No. 14-8744

In The Supreme Court of the United States

In re: Gordon Wayne Watts, Petitioner

On petition for The Extraordinary Writ of *Habeas Corpus* (per Rule 20.2) to

The United States Supreme Court

2nd SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF

Gordon Wayne Watts
821 Alicia Road
Lakeland, FL 33801-2113
Phone: (863) 688-9880

Date: Friday, 20 March 2015

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

(Original Questions presented in petition on docket)

1) **Whether Due Process is implicated when an indigent *pro se* litigant who can not afford an attorney barred in This Court, as RULE 37 requires, wishes to have access to Redress This Court regarding participation as an *Amicus Curiae.***
2) **Whether Equal Protection is implicated when other, otherwise equally-situated litigants gain access to This Court to file 'Friend of the Court' briefs, as compared to an indigent *pro se* litigant who can not afford an attorney barred in This Court, as RULE 37 requires.**
3) **Whether case law, Common Law, and U.S. Constitutional Provision exists to support a basis for *Habeas Corpus* to issue to test this particular deprivation of liberty, namely lack of Due Process to access the courts, and Unequal Protection of indigent *pro se* litigants who wish to be a 'Friend of the Court' and participate in the Democratic Process of 1st Amendment Redress.**

(Supplemental Questions addressed in the Supplemental Brief)

1) **Whether the Justices would need access to proposed *amicus* brief in order to make an informed decision on the matter in the case at bar.**
2) **Whether *pro se amici* can potentially be helpful to the Appellate Jurisdiction of This Honourable Court.**

LIST OF PARTIES

All parties **do not** appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in The Court whose judgment is the subject of this petition (This Honourable Court) is as follows:

Gordon Wayne Watts, Petitioner, in the case at bar: “In Re; Gordon Wayne Watts,” “Petition for the Extraordinary Writ of *Habeas Corpus*, per RULE 20.2,” in Case #: 14-8744

James Obergefell, et al., Petitioners, in Case #: 14-556

Richard Hodges, Dir., Ohio Department of Health, et al., Respondents, in Case #: 14-556

Valeria Tanco, et al., Petitioners, in Case #: 14-562

Bill Haslam, Governor of Tennessee, et al., Respondents, in Case #: 14-562

April DeBoer, et al., Petitioners, in Case #: 14-571

Rick Snyder, Governor of Michigan, et al., Respondents, in Case #: 14-571

Gregory Bourke, et al., Petitioners, in Case #: 14-574

Steve Beshear, Governor of Kentucky, et al., Respondents, in Case #: 14-574

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COVER PAGE.....(Not Numbered)
QUESTION(S) PRESENTED.....a
LIST OF PARTIES.....b
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....c
INDEX TO THE APPENDICES.....c
OPINIONS BELOW: – N/A in Original Jurisdiction petitions such as this –
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED.....d—e

JURISDICTION.....1

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....2

ARGUMENT.....3—4

CONCLUSION.....5—7

PROOF (CERTIFICATE) OF SERVICE.....8—9

PROOF (CERTIFICATE) OF COMPLIANCE (2 certificates).....9

INDEX TO THE APPENDICES

Appendix: A – Testimonial from TheBlaze, March, 19, 2015 news item
Source: http://www.TheBlaze.com/stories/2015/03/19/she-was-raised-by-lesbian-mothers-but-this-womans-open-letter-reveals-why-she-opposes-gay-marriage/

Appendix: B – "Dear Gay Community: Your Kids Are Hurting," The Federalist (Mar.17,2015), referenced by TheBlaze, *supra*
Source: http://TheFederalist.com/2015/03/17/dear-gay-community-your-kids-are-hurting/

