, they too will further that tradition.

However, homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals aren't fighting a just cause and don't have truth, reason or logic on their side when they interpret the *Constitution* according to their cultures. In fact, in order to legitimately control or influence public policy both homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals would have to first amend the *Constitution* to make it permissible for the *Constitution* to be interpreted according to either or both of their cultures. As expected, homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals don't have the support to achieve that and don't want to achieve that; instead, they want to disregard America's normal heterosexual *Constitution* and illegally build upon normal heterosexuals' foundation. Consequently, that's what disqualifies both homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals from having a legal right to exist in free society. For America's normal heterosexual Founders fought for and created a very normal heterosexual *Constitution* and intended it to become even more normal heterosexual by including in it provisions that would achieve their intentions. In contrast, both homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals defy the normal heterosexual *Constitution*. Furthermore, if allowing homosexuals or collectivist heterosexuals to have a significant influence in the interpretation of the *Constitution* would either make normal heterosexuals incapable of furthering America's tradition of real freedom or make it substantially more difficult for heterosexuals to further America's tradition of real freedom, then homosexuals or collectivist heterosexuals are not following America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including the *Constitution* or respecting America's identity as a republic instead of a democracy.

Finally, regardless of a person's race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, nationality, gender, disability or income level, when that person interprets the *Constitution* it must be an interpretation that adequately reflects established truth, reason, and logic in non-institutional private society or that furthers America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom. In other words, all persons who interpret the *Constitution* must do so absent any culture that is not normal heterosexual culture. Furthermore, if they conflict with or defy normal heterosexual culture they're not legitimately interpreting the *Constitution* or following America's tradition of real freedom. Additionally, requiring them to follow normal heterosexual culture is not an overly-restrictive standard. For normal heterosexual culture intersects with the *Bible* religions and many other religions and philosophies; it intersects with all races and ethnicities; it intersects with gender; it intersects with all nationalities; it intersects with disability; and it intersects with all income levels. However, normal heterosexual culture is currently the only culture that can legitimately influence how the *Constitution* is interpreted and applied. Therefore, if any American wants a part of his or her religion or philosophy, race or ethnicity, nationality, gender, income level, sexual orientation or disability that does not already intersect with normal heterosexual culture, or is not already a part of normal heterosexual culture, to influence interpretations of the

*Constitution*, then the *Constitution* must first be amended. For conservative heterosexual Americans will not, should not, and cannot incorporate that part of any person into their interpretations of the *Constitution* since it would defy America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including the *Constitution*.

44. Inferior cultures including both homosexual and collectivist heterosexual cultures are incapable of securing the blessings of liberty to current and future generations of Americans as the *Constitution* requires. In fact, inferior cultures are only capable of immorally and unjustly securing *control* as an illusory means to an illusory end.

Furthermore, apart from humane treatment for all people, who did the normal heterosexual Founders include in the phrase "blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity"?

Homosexuals? Never.

Collectivists? Never.

Illegal aliens? Never.

Any other group that practices an inferior culture? Never.

African-Americans? *As soon as possible was what they intended.*

Women? *As soon as possible was what they intended.*

I am not, in the first place, unaware that this Government has endured eight-two years, half slave and half free. I know that. I am tolerably well acquainted with the history of the country, and I know that it has endured eighty-two years, half slave and half free. I believe---and that is what I meant to allude to there---I believe it has endured because, during all that time, until the introduction of the Nebraska Bill, the public mind did rest, all the time, in the belief that slavery was in course of ultimate extinction. ["Good!" "Good!" and applause.] That was what gave us the rest that we had through that period of eight-two years; at least, so I believe. I have always hated slavery, I think as much as any Abolitionist. [Applause.] I have been an Old Line Whig. I have always hated it, but I have always been quiet about it until this new era of the introduction of the Nebraska Bill began. I always believed that everybody was against it, and that it was in course of ultimate extinction. (Pointing to Mr. Browning, who stood near by.) Browning thought so; the great mass of the nation have rested in the belief that slavery was in course of ultimate extinction. They had reason so to believe.

