

Michael J. McDermott  
Ca License #235984  
7172 Regional #329  
Dublin Ca 94568  
Phone: (925) 548-3446 (No Fax)  
Email: [mjmlusa@aol.com](mailto:mjmlusa@aol.com)

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

KRISTIN M. PERRY, et al.,	)	Case no. 09-CV-2292 VRW
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	<b>MOTION FOR LEAVE TO</b>
and	)	<b>FILE AND PRO-SE AMICUS</b>
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO	)	<b>CURIAE BRIEF AND</b>
	)	<b>DECLARATION BY</b>
Plaintiff – Intervenor,	)	<b>MICHAEL J.</b>
	)	<b>McDERMOTT</b>
v.	)	
	)	Trial Date: January 11, 2010
ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, et al.,	)	
	)	Chief Judge Vaughn R. Walker
Defendants, and	)	
	)	
PROPOSITION 8 OFFICIAL PROPONENTS	)	
DENNIS HOLLINGSWORTH, et al.,	)	
Defendants-Intervenors.	)	

TO: THE PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

Please Take Notice that before the U, S, District Court for the Northern District of California, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California, the Honorable Vaughn R Walker presiding; Pro Se Amicus Curia Michael J. McDermott (CA Lic. #235984) now moves this court for an order granting leave to participate as Amicus Curia in the above captioned case in support of California Proposition 8, aligned with Defendant-Intervenor.

**1. Standard For Motion For Leave to File Brief of Amicus Curia**

Although there are no local rules directly on point, this court has broad discretion to permit their parties to participate as Amicus Curiae:

“District Courts frequently welcome amicus briefs from non- parties concerning legal issues that have potential ramifications beyond the parties directly involved or if the amicus has [“unique information or perspective that can help the court beyond the help that the lawyers for the parties are able to provide.”]” *NVG Gaming, Ltd. v. Upstream Point Molate, LLC.*; 355 F. Supp 1061, 1067 (N.D. Cal. 2005); (quoting *Ryan v. Commodity Futures Trading Comm’n*, 125 F.3d 1062, 1064 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997))

## **II. Identity and Interest of Pro-Se Amicus Curiae Michael J. McDermott**

I am a California Voter, native son of San Francisco and current resident of Alameda County, and supporter of Proposition 8 (Prop. 8). I had previously submitted a Pro-Se Amicus Brief to the California State Supreme Court supporting Prop. 8 and opposing the Misandry (Hatred of Men, Masculinity and Normal Heterosexuality) I believe motivates much of the attack on Marriage. I now believe it equally appropriate to do so in this Federal case in order to defend rights and viewpoints not fully represented by any current parties to the action.

I graduated with Distinction from the McGeorge School of Law in 2003 with focus on First Amendment and Civil Rights law, and was the founder and president of the campus Men’s Caucus. Like many who openly supported Prop. 8, I have been targeted for retaliation both personally and professionally, and feel the need to defend the validity of my vote and the benefit to the citizens of my state and the nation derived there from.

I believe I present a perspective not represented by other parties; particularly my familiarity with and long term opposition to what I contend is the Inherent Animus and Misandry of Plaintiff’s positions; especially those of the City of San Francisco, the

County of Alameda and (although nominally on the defendant side) the California Attorney Generals Office; as well as the ideological movements behind such animus.

### **III. Why Amicus Curiae's Brief Will Be Beneficial To This Court**

I submit that the attack on the validity of Prop. 8 is not just one involving social issues of the culture wars, but also an attempt to destroy basic rights to the Freedom of Speech, Conscience and Political Viewpoint as guaranteed by the US Constitution. Where other briefs by the Defendants side seem to focus on rebutting charges of animus, I believe that the real animus is found in Plaintiff's attack on Marriage and the Rights of the Voters. I further submit that my Pro-Se Amicus position fills a necessary function in addressing this gap and my input in to the process is necessary to a full airing of the facts and issues of this case, and thus ask the Court to grant my application.

