

THE UNDETECTED WAR TO DESTROY CIVILIZATION
ANOTHER OBAMA-CLINTON UGLY OCTOBER SURPRISE

by
James Roger Brown
Sociologist, Intelligence Collection and Analysis Methodologist

OCTOBER 20, 2016

Until now, those of us analyzing and identifying the evil enterprises ruining our lives, myself included, have completely failed to realize that we are experiencing a war to destroy civilization itself. We have failed to detect this, in part, because we have not been educated to feel an identity with or allegiance to a civilization. Our civilization does not even have the basic identity of a name, but it is more important than our national identity and loyalty. Civilization can survive the collapse of a nation, but a nation cannot survive the collapse of civilization. One of the critical processes that sustain civilization is the heterosexual family in all its variations. It is the basic unit for producing and educating new members of a civilization. I had this important insight about the ongoing effort to destroy civilization while attempting to write a commentary about Rowan County Kentucky Clerk Kim Davis and her refusal to issue homosexual marriage licenses.

Robert H. Jackson, Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court and Chief US Prosecutor at the Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal, established in International Law that every individual has the moral responsibility NOT to obey orders from superiors they know to be wrong or evil. As with the facts Jackson pointed out about how Nazis came to power, we have the situation in the US where evil people have knowingly infiltrated government positions to carry out the total destruction of the critical social processes that sustain civilization. (For some details on how this has been done, see the Congressional Evidence Book COMPENDIUM OF DOCUMENTATION OF ORGANIZED CRIME METHODS AND PROCEDURES INTEGRATED INTO STATE AND FEDERAL AGENCIES FOR THE PURPOSE OF POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC EXPLOITATION OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES THROUGH STATE AND FEDERAL CHILD PROTECTION, MENTAL HEALTH, AND SOCIAL WORK SYSTEMS.) Rowan County Kentucky Clerk Kim Davis did the right thing refusing to issue marriage licenses to individuals advancing the goal of destroying an essential social process of civilization.

The ruling in *Obergefell et al. v. Hodges, Director, Ohio Department of Health, et al.* is easily demonstrated the product of intellectual fraud, judicial fraud, and worse.

One dead giveaway was the failure of LGBT members of the United States Supreme Court to recuse themselves. Rendering a decision on the issue of LGBT marriage rights was a conflict of interest that violates both the Canons of Judicial Ethics and the ethical code of conduct for attorneys regarding engaging in improprieties. Just as in the case of former President William Jefferson Clinton, their respective States should revoke their licenses to practice law.

Judicial decisions are written using precise meanings. If we read the dissenting opinions in this case we learn exactly what is wrong and are pointed in the direction we need to go to correct the problem. One of the dissenting opinions in particular recognizes some of these problems and even an inevitable consequence.

“Although the policy arguments for extending marriage to same-sex couples may be compelling, the legal arguments for requiring such an extension are not. The fundamental right to marry does not include a right to make a State change its definition of marriage. And a State’s decision to maintain the meaning of marriage that has persisted in every culture throughout human history can hardly be called irrational. In short, our Constitution does not enact any one theory of marriage. The people of a State are free to expand marriage to include same-sex couples, or to retain the historic definition.

Today, however, the Court takes the extraordinary step of ordering every State to license and recognize same-sex marriage. Many people will rejoice at this decision, and I begrudge none their celebration. But for those who believe in a government of laws, not of men, the majority’s approach is deeply disheartening. Supporters of same-sex marriage have achieved considerable success persuading their fellow citizens—through the democratic process—to adopt their view. That ends today. Five lawyers have closed the debate and enacted their own vision of marriage as a matter of constitutional law. Stealing this issue from the people will for many cast a cloud over same-sex marriage, making a dramatic social change that much more difficult to accept.” (Dissenting opinion of Justices Roberts, Scalia, and Thomas, *Obergefell et al. v. Hodges, Director, Ohio Department of Health, et al.*)

There is an important revealing insult in this dissenting opinion. Note Justices Roberts, Scalia, and Thomas state “Five lawyers have closed the debate.” They did not refer to the majority as Justices. Here is the definition of “lawyer” from Blacks Law Dictionary online:

“A person learned in the law; as an attorney, counsel, or solicitor. Any person who, for fee or reward, prosecutes or defends causes in courts of record or other judicial tribunals of the United States, or of any of the states, or whose business it is to give legal advice in relation to any cause or matter whatever. Act of July 13, 1800.”