The adoption of the Constitution and its attendant history led the people to believe so; and that such was the belief of the framers of the Constitution itself. Why did those old men, about the time of the adoption of the Constitution, decree that Slavery should not go into the new Territory, where it had not already gone? Why declare that within

twenty years the African Slave Trade, by which slaves are supplied, might be cut off by Congress? Why were all these acts? I might enumerate more of these acts---but enough. What were they but a clear indication that the framers of the Constitution intended and expected the ultimate extinction of that institution. [Cheers.][that is, that America would evolve according to normal heterosexual culture – P.R.] And now, when I say, as I said in my speech that Judge Douglas has quoted from, when I say that I think the opponents of slavery will resist the farther spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest with the belief that it is in course of ultimate extinction, I only mean to say, that they will place it where the founders of this Government originally placed it [in particular, subject to normal heterosexual culture in both the text of the *Constitution* and throughout America – P.R.].

Abraham Lincoln  
Chicago, Illinois  
July 10, 1858

45. Like conservative heterosexuals, both homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals have traditions and forefathers. Furthermore, homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals in contemporary America are following their traditions and forefathers just as homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals did immediately prior to both the Revolutionary and Civil Wars. Thus, conservative heterosexuals cannot be accurately criticized for being too traditional, old fashioned, or scared of change with respect to homosexual rights laws, immigration, gun control, and many other important issues. For both homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals are also walking the beaten paths, or in the footprints, of their traditions and forefathers.

However, conservative heterosexuals have a normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom to stand upon, which includes the *Declaration of Independence* and *Constitution*. That's why it's right to believe that if homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals don't abandon their traditions and forefathers and begin to follow America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom their lives will continue to worsen just as the lives of homosexuals and collectivist heterosexuals worsened leading up to and including both the Revolutionary and Civil Wars. Thankfully, since incestuous homosexuals have been exposed as the political leaders, or the political head, of all collectivists in America, it's not likely that both collectivist non-incestuous homosexuals' and collectivist heterosexuals' lives will worsen to the point of being on the losing side of large- or medium-scale bloodshed like their forefathers were on. Nonetheless, if they continue to vote for the Democratic Party they're still defying America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including the *Constitution*. Consequently, we can expect their lives to continue to worsen in other ways.

46. There is now a “safety valve” in America that did not exist in the years preceding both the Revolutionary and Civil Wars. Specifically, heterosexuals know, first, that homosexuals are quickly decreasing in number because they cannot recruit heterosexuals who are not their own minor children or other close minor blood relatives whose parents are homosexuals, second, that incestuous homosexuals are the leaders of both the Democratic Party and of political collectivism in general and, third, that incestuous homosexuals are worse off than any other group in America. Consequently, this safety valve substantially minimizes the need or possibility for large-scale armed conflict between collectivists and conservatives, in contrast to the circumstances among collectivists and conservatives that preceded both the Revolutionary and Civil Wars. Incidentally, ideologically-driven domestic terrorism and mass murders including the killings of law enforcement personnel in recent years are in fact the incestuous homosexual-led collectivist versus conservative conflict in very small scale. Nonetheless, it’s improbable that the conflict will increase to large- or medium-scale since both non-incestuous homosexual and heterosexual collectivists will not follow their incestuous homosexual, collectivist political leaders that far.

Also, partly because of the rapid decrease in the homosexual population conservatives will achieve overwhelming and irreversible political power on both the state and federal levels as early as the middle of next decade. This is aided by the fact that since the 2010 elections far more people have left the Democratic Party for the Republican Party than people who’ve left the Republican Party for the Democratic Party because of homosexual culture being exposed and because of incestuous homosexual Democrats’ disastrous monetary policies. As a result, the most important consideration for conservatives at this time is not how quickly will America be in another large-scale, deadly civil war. In fact, the most important considerations for conservatives are how quickly will conservatives achieve overwhelming political power, and how can conservatives survive monetarily until the time when capitalism is again having big, positive effects in America’s economy as it did during the Presidency of George W. Bush.

47. Contemporary conservative heterosexuals, collectivist heterosexuals, and homosexuals are following traditions that were followed by conservative heterosexuals, collectivist heterosexuals, and homosexuals immediately prior to both the Revolutionary and Civil Wars. Additionally, the very small-scale violence and bloodshed in recent years between citizens and law enforcement personnel are evidence of the traditions. For the violence is perpetrated by incestuous homosexuals, is ideologically driven, and defies America’s normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including the *Constitution*. Furthermore, conservative heterosexuals are not