### **IV. Conclusion**

I therefore request this Courts leave to submit my Pro-Se Amicus Curiae brief in support of my vote in favor of the great good of Proposition 8

Michael J. McDermott, Pro-Se Amicus Petitioner. February 1, 2010.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....4  
APPLICATION TO FILE AMICUS BRIEF.....1  
BRIEF OF AMICUS CURIA - INTRODUCTION.....5  
ARGUMENTS.....7-14  
CONCLUSION.....14  
APPENDIX (EXHIBITS, DECLARATION & PROPOSED ORDER).....15-19

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

United States Constitution: 1<sup>st</sup> & 14th Amendments.....1-9  
United States Supreme Court: *Torasco v. Watkins*, 367 U.S. 488, n.3 (1961).....4  
Federal Public Law: Pub L. 111-84, Division ‘E’: (2010).....1

**Supreme Court for the State of California & Government Code:**

*K.M., v. E.G.*: S125643 (2005).....7  
*Elisa B. v. Superior Court* ; S125912 (2005).....7  
*Kristine H. v. Lisa R.*: S126945 (2005).....7  
California Government Code: §8240-8246 (Commission on the Status of Women).....5

**Articles and Interviews:**

Interview with Theodore Dalrymple, [www.FrontPageMagazine.com](http://www.FrontPageMagazine.com)( 8/31/05).....2  
Jeffrey M. Barker, ‘Same-sex shoo-in’: Sacramento News & Review (4/28/05)  
[www.newsreview.com/sacramento/content?oid=35079](http://www.newsreview.com/sacramento/content?oid=35079)).....6  
Susan Bridle, ‘No Man’s Land’ An interview with Mary Daly by Susan Bridle (1999)  
[www.enlightennext.org/magazine/j16/daly](http://www.enlightennext.org/magazine/j16/daly).....9  
‘Lesbians Raising Sons’, Anthology by Jess Wells, Alyson Books (1<sup>st</sup> Ed. 1997); ISBN  
1-55583-410-8.....9  
‘The Physical Health Risks of Homosexuality’, by Alysse ElHage Family North  
Carolina Magazine—July/August 2007, [www.ncfamily.org/FNC/0707S3.html](http://www.ncfamily.org/FNC/0707S3.html).....9

### INTRODUCTION & ISSUE STATEMENT

*“Not merely the validity of experience but the very existence of external reality was tacitly denied by their philosophy. The heresy of heresies was common sense.”*

George Orwell, 1984, on the Thought Police.

The Attack on Proposition 8 is such an overt act of ideological thought policing, financed mainly by radical hollywood activists such as the notorious propagandist Rob Reiner, that it is worthy of the title of ‘Tantrum Theater.’ With the recent enactment of the most draconian ‘Thought Crime’ law in American history: Pub L. 111-84, Division ‘E’: *Matthew Shepard & James Byrd Jr. Hate Crimes act (2010)*, promoting imprisonment for using words alone to allegedly “Incite” parties unknown to the speaker to commit alleged “hate crimes”; the attack by the radical gender feminist / homosexualist alliance on the First Amendment has gained a powerful tool. Thus this legal attack on the very idea of Marriage as a heterosexual institution between a woman and a man, now portends using that law to punish those who dare speak such basic truths.

Marriage in our society is and always has been for members of opposite complimentary genders, meaning the immutable and inherited characteristics of birth that make us male and female; as scientifically proven by the presence of XY and XX chromosomes in every cell of our bodies. Further, All human procreation is Heterosexual, and every child has a Male Father and a Female Mother; and is created by the combination of male sperm and female ovum, regardless of the physical mechanics of that union. Thus the attack on Prop. 8 is an Orwellian pogrom aimed not just at destroying the term ‘marriage’, but an institution grounded in scientific fact.

The Plaintiffs want to use the Court to disenfranchise the voters in order to change the meaning of the word ‘marriage’ in furtherance of their radical political agenda.