For those paying attention to details, the dissenting Justices are telling us this marriage “rights” ruling is the product of corruption of the Supreme Court by five lawyers acting under color of authority as Justices to advance a special interest, which at least some of them are members of.

IMPORTANT DETAILS FROM THE DISSENTING OPINIONS

(I strongly urge everyone to read all the dissenting opinions to *Obergefell et al.*

v. Hodges, Director, Ohio Department of Health, et al. in their entirety. There are many more substantive issues than I include in these important details.)

CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS, with whom JUSTICE SCALIA and JUSTICE THOMAS join, dissenting

“But this Court is not a legislature. Whether same-sex marriage is a good idea should be of no concern to us. Under the Constitution, judges have power to say what the law is, not what it should be. The people who ratified the Constitution authorized courts to exercise “neither force nor will but merely judgment.” *The Federalist* No. 78, p. 465 (C. Rossiter ed. 1961) (A. Hamilton) (capitalization altered).”

“The majority’s decision is an act of will, not legal judgment. The right it announces has no basis in the Constitution or this Court’s precedent. The majority expressly disclaims judicial “caution” and omits even a pretense of humility, openly relying on its desire to remake society according to its own “new insight” into the “nature of injustice.” *Ante*, at 11, 23. As a result, the Court invalidates the marriage laws of more than half the States and orders the transformation of a social institution that has formed the basis of human society for millennia, for the Kalahari Bushmen and the Han Chinese, the Carthaginians and the Aztecs. Just who do we think we are?

It can be tempting for judges to confuse our own preferences with the requirements of the law. But as this Court has been reminded throughout our history, the Constitution “is made for people of fundamentally differing views.” *Lochner v. New York*, 198 U. S. 45, 76 (1905) (Holmes, J., dissenting). Accordingly, “courts are not concerned with the wisdom or policy of legislation.” *Id.*, at 69 (Harlan, J., dissenting). The majority today neglects that restrained conception of the judicial role. It seizes for itself a question the Constitution leaves to the people, at a time when the people are engaged in a vibrant debate on that question. And it answers that question based not on neutral principles of constitutional law, but on its own “understanding of what freedom is and must become.” *Ante*, at 19. I have no choice but to dissent.”

“As the majority acknowledges, marriage “has existed for millennia and across civilizations.” *Ante*, at 3. For all those millennia, across all those civilizations, “marriage” referred to only one relationship: the union of a man and a woman. See *ante*, at 4; *Tr. of Oral Arg. on Question 1*, p. 12 (petitioners conceding that they are not aware of any society that permitted same-sex marriage before 2001). As the Court explained two Terms ago, “until recent years, . . . marriage between a man and a woman no doubt had been thought of by most people as essential to the very definition of that term and to its role and function throughout the history of

civilization.” *United States v. Windsor*, 570 U. S. ___, ___ (2013) (slip op., at 13).

This universal definition of marriage as the union of a man and a woman is no historical coincidence. Marriage did not come about as a result of a political movement, discovery, disease, war, religious doctrine, or any other moving force of world history—and certainly not as a result of a prehistoric decision to exclude gays and lesbians. It arose in the nature of things to meet a vital need: ensuring that children are conceived by a mother and father committed to raising them in the stable conditions of a lifelong relationship. See G. Quale, *A History of Marriage Systems* 2 (1988); cf. M. Cicero, *De Officiis* 57 (W. Miller transl. 1913) (“For since the reproductive instinct is by nature’s gift the common possession of all living creatures, the first bond of union is that between husband and wife; the next, that between parents and children; then we find one home, with everything in common.”).