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

Cases **Page Number**

Bourke, et al., v. Beshear, et al., (No. 14-574, Cert granted).....(b)
Brenner et al., v. Armstrong, et al., (No. 14-14061-AA, 11th Cir., 2014, perfected, and held in abeyance pending the United States Supreme Court's issuance of an opinion in *DeBoer v. Snyder*, 772 F.3d 388 (6th Cir. 2014).....2
DeBoer, et al., v. Snyder, et al., (No. 14-571, Cert granted).....(b), 5
Georgia v. Brailsford, 3 U.S. 1 (1794).....d, 6
Grimsley et al., v. Armstrong, et al., (No. 14-14066-AA, 11th Cir., 2014, perfected, and held in abeyance pending the United States Supreme Court's issuance of an opinion in *DeBoer v. Snyder*, 772 F.3d 388 (6th Cir. 2014).....2
In Re: Gordon Wayne Watts (as next friend of Theresa Marie 'Terri' Schiavo), No. SC03-2420 (Fla. Feb.23, 2005) – denied 4-3 on motion for rehearing.....2
In Re: Jeb Bush, Governor of Florida, et al. v. Michael Schiavo, Guardian: Theresa Schiavo, No. SC04-925 (Fla. Oct.21, 2004) – denied 7-0 on motion for rehearing.....2
Obergefell, et al., Hodges, et al., (No. 14-556, Cert granted).....(b), 5
Schiavo ex rel. Schindler v. Schiavo ex rel. Schiavo, 403 F.3d 1223, 2005 WL 648897 (11th Cir. Mar.23, 2005) – denied 2-1 on appeal.....2
Searcy et al., v. Strange, (No. 15-10295-C, 11th Cir., 2015, perfected, and held in abeyance pending the United States Supreme Court's issuance of an opinion in *DeBoer v. Snyder*, 772 F.3d 388 (6th Cir. 2014).....2
Strawser et al., v. Strange, (No. 14-10313-C, 11th Cir., 2015, perfected, and held in abeyance pending the United States Supreme Court's issuance of an opinion in *DeBoer v. Snyder*, 772 F.3d 388 (6th Cir. 2014).....2
Tanco, et al., v. Haslam, et al., (No. 14-562, Cert granted).....(b)

Statutes and Rules

28 U. S. C. §2241.....1
28 U. S. C. §2242.....1

Rule 15.8, US Supreme Court.....2
Rule 20.2, US Supreme Court.....cover page
Rule 20.4, US Supreme Court.....1
Rule 29, US Supreme Court.....8
Rule 33.1(d), US Supreme Court.....9
Rule 33.1(g), US Supreme Court.....9
Rule 33.1(h), US Supreme Court.....9
Rule 33.2(b), US Supreme Court.....9
Rule 34.1, US Supreme Court.....7
Rule 37, US Supreme Court.....passim

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED (continued)

Briefs:

"AMICI CURIAE BRIEF OF FAMILY EQUALITY COUNCIL AND COLAGE IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS-APPELLEES AND IN SUPPORT OF AFFIRMANCE," in *Brenner et al., v. Armstrong, et al.*, (No. 14-14061-AA, and 14-14066-AA, consolidated before the 11th Cir., 2014, perfected).....4

"DECLARATION OF LOREN MARKS, PH.D.," page 20, in *Searcy, et al. v. Strange*, No. 11:14-cv-208-CG-M (S.D.,Ala. 2015).....3—4

Quotes:

George Washington, letter to Charles M. Thruston, Aug. 10, 1794: QUOTE, Source: Notable Quotes, http://www.notable-quotes.com/w/washington_george.html 6

J.C. Watts, former U.S. Representative for Oklahoma's 4th Congressional District: QUOTE, Source: Brainy Quotes, http://www.BrainyQuote.com/quotes/quotes/j/jcwatts465474.html 6

John Jay, former Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, *Georgia v. Brailsford*, 3 U.S. 1 (1794) Source: http://www.courts.state.ny.us/history/legal-history-new-york/history-new-yorkcourts.html 6

King Solomon: QUOTE, Source: Holy Bible, Ecclesiastes 5:8 (KJV).....6

Thomas Jefferson to Roger Weightman: QUOTE, Source: Library Of Congress, http://www.loc.gov/exhibits/jefferson/214.html 6

Other:

1 Bouv. Inst. n. 601.....1

Due Process.....*passim*

Equal Protection.....*passim*

JURISDICTION

This case is an Original Jurisdiction petition, authorised by RULE 20.4 of This Court, Procedure on a Petition for an Extraordinary Writ of *Habeas Corpus.*

The jurisdiction of This Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. §§ 2241 and 2242.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The 1st, 5th, 9th, and 14th Amendments of the U.S. Constitution are involved, and the Statutory (or regulatory) provision of RULE 20 of This Honourable court is involved and under review in this petition. Also, Common Law, as cited in *1 Bouv. Inst., n.601*, is involved:

“A l'impossible nul n'est tenu.” (No one is bound to do what is impossible.) or possibly: “The Law does not require that which is impossible.” *1 Bouv. Inst. n. 601.*