Thus while the attack on marriage uses many pretexts as propaganda in support of their radical agendas, the overarching goal is furtherance of a Political Gender War against their favorite bogeyman of the hated 'Hetero-Patriarchy.' The arguments attacking Prop. 8 are a prime example of political correctness run amok to the level of destructive absurdity. This phenomenon was perhaps best explained by author Theodore Dalrymple in an interview in FrontPageMagazine.com (August 31, 2005), when he said:

*“Political correctness is communist propaganda writ small. In my study of communist societies, I came to the conclusion that the purpose of communist propaganda was not to persuade or convince, nor to inform, but to humiliate; and therefore, the less it corresponded to reality the better.*

*When people are forced to remain silent when they are being told the most obvious lies, or even worse when they are forced to repeat the lies themselves, they lose once and for all their sense of probity. To assent to obvious lies is to co-operate with evil, and in some small way to become evil oneself. One's standing to resist anything is thus eroded, and even destroyed. A society of emasculated liars is easy to control. I think if you examine political correctness, it has the same effect and is intended to.”*

Hence, a prime goal of the attack on Prop. 8 is not the promotion of alternate views on marriage, but the banishment of the prevailing view (as evidenced by the votes nationwide on the issue) as legally unacceptable. It is an entirely reasonable next step in chilling and destroying free speech on the issue to take what is already a semi official pogrom of punishing people who support Prop. 8 (in employment, government service...) and turn it in to a political thought crime leading to imprisonment.

I know of no greater threat to the liberty and free speech rights of citizens than the combination of mandatory pandering to the radical gender feminist / homosexualist agenda inherent in the attack on marriage, enforced through use of 'hate crime' laws.

The hypocrisy of these radicals claiming that an unthinking animus is all that informs those defending Prop. 8, is only exceeded by the campaign of censorship in service of political correctness by which they and their allies seek to forbid factual examination of the prime motivations for this unprecedented pogrom. There are many rational, reasonable, logical, fact based intellectually and morally valid justifications for rejecting the types of Behaviors and Agendas that inform and motivate this attack, including defense of the fundamental Constitutional Rights of citizens of conscience in service of preservation of the basic fabric of civilized society.

The alliance against Prop. 8 has two main constituencies whose common bond is the shared animus against men, masculinity and normal heterosexuality that is the essence of Misandry. That they have allies in all levels of government, media, professional political lobbies and particularly academia, willing to turn a blind eye to double standards in service of political correctness and viewpoint discrimination, is all the more reason for the Court to thwart this pogrom pushed through the attack on Prop. 8. In essence the goal is to force upon the public normalization of both a separatist / neo-extremist radical feminist misandrist pogrom directed against males, as well as promoting male homo-anal coprophile behaviors as equivalent to normal heterosexuality. This is the true core of the agenda of animus behind this thought policing pogrom.

**1. THOUGHT POLICING**

A. The First Amendment rights of citizens to speak out against the advancement of social evils is under attack like never before, and the war on 'marriage' is a war against speech and ideas totalitarian in nature and destructive in purpose. The attempt to use the Courts to try and force 'beliefs' on the citizens, including those identified by the U.S.

Supreme Court as “Secular Humanist” *Torasco v. Watkins*, 367 U.S. 488, n.3 (1961), is a grave threat to the future of the republic. Whether through direct punishment for alleged ‘hate crimes’ or simply intimidating the Voters from speaking the truth for fear of the consequences, the attack on Prop. 8 has shown the real nature of a campaign that seeks to brand itself as only concerned with ‘love’ - and yet acts out with such fierce animus.

Unable to sell their goods in the market place of ideas, opponents of heterosexual marriage now seek to force the electorate in to accepting a false and harmful equivalency, and by requiring that voters who know better must believe in an agenda that cannot stand up to unbiased public scrutiny by the electorate. Unlike the fable of the boy who exposed the fraud of the ‘emperors new clothes’, those who stand up to this misandrist fraud are being subjected to severe reprisals, particularly from those making a profit from the scam, much as the suppliers of invisible thread and cloth to the emperors tailors did. By enshrining the false equivalency of their agenda in to law, activist for radical gender feminist / homosexualist causes seek a weapon to silence those who would expose them.

## **II. EQUAL PROTECTION HYPOCRISY**

The example of government opponents of Prop. 8 who make equal protection arguments in their cause, are revealed as hypocrisy when compared to the double standards of misandry they support and promote (often with tax subsidy) where they wield power. The following are some prime if not exhaustive examples:

A. **The San Francisco Dyke March / Anti Male Hate Riot.** Every year since 1989 the City of San Francisco ‘hosts’ an annual takeover of the public streets known as the “Dyke March” (Exhibit #1), which although it refuses to apply for a permit or pay any fees none the less orders the banning of Men from the streets.