The premises supporting this concept of marriage are so fundamental that they rarely require articulation. The human race must procreate to survive. Procreation occurs through sexual relations between a man and a woman. When sexual relations result in the conception of a child, that child’s prospects are generally better if the mother and father stay together rather than going their separate ways. Therefore, for the good of children and society, sexual relations that can lead to procreation should occur only between a man and a woman committed to a lasting bond.”

“This Court’s precedents have repeatedly described marriage in ways that are consistent only with its traditional meaning. Early cases on the subject referred to marriage as “the union for life of one man and one woman,” *Murphy v. Ramsey*, 114 U. S. 15, 45 (1885), which forms “the foundation of the family and of society, without which there would be neither civilization nor progress,” *Maynard v. Hill*, 125 U. S. 190, 211 (1888). We later described marriage as “fundamental to our very existence and survival,” an understanding that necessarily implies a procreative component. *Loving v. Virginia*, 388 U. S. 1, 12 (1967); see *Skinner v. Oklahoma ex rel. Williamson*, 316 U. S. 535, 541 (1942). More recent cases have directly connected the right to marry with the “right to procreate.” *Zablocki v. Redhail*, 434 U. S. 374, 386 (1978).”

“Shortly after this Court struck down racial restrictions on marriage in *Loving*, a gay couple in Minnesota sought a marriage license. They argued that the Constitution required States to allow marriage between people of the same sex for the same reasons that it requires States to allow marriage between people of different races. The Minnesota Supreme Court rejected their analogy to *Loving*, and this Court summarily dismissed an appeal. *Baker v. Nelson*, 409 U. S. 810 (1972).”

“In short, the “right to marry” cases stand for the important but limited proposition that particular restrictions on access to marriage as traditionally defined violate due process. These precedents say nothing at all about a right to make a State change its definition of marriage, which is the right petitioners actually seek here. See *Windsor*, 570 U. S., at ____ (ALITO, J., dissenting) (slip op., at 8) (“What *Windsor* and the United States seek . . . is not the protection of a deeply rooted right but the recognition of a very new right.”). Neither petitioners nor the majority cites a single case or other legal source providing any basis for such a constitutional right. None exists, and that is enough to foreclose their claim.”

JUSTICE SCALIA, with whom JUSTICE THOMAS joins, dissenting.

“....So it is not of special importance to me what the law says about marriage. It is of overwhelming importance, however, who it is that rules me. Today’s decree says that my Ruler, and the Ruler of 320 million Americans coast-to-coast, is a majority of the nine lawyers on the Supreme Court. The opinion in these cases is the furthest extension in fact—and the furthest extension one can even imagine—of the Court’s claimed power to create “liberties” that the Constitution and its Amendments neglect to mention. This practice of constitutional revision by an unelected committee of nine, always accompanied (as it is today) by extravagant praise of liberty, robs the People of the most important liberty they asserted in the Declaration of Independence and won in the Revolution of 1776: the freedom to govern themselves.”

JUSTICE THOMAS, with whom JUSTICE SCALIA joins, dissenting.

“The Court’s decision today is at odds not only with the Constitution, but with the principles upon which our Nation was built. Since well before 1787, liberty has been understood as freedom from government action, not entitlement to government benefits. The Framers created our Constitution to preserve that understanding of liberty. Yet the majority invokes our Constitution in the name of a “liberty” that the Framers would not have recognized, to the detriment of the liberty they sought to protect. Along the way, it rejects the idea—captured in our Declaration of Independence—that human dignity is innate and suggests instead that it comes from the Government. This distortion of our Constitution not only ignores the text, it inverts the relationship between the individual and the state in our Republic. I cannot agree with it.”

JUSTICE ALITO, with whom JUSTICE SCALIA and JUSTICE THOMAS join, dissenting.

“Until the federal courts intervened, the American people were engaged in a debate about whether their States should recognize same-sex marriage.¹ The question in these cases, however, is not what States should do about same-sex marriage but whether the Constitution answers that question for them. It does not. The Constitution leaves that question to be decided by the people of each State.”