giving in to the violence and death. The dominant reason is that they consider both incestuous homosexual Democratic Party public officials who are politically aligned with the evildoers perpetrating the violence and death, and collectivist heterosexuals who vote for incestuous homosexual Democratic Party public officials, as enemies of America's normal heterosexual tradition of real freedom including the *Constitution*. Nevertheless, neither large-scale nor medium-scale violence or death will occur because the political head of the collectivists, *incestuous* homosexuals, is exposed. Consequently, it's highly improbable that either collectivist non-incestuous homosexuals or collectivist heterosexuals will support incestuous homosexual Democratic Party leaders to the point of shedding blood, although they do enthusiastically and defiantly vote for them. Thus, the collectivist forces in contemporary America are determinatively fractured in some ways, which has resulted in a huge change in the traditions followed by conservative heterosexuals, collectivist heterosexuals, and homosexuals prior to both the Revolutionary and Civil Wars.

Put this and that together, and we have another nice little niche, which we may, ere long, see filled with another Supreme Court decision declaring that the Constitution of the United States does not permit a State to exclude slavery from its limits. And this may especially be expected if the doctrine of "care not whether slavery be voted down or voted up" [specifically, Senator Douglas's fraudulent, bad-intentioned application of self-government, popular sovereignty, or democracy – P.R.] shall gain upon the public mind sufficiently to give promise that such a decision can be maintained when made.

Such a decision is all that slavery now lacks of being alike lawful in all the States. Welcome, or unwelcome, such decision is probably coming, and will soon be upon us, unless the power of the present political dynasty shall be met and overthrown. We shall lie down pleasantly dreaming that the people of Missouri are on the verge of making their State free, and we shall awake to the reality instead that the Supreme Court has made Illinois a slave State. To meet and overthrow the power of that dynasty is the work now before all those who would prevent that consummation. That is what we have to do. How can we best do it?

There are those who denounce us openly to their own friends, and yet whisper us softly that Senator Douglas is the aptest instrument there is with which to effect that object. They wish us to infer all from the fact that he now has a little quarrel with the present head of the dynasty; and that he has regularly voted with us on a single point upon which he and we have never differed. They remind us that he is a great man, and that the largest of us are very small ones. Let this be granted. But "a living dog is better than a dead lion." Judge Douglas, if not a dead lion for this work, is at least a caged and

toothless one. How can he oppose the advances of slavery? He don't care anything about it. His avowed mission is impressing the "public heart" to care nothing about it. A leading Douglas Democratic newspaper thinks Douglas's superior talent will be needed to resist the revival of the African slave-trade. Does Douglas believe an effort to revive that trade is approaching? He has not said so. Does he really think so? But if it is, how can he resist it? For years he has labored to prove it a sacred right of white men to take negro slaves into the new Territories. Can he possibly show that it is less a sacred right to buy them where they can be bought cheapest? And unquestionably they can be bought cheaper in Africa than in Virginia. He has done all in his power to reduce the whole question of slavery to one of a mere right of property; and as such, how can he oppose the foreign slave-trade? How can he refuse that trade in that "property" shall be "perfectly free," unless he does it as a protection to the home production? And as the home producers will probably not ask the protection, he will be wholly without a ground of opposition.

Senator Douglas holds, we know, that a man may rightfully be wiser to-day than he was yesterday--that he may rightfully change when he finds himself wrong. But can we, for that reason, run ahead, and infer that he will make any particular change of which he, himself, has given no intimation? Can we safely base our action upon any such vague inference? Now, as ever, I wish not to misrepresent Judge Douglas's position, question his motives, or do aught that can be personally offensive to him. Whenever, if ever, he and we can come together on principle so that our great cause may have assistance from his great ability, I hope to have interposed no adventitious obstacle. But clearly, he is not now with us--he does not pretend to be--he does not promise ever to be.

Our cause, then, must be intrusted to, and conducted by, its own undoubted friends--those whose hands are free, whose hearts are in the work, who do care for the result. Two years ago the Republicans of the nation mustered over thirteen hundred thousand strong. We did this under the single impulse of resistance to a common danger, with every external circumstance against us. Of strange, discordant, and even hostile elements, we gathered from the four winds, and formed and fought the battle through, under the constant hot fire of a disciplined, proud, and pampered enemy. Did we brave all then to falter now?--now, *when that same enemy is wavering, dissevered, and belligerent?* [italics added – P.R.] The result is not doubtful. We shall not fail--if we stand firm, we shall not fail. Wise counsels may accelerate or mistakes delay it, but, sooner or later, the victory is sure to come.

Abraham Lincoln

Springfield, Illinois  
June 16, 1858