Despite the fact that it refuses to even mark the route in advance or warn citizens of the gridlock that shuts down a good part of the city, San Francisco now supplies tax subsidized police and transit services to this takeover, which boasts that it seeks to bring about “A World Devoid of Men.”

Such raw Animus could not be directed against other groups without causing considerable fallout, but in Frisco the level of official misandry is such that it is best describes as a public policy of BAMN BAMN – Bash Men, By Any Means Necessary. The self avowed “Separatists” who run the Dyke March are fully integrated in to the City Government, and represent a powerful interest behind the misandrist attack on Prop.8.

B. **Government Censorship and Discrimination.** By not only overtly silencing certain politically incorrect viewpoints, but of also providing tax subsidized forums for promoting only one point of view, government agencies throughout California promote radical gender feminist misandry. Granting extraordinary political lobbying powers to groups such as the “California Commission on the Status of Women” (created by Government Code Section 8240-8246), is a prime example of the mockery of equal protection that is the reality in this state. The statements by Alameda County board of supervisors president Scott Haggerty showing his vehement opposition to allowing an equal voice for male citizens (Amicus Dec. P-3) serve to highlight the hypocrisy in any claims of concern for equal protection these parties may make.

C. **Ignoring Attacks on the Voters.** The story of former Yolo County District Attorney’s office manager Gretchen Bender is also relevant<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Same-sex shoo-in: A gender-neutral marriage bill passes its first hurdle in the Assembly. By Jeffrey M. Barker, ([www.newsreview.com/sacramento/content?oid=35079](http://www.newsreview.com/sacramento/content?oid=35079))

Bender publicly boasted in an article widely published in the state capitol (Exhibit # 2.) of engaging in egregious acts of trespass and vandalism of election materials maliciously directed against law abiding citizens; and apparently escaped any sanctions from the State. Contrast this treatment to the official public statements of then Attorney General Bill Lockyer (Amicus Dec. P-4) supporting homosex prison rape for Males Only, and his continued leadership amongst ‘male feminists’ in the political party that controls the California Legislature. These few examples serve only as indicators of the pervasive institutional misandry endemic to California government, and the double standards they embrace that betray their public posturing about ‘equal’ protection.

D. **Discrimination against Children & Heterosexuality.** By attempting to create a suspect class with rights superior to all others, based solely on their choice to perceive themselves as oriented towards engaging in homosex behaviors, Prop. 8 opponents display animus to both the rights of Children and Heterosexual Males. Phenomenon such as the ‘Donor – Sibling’ registry ([www.donorsiblingregistry.com](http://www.donorsiblingregistry.com)) show the problems (ranging from search for identity to potential incest...) resulting from ‘anonymous donors’ and the legal elimination of male parents from appearing as real persons on birth certificates. Children deserve to know who their natural biological parents are, and the attack on Prop. 8 is a deliberate roadblock to thwart this normal and healthy aspiration.

This bias against equal protection for heterosexuality was demonstrated in the set of three cases foundational to the California Supreme Court’s marriage / procreation jurisprudence prior to Prop. 8, published together on August 22, 2005: (*K.M., v. E.G.*: S125643 / *Elisa B. v. Superior Court*; S125912 / *Kristine H. v. Lisa R.*: S126945).

Because Prop. 8 can now be argued to have invalidated attempts to Disfavor Heterosexuality in the law, and reaffirmed the equal protection rights of heterosexual males as opposed to ‘donors’, the misandry lobby is targeting it.

Indeed, even California Justice Werdegar in her dissent touched on one aspect of such violations of equal protection when she said: *"Although the majority denies that its rule depends on sexual orientation the opinion speaks for itself; The majority has chosen to use the term lesbian no less than six times in articulating its holding. Moreover, the majority prevents future courts from applying its holding automatically to persons other than lesbians. I see no rational basis, and the majority articulates none for permitting the enforceability of an ovum donation agreement to depend on the sexual orientation of the parties. Indeed, lacking a rational basis, the rule may well violate equal protection."* K.M., v. E.G.; Werdegar Dissenting at 6.