As I wrote in *Windsor*:

“The family is an ancient and universal human institution. Family structure reflects the characteristics of a civilization, and changes in family structure and in the popular understanding of marriage and the family can have profound effects. Past changes in the understanding of marriage—for example, the gradual ascendance of the idea that romantic love is a prerequisite to marriage—have had far-reaching consequences. But the process by which such consequences come about is complex, involving the interaction of numerous factors, and tends to occur over an extended period of time.

“We can expect something similar to take place if same-sex marriage becomes widely accepted. The long-term consequences of this change are not now known and are unlikely to be ascertainable for some time to come. There are those who think that allowing same-sex marriage will seriously undermine the institution of marriage. Others think that recognition of same-sex marriage will fortify a now-shaky institution.

“At present, no one—including social scientists, philosophers, and historians—can predict with any certainty what the long-term ramifications of widespread acceptance of same-sex marriage will be. And judges are certainly not equipped to make such an assessment. The Members of this Court have the authority and the responsibility to interpret and apply the Constitution. Thus, if the Constitution contained a provision guaranteeing the right to marry a person of the same sex, it would be our duty to enforce that right. But the Constitution simply does not speak to the issue of same-sex marriage. In our system of government, ultimate sovereignty rests with the people, and the people have the right to control their own destiny. Any change on a question so fundamental should be made by the people through their elected officials.” 570 U. S., at ____ (dissenting opinion) (slip op., at 8–10) (citations and footnotes omitted).”

“Today’s decision shows that decades of attempts to restrain this Court’s abuse of its authority have failed. A lesson that some will take from today’s decision is that preaching about the proper method of interpreting the Constitution or the virtues of judicial self-restraint and

humility cannot compete with the temptation to achieve what is viewed as a noble end by any practicable means. I do not doubt that my colleagues in the majority sincerely see in the Constitution a vision of liberty that happens to coincide with their own. But this sincerity is cause for concern, not comfort. What it evidences is the deep and perhaps irremediable corruption of our legal culture's conception of constitutional interpretation.

Most Americans—understandably—will cheer or lament today's decision because of their views on the issue of same-sex marriage. But all Americans, whatever their thinking on that issue, should worry about what the majority's claim of power portends."

To grasp the magnitude of this corruption of the rule of law, we must also understand that this reverses a 139-year-old Supreme Court ruling and all of the subsequent Supreme Court case law. A marriage license has nothing to do with bestowing marriage rights. It only creates in government records the civil status of "married." With a firm grip on reality, in 1877 the United States Supreme Court elaborately addressed this fact in *Meister v. Moore*, 96 U.S. 76:

"....That such a contract constitutes a marriage at common law there can be no doubt in view of the adjudications made in this country from its earliest settlement to the present day. Marriage is everywhere regarded as a civil contract. Statutes in many of the states, it is true, regulate the mode of entering into the contract, but they do not confer the right. Hence they are not within the principle, that where a statute creates a right and provides a remedy for its enforcement, the remedy is exclusive. No doubt a statute may take away a common law right, but there is always a presumption that the legislature has no such intention unless it be plainly expressed. A statute may declare that no marriages shall be valid unless they are solemnized in a prescribed manner, but such an enactment is a very different thing from a law requiring all marriages to be entered into in the presence of a magistrate or a clergyman or that it be preceded by a license, or publication of banns, or be attested by witnesses. Such formal provisions may be construed as merely directory, instead of being treated as destructive of a common law right to form the marriage relation by words of present assent. And such, we think, has been the rule generally adopted in construing statutes regulating marriage. Whatever directions they may give respecting its formation or solemnization, courts have usually held a marriage good at common law to be good notwithstanding the statutes unless they contain express words of nullity. This is the conclusion reached by Mr. Bishop, after an examination of the authorities. Bishop, Mar. and Div., sec. 283 and notes.