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner, Gordon Wayne Watts, who nearly won in court as Terri Schiavo's next friend in 2005 (doing better than both Jeb Bush and Schiavo's own family), and, more recently, was permitted by the U.S. 11th Circuit Court of Appeals to submit several *Amicus* briefs in 4 of their 'Gay Marriage' cases (*Brenner*, *Grimsley*, *Searcy*, & *Strawser*, cited in the Table of Citations, *supra*), filed a Petition for the Extraordinary Writ of *Habeas Corpus*, in the above-styled case, and cited (in said petition) case-law which shows that *Habeas* will issue to test the Unconstitutional Deprivation of certain liberties regarding submission of an *Amicus*. When clerk returned all 42 copies of the proposed $6^{1}/_{8}$- by x $9^{1}/_{4}$-inch 'booklet' format *Amicus Curiae* brief, which was "sought to be filed" and "submitted within the time allowed," Petitioner, by this time, experiencing "extreme financial hardship" due to Court Costs (service, printing, etc.), submitted O+10 of a Supplemental Brief in 8½- by 11-inch 'letter' format, under the *In Forma Pauperis* guidelines, which had a scanned image, in APX-D, of said brief, in order that Justices may have relevant facts at hand, and thereby be able to make an informed decision.

In support of this, Petitioner cited to RULE 15.8, and cited the actions of the clerk's "unexpected" action of returning the O+O+40 (i.e., forty-two) booklets as "intervening matter not available at the time of the party's last filing."

Since that time, however, Petitioner has discovered a newly-published testimonial which relates to proposed *Amicus:* Testimonial of a woman raised by 2 lesbian parents, published just yesterday, Thursday, 19 March 2015, on TheBlaze (APX-A), a website run by nationally-known talk-show host, Glenn Beck, an item which Petitioner would have included in his original *Amicus Curiae* Appendix, had it been available at the time, legally qualifies for an "intervening matter not available at the time of the party's last filing." TheBlaze referenced her testimony, on The Federalist (APX-B), which was published just days ago.

To that end, Petitioner is submitting a timely 2nd Supplemental Brief.

ARGUMENT

Petitioner, is keenly aware of the heavy work-load of This Court, and knows that The Justices, *themselves*, review every single filing, about 8,000 or 9,000 of which come to This Noble Court, each year—and then discuss it both with their clerks, as well as amongst themselves. Therefore, he is VERY reluctant to file *any* additional matter**;** however**,** the new find "puts teeth" to the 'bite of truth' elucidated in 'dull' scientific studies, cited in his *Amicus Curiae* brief.

The "intervening matter not available at the time of the party's last filing," in this case, is a testimonial by a woman raised by 2 lesbian parents. *It, in essence, shows that '**both** sides" are **wrong** insofar as they go to extremes:*

The anti-gay 'extremists,' who oppose any and all Gay Marriage, run afoul of Equal Protection, since this testimony shows that gay parents CAN be fine parents for adoption.

The 'Gay Marriage' advocates, on the other hand, are *also* wrong to assert that 'Gay Marriage' is of the same quality as 'Traditional Marriage' rearing of children.

In the "*AMICUS CURIAE* BRIEF OF GORDON WAYNE WATTS, IN SUPPORT OF NEITHER PARTY: FAVOURS STATES' LAWS, BUT SUPPORTIVE OF MANY PETITIONER GRIEVANCES," which is sought to be filed under *Habeas* relief, in the case at bar, Petitioner cites the "DECLARATION OF LOREN MARKS, PH.D.," page 20, in *Searcy, et al. v. Strange*, No. 11:14-cv-208-CG-M (S.D.,Ala. 2015), where a small, but statistically-significant, group of children were compared, and all things being equal, married couples had the best development from objective teacher reports (and not biased parental reporting), and next, singles, and lastly, homosexual rearing.

In essence, since both the science, as well as what we see with our eyes, tells us that singles are, on average, less fit to adopt & rear, then we know that "preferences" to married couples is not "prejudice," but rather "legal distinction" for a "compelling state interest." Therefore, it is instructive to view the testimonial (APX-A; APX-B) ***in pari materia*** with Dr. Marks' study**:**

Indeed, the testimony of this woman, alone, would not have scientific backing. On the other hand, with the study alone, we would lack a “word-picture” testimony, and a “picture is worth a 1,000 words.” Therefore, Petitioner submits this newly-discovered testimonial in the appendices.