Even more telling of the attempt to instill misandry in to the law is the bizarre ruling in favor of holding males who engage in heterosexual behaviors to a different standard than those who Intentionally ‘donate’ Sperm at what are commonly referred to as ‘sperm banks (Aka - ‘dead beat dad’ factories): *"Usually, whether there is evidence of a parent and child relationship under the UPA does not depend upon the intent of the parent. For example, a man who engages in sexual intercourse with a woman who assures him, falsely, that she is incapable of conceiving children is the father of a resulting child, despite his lack of intent to become a father."* Id. at 4-5

Because it can be argued that Prop. 8 makes it clear that marriage is between a Man (XY) and a Woman (XX), all such ersatz attempts to create ‘fatherless’ children as a matter of law may now be open to challenge. This includes such bizarre double standards that say amongst other things, that fraternal twin brothers can have different paternity. Consider the case of a woman who uses a sperm bank to conceive one male (XY) son, and then later engages in heterosexual intercourse with the same man (the prior ‘anonymous’ donor), and conceives another male (XY) son – his fraternal twin brother.

The First Boy (who Inherited His Father’s Y Chromosome via intentional ‘donation’) is held to have No Legal Father – not an absent one or a deadbeat, but no legally existent male parent, despite the scientific evidence of his own genes. His twin brother (exact same Y Chromosome), because he was conceived by heterosexual intercourse, does have a Father recognized by law (even if the conception was unintentional), and that Man can be sent to prison for failure to pay support for this Son only, based on scientific proof of parentage from the same Y Chromosome.

Prop. 8 threatens to invalidate such insanely contradictory anti-scientific misandry, which is based on a hatred of normal heterosexual intercourse and not ‘love’ for those of the same sex, and which is a central factor behind the attack on Prop. 8.

### **III. MISANDRY**

A. **Radical Gender Feminist Misandry Motivates Animus.** Recently deceased academic icon Mary Daley was widely eulogized by the media and other prominent feminists for a lifetime of misandry. She is emblematic of many of the Prop.8 activists in her motivation by a fierce hatred for the “patriarchy.”<sup>2</sup> Like many others of her ilk she openly advocated an agenda whereby the male population could be reduced to 10% of less of its present level as a means of “decontaminating the earth.” Such views are not only widespread and popular in radical feminist circles, but also inform and motivate much of the attack on Heterosexual marriage, particularly given the popular radical feminist position that all heterosexual intercourse is rape, because women cannot consent to heterosexual relations under the yoke of oppression by said “Patriarchy.”

---

<sup>2</sup> Susan Bridle, ‘No Man's Land’ An interview with Mary Daly by Susan Bridle (1999) [www.enlightennext.org/magazine/j16/daly](http://www.enlightennext.org/magazine/j16/daly)

The anthology book “Lesbians Raising Sons” by Jess Wells <sup>3</sup> provides stark example of such separatist / exterminationist misandry in the Anti 8 movement. The book is full of stories ranging from denunciations of those who fail to abort male children as “Traitors to your species”, to demeaning male babies as “Pig Child” and the banishment of those who associate with them because they “exude maleness.” The attack on Prop. 8 is in large part the extension of such hate driven misandrist pogroms in to the Courts, where they have already found considerable success. These aspects of anti male animus are rarely discussed, but need to be part of the full debate.

**B. Forced Acceptance of Behavioral Equivalency.** By contrast another main thread of misandry behind the attack on Prop.8 is motivated by the demand for normalizing male homo-anal coprophile behaviors, and forcing the public to accept them as no different than heterosexual relations<sup>4</sup>. Although nearly three of every four new first time Aids cases in California are the direct result of homo-anal transmission, the campaign to censor those who point out the pathological nature of such behaviors and the harm from endorsing them is widespread and relentless.