....In speaking of the effect of statutes regulating marriage, including the Massachusetts statute (which, as we have said, contained all the provisions of the Michigan one), the court said:

"The effect of these and similar statutes is not to render such marriages, when duly solemnized, void although the statute provisions have not been complied with. They are intended as directory only upon ministers and magistrates, and to prevent as far as possible, by penalties on them, the solemnization of marriages when the prescribed conditions and formalities have not been fulfilled. But in the absence of any provision declaring marriages not celebrated in a prescribed manner, or between parties of certain ages, absolutely void, it is held that all marriages regularly made according to the common law are valid and binding, though had in violation of the specific regulations imposed by statute."...

We will not undertake to cite those which hold a different doctrine, one in accord with the opinion we have cited from 1 Gray. Reference is made to them in Bishop, Mar. and Div. sec. 283 et seq.; in Reeve's Domestic Relations 199, 200; in 2 Kent Com. 90, 91; and in 2 Greenleaf on Evidence. The rule deduced by all these writers from the decided cases is thus stated by Mr. Greenleaf:

"Though in most if not all the United States there are statutes regulating the celebration of marriage rites and inflicting penalties on all who disobey the regulations, yet it is generally considered that in the absence of any positive statute declaring that all marriages not celebrated in the prescribed manner shall be void or that none but certain magistrates or ministers shall solemnize a marriage, any marriage, regularly made according to the common law without observing the statute regulations would still be a valid marriage."

As before remarked, the statutes are held merely directory, because marriage is a thing of common right, because it is the policy of the state to encourage it, and because, as has sometimes been said, any other construction would compel holding illegitimate the offspring of many parents conscious of no violation of law."

Marriage rights are rooted in human civilizations that predate modern nation states. There are no LGBT marriage rights to point to in the long record of human civilizations, because no civilization evidently ever found them of any use in sustaining its existence. The marriage rights records of previous civilizations include polygamy, polyandry, and monogamy, but none for LGBT. Anyone who buys into the argument that being issued a marriage license bestows marriage rights is either a perpetrator or victim of intellectual fraud. Non-LGBT individuals who buy into the political movement that our civilization should be disrupted to accommodate fictitious rights for these self-indulgent anti-civilization subversives resemble the Jews who purchased tickets to get on the Nazi death camp trains. Remember that these are the same people claiming that cloning is their natural reproductive right. If cloning were a natural right, they would be

able to reproduce asexually and would not need a spouse of either gender. That would definitely demonstrate genetic superiority, but since none have that ability they must be genetically equal with the rest of us.

It is vitally important for all of us to understand the true anti-civilization political agenda of the LGBT movement. Molly Ball provides us with a politically correct summary in an Atlantic article “How Gay Marriage Became a Constitutional Right:”

‘The fight for gay marriage was, above all, a political campaign—a decades-long effort to win over the American public and, in turn, the court. It was a campaign with no fixed election day, focused on an electorate of nine people. But what it achieved was remarkable: not just a Supreme Court decision but a revolution in the way America sees its gay citizens. “It’s a virtuous cycle,” Andrew Sullivan, the author and blogger whose 1989 essay on gay marriage for The New Republic gave the idea political currency, told me. “The more we get married, the more normal we seem. And the more normal we seem, the more human we seem, the more our equality seems obviously important.”’
(<http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2015/07/gay-marriage-supreme-court-politics-activism/397052/>)

When I first detected that lesbians and gays working in the child protection system were falsifying evidence and engaging in other criminal activity to take children away from heterosexual parents and give them to gay “parents,” I called every national gay and lesbian organization that existed at the time. I asked them what their official position was on members advancing the interests of homosexuals by committing criminal acts under color of authority. The official position of all was that they knew nothing about the problem, however, after stating the official blurb one honest individual added that the organizations knew about the problem, but did not know what to do about it. Each and every one of these LGBT organizations were willing to remain silent while individuals committed criminal acts on an industrial scale which advanced their agendas. We have no enlightened self-interest other than to hold them accountable for trafficking children from heterosexual parents to LGBT “families” on a scale Adolf Hitler and the Nazi Party would have envied.