By coupling the choice to engage in such behaviors with ‘marriage’, the intent is to force a false equivalency on the public consciousness, with even greater penalties for those who dare to point out the important differences than already exist. An analogy to the flaws in equal protection arguments made by such activists can be found in the rules for sound eyesight in order to get a drivers license, in that blind people may claim it is

---

<sup>3</sup> ‘Lesbians Raising Sons’. Anthology by Jess Wells, Alyson Books (1<sup>st</sup> Ed. 1997) ISBN 1-55583-410-8

<sup>4</sup> ‘The Physical Health Risks of Homosexuality’, by Alysse ElHage **Family North Carolina Magazine—July/August 2007**, [www.ncfamily.org/FNC/0707S3.html](http://www.ncfamily.org/FNC/0707S3.html). Writing in their 1989 gay manifesto, *After the Ball*, Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen, Ph.D., offered the homosexual community the following strategy: “In the early stages of the campaign, the public should not be shocked and repelled by premature exposure to homosexual behavior itself. Instead, the imagery of sex per se should be downplayed, and the issue of gay rights reduced, as far as possible, to an abstract social question.”<sup>[i]</sup>

unfair to have a double standard favoring those who can see, because some of them still get in car wrecks anyway. So to with the notion that heterosexual behavior must be free of similar pathological aspects in order to recognize its natural procreative value. Thus the attack on Prop. 8 is a deceitful attempt to use the Courts to normalize and force acceptance of behaviors that advocates have failed to sell in the marketplace of ideas.

#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

The plaintiffs seek to cast themselves in the guise of victims seeking to overcome oppression at the ballot box, by judicial fiat. The reality is just the opposite. They are instead trying to enforce their own radical political ideologies on an unwilling public by ever more draconian intimidation tactics, including the use of the Courts to thwart the will of the electorate, at least when they don't like the outcome of the vote.

The attempt by Plaintiffs to use the Courts as Thought Police, in order to push a radical political agenda that is rationally and reasonably opposed by a majority of the citizens, should not be allowed to succeed. Far from opening up any debate about the issue, destroying the vote of the electorate for Prop. 8, or using that vote as grounds for advancing the political ideology of the Plaintiffs, would have a deeply chilling effect on all manner of Rights to Freedom of Speech and Conscience on these important issues. The Vote of the Electorate in favor of the rational and reasonable position of Proposition 8 should be upheld, and the Plaintiff's case dismissed in full.

Sincerely,  
Michael J. McDermott – Amicus Pro-Se.  
Submitted 2/2/10 in accord with the rules of Court for N.D. CA.  
7172 Regional #329 Dublin CA94568  
[mjmlusa@aol.com](mailto:mjmlusa@aol.com) (925) 548-3446

**EXHIBIT #1: 6/28/98 San Francisco Dyke March - Anti Male Hate Riot. \*Note Lit  
Torches carried by self avowed Dykes in Daylight Takeover of the Public Street.**



6-28-98 EXAMINER/KIM KOMENICH

*A pulsing crowd takes over Valencia Street as part of the sixth annual Dyke March on Saturday night. Carrying signs reading "Death to the Patriarchy" and "Lesbians Moms Rock," the marchers chanted and occasionally stripped on the way from Dolores Park to*

*a massive street party at Castro and Market streets. "Guys are welcome," said Lisa Roth, one of the organizers, "but the whole thing is about saying this is when we do our thing, when we raise our issues." The event is part of The City's gay pride weekend.*

The actual quote by Lisa Roth is found in her follow up Letter to the S.F. Chronicle of 7/1/98, where she **Explicitly Bans Men from the Streets:** "Many thanks for running a great picture of the 6th Annual Dyke March on the front page of Sunday's paper, but I must correct an error. **I never said, "Guys are welcome." I said, "Guys are welcome to stand on the side and cheer" The Dyke March is a "woman only" event, organized by women for women and about women. As we said at our rally, the Annual San Francisco Dyke March is the best live girl show in town. We've got No Permit, no politicians, no corporate sponsors and No Men. We are fierce and feisty and fat and feminist.**" 7/1/98 Lisa Roth - S. F. Dyke March Organizing Com. / Damn Lesbians

**Women rule the world, if only for a little while .** By Ryan Kim, Chronicle Staff Writer. Sunday, June 27, 2004 San Francisco Chronicle. For a few hours Saturday night, Vicki Noble got a fleeting glimpse of **a world devoid of men..."This is what the world would look like if women ruled the world, which we intend to do,"** said Noble...