I have some really bad news for all of the LGBT national organizations, when your efforts to destroy critical civilization social process merge with the efforts of other anti-civilization groups and you succeed, LGBTs will suffer intensely without hope. No one among the survivors will have any sympathy for you because your selfishness has destroyed everything of value to them too. I have known both lesbians and gay men since college in the 1970s. All the ones I knew were concerned with earning enough money to pay rent, buy food, and find a good job, just like the rest of us. None of them were plotting the destruction of heterosexual marriage and other processes of civilization. The LGBT attack on all the processes that sustain civilization is the work of a minority consisting of Rainbow Diaper Babies and anti-civilization elite who financed them.

What you have done with your corrupt engineered “victory” at the Supreme Court

is shred the last fragment of rainbow bunting that concealed your anti-civilization covert political agenda to destroy “The cultural institutions which embody and enforce those interlocked aberrations--for instance, law, art, religion, nation-states, the family, tribe, or commune.” You can hardly deny that your collective goal is the destruction of all the social components that sustain civilization because it is a critical element in all of your various manifestos ([see links to various gay and lesbian manifestos at the end](#)).

Now, when ordinary people are shown details of your civilization destroying political ideology and agenda, they will know what you have been doing under the pretext of demanding a civil right. People will now also understand that the Supreme Court majority in this decision have moved from being Justices to active participants in an attempt to destroy civilization itself. When ordinary people understand the falsehoods you have perpetrated upon them, you will be more despised than ISIS, and deservedly so.

People will learn about your evil fraud upon the court by reading and understanding the four Supreme Court whistle blowing dissenting opinions filed by Justice Roberts, Justice Scalia, Justice Thomas, and Justice Alito in *Obergefell et al. v. Hodges, Director, Ohio Department of Health, et al.* (Here is the link to read them now, http://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/14pdf/14-556_3204.pdf .) If Justice Scalia has been murdered, I suspect it could be linked to his contributions to these four whistle blowing Dissenting Opinions.

What can we do to stop this? The simple solution is to enact laws that protect and sustain the essential processes of civilization in the way sedition and treason laws are meant to protect the nation-state. That is not possible with a Supreme Court containing anti-civilization subversives who would overrule any direct remedy to the problem.

We face a situation where anti-civilization subversives have infiltrated all levels of United States government from Child Protective Services to the Supreme Court and White House. We must identify, expose, and remove each and every one of them using crimes against humanity provisions. Based upon my interaction with some of the non-anti-civilization subversive LGBT members, I am certain when they are made aware of what these subhuman monsters are doing in their name they will turn on them like the rest of humanity. No one who currently enjoys the benefits of civilized existence is going to accept being forced to take up flint knapping or becoming a hunter-gatherer to feed themselves because some elitist LGBT psychopaths decided their unrestrained self-indulgence was more important than sustaining a state of civilization.

In our daily life the social processes that sustain nation and civilization are so co-mingled we cannot readily discern their separate existence. Although not comprehensive, the following list contains critical civilization sustaining social processes that can be documented under attack by one or more anti-civilization groups:

1. Common language

This is currently under assault in both Europe and North America. In what I call the Tower of Babble attack, “refugees” speaking many different languages are being distributed around European Nations and the United States in a manner to maximize language chaos.

2. National Borders

The numerous open border initiatives and groups are attempts to damage several critical civilization social processes such as common language, destabilize economic processes and employment, raise crime rates, disrupt expression of spirituality, disrupt public health, and disrupt political processes.

President Obama's mass importation and distribution of Muslim "refugees" throughout America are for the purpose of creating the opportunity for an initially bloodless Islamic coup. As no doubt planned and coordinated, these instant Muslim communities have been quietly electing their own government officials from within their community. All that remains is for President Obama to issue an executive order that all Federal employees recognize these Muslim community officials as the legitimate local government. That would instantly de-legitimize all current city, county and state governments. The United Nations or the numerous pre-positioned foreign troops already here could be used to enforce the executive order. At any given moment now, we are the time it would take President Obama to sign an executive order away from chaos and disaster. This simple possibility may shock many, including members of the United States House and Senate who have had their heads up their asses (sometimes one-another's) thinking something entirely different was going on.

3. Public Health

In violation of Federal Public Health Laws, diseased illegal immigrants are being brought into the United States and distributed among the general population with the knowing intent of spreading the diseases to healthy people.

4. Shared model and relationship to spiritual reality

Muslims are being brought into the United States and European Nations to incite religious conflict and violence.

5. Social education processes to teach language, technology skills, functional behavior and family rearing skills

Our current education system is being destroyed by the anti-civilization groups. Instead of being taught skills necessary to sustain civilization, elementary, high school, and college students are being taught to be racially divided, dumbed down, and regressed to immature infantile expectations and behavior instead of being turned into responsible adults.

One of the three Chinese Curses is, "May you live in interesting times." We live at a time when a cadre of evil scum sucking sewer fish are nearing completion of their efforts to destroy the critical social processes that sustain the existence of civilization and the related consequence of reducing world population. We can no longer grant them any tolerance or ignore their destruction of social processes necessary to sustain civilization. It will not be pleasant, but all the illegal immigrants in the United States or Europe for the purpose of spreading disease or any form of conquest must be removed and returned where they came from. In the United States there is currently a chance

completion of the current election cycle will solve the problem. If President Barack Obama signs his executive order for Federal Employees to deal with Muslim community officials as the legitimate government of the United States there will be one solution left to us and we will all need to act quickly.

For those inclined to argue President Obama would never do that, thugs were moved into several Middle Eastern Nations, given arms and declared by the Obama Administration to be freedom fighters. The same type of thugs have been infiltrated into the United States. Here in the United States Obama does not have to rely on the flimsy freedom fighter declaration. He can issue an executive order declaring them to be the legitimate local government. That should cause enough chaos to also justify him declaring a National State Emergency activating all his dictatorial Executive Orders already in place.

For additional details on the execution of plans to destroy the social processes that sustain civilization, as well as who the leaders and key persons are, read the documentation contained in the WikiLeaks election related email dumps from August through November 2016. There are addition supporting documents being released by other sources. Do not waste time thinking about whether or not you need to take action to protect yourself and loved ones. That decision was made for you when your name was left off the five hundred million designated survivors list that is the intended total world population at the end of this planned civilization destruction. You should take note that the concept of “designated survivor” in the context of a world crisis was placed in public awareness through a new television series this year. What a coincidence!

In searching for means to protect yourself from ending up dead, or worse, in a collapse of civilization, remember the principle “All politics is local.” You need to do what is necessary to ensure your municipal and/or county governments have effective contingency plans to maintain public utilities and infrastructure after a civilization collapse. If no one will do anything, devise a plan yourself and recruit others to help you if implementing the plan becomes necessary. (Most public libraries have free public meeting rooms.) Identify and expose all local lesbians, gays, bisexuals, trans-genders, illegal immigrants, racist leadership in other ethnic groups, and anti-civilization subversives in the education system who are participating in the destruction of civilization. You will also need to know their identities in case you are not killed immediately by the civilization collapse and local political issues have to be settled in the street or from behind rocks and trees like our Founding Patriots.

© Copyright October 20, 2016 by James Roger Brown. All rights reserved.

How Gay Marriage Became a Constitutional Right
Molly Ball

<http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2015/07/gay-marriage-supreme-court-politics-activism/397052/>

Why Does the Government Regulate Marriage?