**Men told not to rain on parade Unity key to Dyke March; 50,000 expected at S.F. Dyke March 50,000 expected -- men not advised.** By Joe Garofoli, S.F. Chronicle Staff Writer - Saturday, June 26, 2004. A few simple rules are expected to attract more than 50,000 participants to today's 12th annual Dyke March through San Francisco: no corporate sponsors, no politicians, no permit to march and no men.

**Dyke- friendly guys are invited to cheer from the sidewalk** as marchers wind along a **still-secret route** through the Mission and Castro districts and points beyond. It's cutting-edge politics like this that has helped the march blossom... **The biggest donation was a \$5,000 gift from the city's Grants for the Arts.**

The same goes for calling it a "dyke" and not a "lesbian" march. Organizer Tina D'Elia said it's an effort to reclaim the word "dyke," long considered a derogatory term for lesbians... - it's become **one of the city's largest winked-at underground events.** **Though there are no official march permits, the city's police, traffic and transportation officials now plan for it...**

.....

#### **San Francisco Dyke March 2002 Official Statement**

This grass roots activist event has **neither a permit nor the city's blessing**, but nobody's worried: The parade draws women by the tens of thousands, and **there's nothing the city can do.** Unlike Sunday's official pride parade, the march has no corporate sponsors, no leadership hierarchy, and **no guys, save for the few supportive fellows cheering from the sidelines...** the **march is a return to raw, in-your-face activism... the crowd of women takes over the Mission Quadrant, with Dykes on Bikes leading the Charge...** The 2000 San Francisco Dyke March Website clearly states the requirement for Men to be allowed in the streets when it says: **"It's okay for men to march, but they must first complete two thousand years of evolution"**

**Exhibit #2: Same-sex shoo-in: A gender-neutral marriage bill passes its first hurdle in the Assembly.** By Jeffrey M. Barker, Sacramento News & Review ([www.newsreview.com/sacramento/content?oid=35079](http://www.newsreview.com/sacramento/content?oid=35079)) 4/28/05. Before the committee discussion had even begun, gender-neutral marriage was a shoo-in... **Enter Gretchen Bender, a self-described "poster child of the modern lesbian."** The 34-year-old Natomas woman is the chief fiscal officer for a branch of Yolo County government, is a mother of two and has been in a relationship with a woman for five years...

It was on a rainy day during election season, in 2000, that Bender became openly involved in the gay-marriage movement. As she drove down a street in Riverside, her daughter pointed out the many pro-Proposition 22 campaign signs. **"I jumped out of the car and started pulling the signs off the side of the road,"** she said. She collected them at home, where she **changed the "Yes" to read "No."** **Then she swapped out the signs on people's lawns** and on utility poles. **"It definitely put the community in a defensive stance** rather than in an offensive stance,"



DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF AMICUS BRIEF

I, Michael J. McDermott, submit this true copy of my Declaration to the California Supreme Court in its Proposition 8 case, as my Declaration in Perry V. Schwarzenegger:

1. I am a native son of the city of San Francisco and an advocate on behalf of the Civil Rights of this nation's despised and disposable Male Minority. I am also a 2003 graduate of the McGeorge School of Law in Sacramento, who has been summarily stripped by the administration of all my vested alumni rights; without charges, process or appeal, This was done in retaliation for reporting Threats of Extreme Physical Violence against me by a McGeorge Professor, sanctioned by the school's policy of aggressive viewpoint discrimination in favor of the same radical gender feminist / homosex political agenda that is also driving the opposition to Proposition 8 and promoting Misandry (Hatred of Men, Masculinity and Normal Heterosexuality) throughout the California Legal System.

2. In 1989 as a professional firefighter in Santa Barbara County CA, I was terminated as the result of a secret government run star chamber political vendetta, again based on viewpoint discrimination, in retaliation for recommending the establishment of a Commission for Men to parallel the existing Commission for Women, and having allegedly "*Written Letters to the Editor Expressing Negative Views in Current Women's Issues.*" Additional secret anonymous charges in the star chamber process included retaliation for attending open public lectures at the University of California, and during the Q&A Sessions daring to ask questions that angered the campus feminist / homosex thought police – who used their police powers to reach out in to the community and secretly complain to my employer in order to silence and censor me while remaining anonymous.