<http://vigilance.teachthefacts.org/2007/11/why-does-government-regulate-marriage.html>

Common Law Marriage

<http://www.originalintent.org/edu/marriage.php>

U.S. Supreme Court

Meister v. Moore, 96 U.S. 76 (1877)

Syllabus

<https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/96/76/>

Case

<https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/96/76/case.html>

EXCERPT FROM THE FAMILY DEFENSE MANUAL (Contained in an earlier version of THE CONCISE FAMILY DEFENSE MANUAL)

by James Roger Brown

FEMALE SUPREMACISTS AND LESBIAN SEPARATISTS IDEOLOGY QUOTES

<http://thesociologycenter.com/GeneralBibliography/EXCRPTFAMDEFMANUAL.pdf>

Full text of ruling and dissenting opinions in *Obergefell et al. v. Hodges, Director, Ohio Department of Health, et al.*

http://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/14pdf/14-556_3204.pdf

LGBT UNIVERSAL ANTI-CIVILIZATION POLITICAL IDEOLOGY AND GOALS

(This is an extensive, but not comprehensive, list of LGBT manifestoes and statements of anti-civilization political goals.)

Chapter 13: Documentation of the Homosexual Agenda

The Homosexual Manifesto

1972 "Gay" Rights Platform

1993 "Gay" Rights Platform

The Overhauling of Straight America

List of Sexual Orientations

http://www.massresistance.org/docs/gen/09b/Redeeming_rainbow/chapters/Chapter-13.pdf

Gay Liberation Front: Manifesto

London, 1971, revised 1978

http://library.gayhomeland.org/0015/EN/glf_london_manifesto.html

GAY REVOLUTIONARY

by Michael Swift

[An accompanying statement alleges this was written as satire. The problem with this excuse is that the statement is consistent with the other manifestos and statements of political goals. Its validity is also supported by evidence of a LGBT rape culture from LGBT related organized crime in the child protection system and acts such as the outrageously heinous gay rape and murder of Jesse Dirkhising: "Boy's death spotlights bias in coverage of gays"]

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2001/mar/23/20010323-021726-9700r/>]
http://library.gayhomeland.org/0017/EN/EN_Gay_Revolutionary.htm

Gay Separatist Manifesto (1998)
by K6 (aka Kingsix)
http://library.gayhomeland.org/0007/EN/K6_Manifesto.htm

QUEER NATION MANIFESTO
<http://www.historyisaweapon.com/defcon1/queernation.html>

QUEERS READ THIS (another version of Queer Manifesto that is important for the clear reference to getting their ideology and political goals from lesbian ideology)

A leaflet distributed at pride march in NY

Published anonymously by Queers

June, 1990

http://library.gayhomeland.org/0016/EN/EN_Queer_Nation_Manifesto.html

THE OVERHAULING OF STRAIGHT AMERICA

By Marshall Kirk and Erastes Pill

"The Overhauling of Straight America" appeared in Guide Magazine. A few years later it's authors did expand it into a book:

Marshall Kirk, Hunter Madsen: "After the Ball -- How America will conquer its fear and hatred of Gays in the 1990s". (Plume, 1990), ISBN: 0452264987.

What is Wrong With the Gay Movement

by Lars Eighner

http://library.gayhomeland.org/0019/EN/EN_what_is_wrong_with_the_gay_movem_by_Lars_Eighner.htm

LEGISLATIVE DRAFTING AND STYLE MANUALS

1. Office Of The Legislative Counsel

U.S. House of Representatives

HOLC Guide to Legislative Drafting

https://legcounsel.house.gov/HOLC/Drafting_Legislation/Drafting_Guide.html

2. National Conference of State Legislatures

Links to State Legislatures' Bill Drafting Manuals

<http://www.ncsl.org/legislators-staff/legislative-staff/legal-services/bill-drafting-manuals.aspx>

HILLARY CLINTON CIVILIZATION DESTRUCTION AGENDA

1. Purported Poll Rigging Memo To Patrick Murray, Monmouth University Polling Institute

<https://fellowshipofminds.files.wordpress.com/2016/10/324776022-monmouth.pdf>

2. Purported Clinton Campaign Salvage Program

See page 7, Salvage Options (Recommendation & Alternatives), then pick your jaw up off the floor.

<http://www.rense.com/general96/hillaryagenda.pdf>