3. As a Men's Civil Rights Advocate I have long opposed the Unconstitutional Violation of Equal Protection inherent in the State and Counties subsidizing and granting extraordinary political power to Commissions for Women, while simultaneously Denying Equal Voice to the Male Minority. One example of this occurred on September 17, 2008, when I attended a government-sponsored session labeled as political appointments training - for women. The only other Male present was Alameda County Supervisor Scott Haggerty – who after boasting about their County Commission for Womyn said: "**I would Never Appoint a Man to the Status of Womyn Commission; that would Not be the right thing to do.**" Supervisor Haggerty then went on to state that He and the Rest of the Supervisor were Completely Opposed to allowing the establishment of any Similar Commission for Men and had been so for Decades. The hypocrisy of the CA Attorney General and County Counsels presenting briefs in this case claiming to demonstrate a concern for Equal Protection, is clearly shown by their own egregious Discrimination against allowing any such Equal Representation for the Male Minority.

4. The extent of Institutional Misandry pervading the California Legal System is highlighted by the example of former Attorney General Bill Lockyer while in office. During the spring of 2003 I attended a lecture by this McGeorge graduate during which he engaged in considerable Male Bashing rhetoric. After the lecture I asked him about his

public statements supporting Male Prison Rape as a Policy of the State, in regard to his public statements about a then un-indicted target, when he said: *"I would love to Personally Escort Ken Lay to an 8x12 cell that he could share with a tattooed dude who would say, 'Hi, My Name is Spike, Honey"*. Attorney General Lockyer not only confirmed this Official State Policy of Homo-Anal Prison Rape targeting Males as valid, but emphasized that it was only policy for Male citizens and did not under any circumstances apply to Women. When I asked him why the double standard against Men, he swore at me and walked away with his staff and supporters.

5. One of the most important educational moments of my life occurred on June 28, 1998, during the San Francisco Dyke March / Anti Male Hate Riot pictured and described in Exhibit #1. I was going about my business in my home town of San Francisco when, in the process of crossing the public street, I encountered the Misandrist Reality of the San Francisco Dyke March in the form of several Dykes on Bikes using their motorcycles as offensive weapons to clear the streets of Men in advance of the Hate Riot. I later learned from reading the story that accompanied the picture of these torch bearing hate mongers, as well as research on the internet, that these self avowed "Separatist Dykes" boast that they refuse to even apply for a permit when they take over the public streets and Ban Male Citizens. They even boast in Court Filings that this is as part of their pogrom to bring about their Misandrist / Exterminationist ideal of a **"World Devoid of Men"**.

That the leaders and legal establishment of my home town of San Francisco use tax money to subsidize this Anti Male Hate Riot, and turn a blind eye to the rampant violations of the law and the civil rights of the Male Minority it represents, simply illustrates the hollow and hypocritical nature of their briefs purporting to show such a great concern for 'Equal Protection'. Support for Separatist / Exterminationist Misandry is a mainstay of the Frisco political establishment, and a shame to the nation.

6. On January 6, 2008, I learned that the San Francisco Catholic Church where my parents were married, Holy Redeemer, was vandalized with spray paint swastikas and anti Catholic Hate speech, by those retaliating against the Church for its principled stand in favor of Proposition 8. As a student of history and particularly the fascist movements of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the use of Swastikas as a symbol of Radical Homosex Activism struck a chilling cord. Historical truth found in books like The Pink Swastika clearly highlight the connection between Homosex Behaviors and Nazism that gave rise to one of the most hateful Exterminationist regimes in modern history. The stark historical reality is that the Nazi Party was founded and run by butch Homo-Anal Coprophile Ephebophiles, such as Storm Trooper leader Ernst Röhm and his Protégé Adolph Hitler. The predilections that characterized them are demonstrated each year in Frisco during the Folsom Street Fair. Likewise, the Exterminationist Hatred they directed towards the Jews is echoed in the public demands of Dyke Marchers for **"A World Devoid of Men."**

7. Thus I find that the campaign of Anti Male Thought Policing and Retaliatory Discrimination that has come to characterize my home state of California is indeed reminiscent of the fall of Weimar Germany and its replacement with a National Homo-Socialist Third Reich.