In order to be fair, however, here is *opposing* testimonial from “AMICI CURIAE BRIEF OF FAMILY EQUALITY COUNCIL AND COLAGE IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS-APPELLEES AND IN SUPPORT OF AFFIRMANCE,” in Nos. 14-14061-AA, 14-14066-AA, the consolidated *Brenner* cases in the recent 11th Cir,. Cases, in which Petitioner, Gordon Watts, was an opposing *amicus*:

> “Eleven-year-old J.A.B.-M.from Fort Lauderdale describes her family as no different from different-sex-parented families:
>
> > My family is like any other family. We play games, we take care of each other, we talk, and we enjoy our rescue puppy, Tippy. In the morning, my dads wake me up and make me a school lunch. At night, my dads tuck me in. In between, they help me study, they do my laundry, they work to support me, and they show me unconditional love (and, as Mr. Peabody might say, “I have a deep regard for them,too”).”

So, it is obvious, when there is opposing testimonial (which there is), it is needful to view both of them, in context, but also *in pari materia* with the actual scientific research. Since Dr. Marks' study compared otherwise similar families, then “confounding factors” were avoided, and this makes the research accurate. The Petitioner, Gordon Wayne Watts, who graduated with honours from The Florida State University, with a double-major, **with honours,** in the hard sciences, is qualified to make this assessment, but Petitioner asks that This Court not take his word, but rather, verify and claims made herewith.

CONCLUSION

When Justices & clerks review Watts' *Habeas* Petition & two (2) Supplemental Briefs (which include scanned images of a proposed *Amicus Curiae* brief sought to be filed, and newly-discovered testimonial, *infra*), they'll discover one very disturbing fact**:** Lawyers on both sides (Petitioners and Respondents) all fail to propose a solution that would be acceptable to both sides.

That is why Petitioner, Gordon Watts' *Amicus* brief is necessary**:**

> **Rule 37. Brief for an *Amicus Curiae***
> 1. An *amicus curiae* brief that brings to the attention of the Court **relevant matter** not already brought to its attention by the parties may be of considerable help to the Court.

Petitioners (*Obergefell, et al.*) rightly make complaints of mistreatment against gays, but propose solutions that open the door, under Equal Protection, to polygamous plural marriage—and have other ill side-effects. Respondents, on the other hand, rightly defend 'traditional' marriage**, but Respondents make two (2) key errors:** First, they omit "relevant matter" in defense of the definition of marriage, which is found in Watts' *Amicus Curiae* brief**:** several arguments that haven't been used (or, if used, used poorly). Watts' *Amicus Curiae* brief is short enough that enumeration of arguments won't be done here but merely incorporated by reference. Secondly, Respondents don't offer solutions to legitimate complaints of Gay Rights advocates, much less ones that do so without changing the definition of marriage as 1-man and 1-woman. **Gay people are people, too,** and need to be shown solutions which will "work for both sides," as described in Watts' *Amicus* sought to be filed. This Court's Justices (and many others) have said that citizens have "no automatic right" to review by This Court, since removal of automatic appellate jurisdiction—which would imply that Watts' request to file an *Amicus* brief is not a 'right'. That is *almost* correct—but not quite correct**:** in *DeBoer*, since both sides have granted 'blanket consent' to *Amici*, then **any** person "rich" enough to afford a SCOTUS-barred attorney WILL have automatic acceptance of their brief. **That would imply that "money can buy access to the Court."** ***Is that true?***

Petitioner, Watts, **not only** is too poor to pay what lawyers demand (one lawyer said she'd file an *Amicus* for $50,000.oo–not a penny less), **but moreover,** he isn't "connected" to the "in crowd." **Lastly,** since his proposed *Amicus Curiae* brief "takes hard shots" at both sides (Petitioners and Respondents), it's next to impossible to find an attorney willing to alienate political friends on "this" or "that" side. Constitutional Forefathers (both contemporary and ancient) agree that the poor citizens should not be oppressed—or denied Justice:

> "Justice is indiscriminately due to all, **without regard to numbers, wealth, or rank.**" (**Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court John Jay**, *Georgia v. Brailsford*, 3 U.S. 1 (1794)) Source: http://www.courts.state.ny.us/history/legal-history-new-york/history-new-york-courts.html
>
> "[T]he mass of mankind has not been born with saddles on their backs, **nor a favored few booted and spurred,** ready to ride them legitimately, by the grace of [G]od." (**Thomas Jefferson** to Roger Weightman) Source: http://www.loc.gov/exhibits/jefferson/214.html
>
> **"Truth** will ultimately prevail where there is pains taken to bring it to light." (**George Washington,** letter to Charles M. Thruston, Aug. 10, 1794) Source: http://www.notable-quotes.com/w/washington_george.html
>
> "**If thou seest the oppression of the poor**, and violent perverting of judgment and justice in a province, marvel not at the matter: for he that is higher than the highest regardeth; and there be higher than they." (**King Solomon**) Source: Ecclesiastes 5:8 (KJV), Holy Bible
>
> "I'm not one that believes that affirmative action should be based on one's skin color or one's gender, I think it should be done based on one's need, **because I think if you are from a poor white community, I think that poor white kid needs a scholarship just as badly as a poor black kid." (J.C. Watts,** former U.S. Representative for Oklahoma's 4th Congressional District) Source; http://www.BrainyQuote.com/quotes/quotes/j/jcwatts465474.html

As Washington has said, truth ultimately prevails, even if Petitioner isn't one of wealth, favor, rank, or power. We must heed the words of Justice John Jay, Thomas Jefferson & other Founding Fathers throughout history**:** we mustn't deny Court Access, simply because Petitioner is unable to "buy access" with an attorney barred in This Court**:** Due Process demands access, and Equal Protection demands that, if his *Amicus* is "in compliance," it should be treated 'Equally' as those of other, *richer*, litigants.

Petitioner has identified a problem**:** RULE 37.1, (which restricts access as follows**:** "An *amicus curiae* brief may be filed only by an attorney admitted to practice before this Court as provided in Rule 5.") is clearly Unconstitutional. Since he is complaining, the burden to propose a solution *first* falls upon him. **Proposed Solution:** *Short-term*, the *Habeas* Writ, requested here, should be granted. *Long-term*, RULE 37.1 needs to be tweaked or revised, to come into compliance with other rules governing *pro se* litigation (and come into compliance with the US Constitution). Perhaps, "The Gordon Rule" would suffice**:** any prospective *Amicus Curiae* to This Court, who is not an attorney admitted to This Court's bar, could be required to **meet *or exceed*** the level of excellence demonstrated in filings of Petitioner, Gordon Wayne Watts, *pro se*, in the case at bar. Since This Honourable Court surely does not intend to allow a Rule to stand which, in essence, says "Money can buy access to This Court," we are sure that This Court will *speedily* answer the following prayer in The Affirmative**:**

Therefore, Petitioner respectfully prays This Court, for good cause, to issue "all writs necessary" to aid your jurisdiction—including, of course, this writ.

Respectfully submitted, **Date: Friday, 20 March 2015**

Gordon Wayne Watts, *Amicus Curiae**
http://GordonWatts.com / http://GordonWayneWatts.com
821 Alicia Road, Lakeland, Florida 33801-2113
H: (863) 688-9880 ; W: 863-686-3411 ; 863-687-6141
E-mail: gww1210@aol.com ; gww1210@gmail.com

s/ _____

Gordon W. Watts, PRO SE / PRO PER, *in persona propia*

* Watts, acting counsel of record, is not a lawyer. Per RULE 34.1(f), Watts, appearing *pro se*, is listed.

No. 14-8744

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

In re: Gordon Wayne Watts — PETITIONER

PROOF (CERTIFICATE) OF SERVICE

I, Gordon Wayne Watts, do swear or declare that on this date, FRIDAY, the 20th day of March 2015, as required by Supreme Court Rule 29, I have served the enclosed 2nd-SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF on each party to the above proceeding or that party's counsel, and on every other person required to be served, by depositing an envelope containing the above documents in the United States mail properly addressed to each of them and with first-class postage prepaid, or by delivery to a third-party commercial carrier for delivery within 3 calendar days.

The names and addresses of those served are as follows:

• Supreme Court of the United States, 1 First Street, N.E., Washington, DC 20543, ATTN: Clerk of the Court, (202) 479-3011, MeritsBriefs@SupremeCourt.gov

• Alphonse A. Gerhardstein, Counsel of Record for James Obergefell, et al., c/o: Gerhardstein & Branch Co. LPA, 432 Walnut St., Suite 400, Cincinnati, OH 45202, (513) 621-9100, AGerhardstein@GBLfirm.com

• Eric E. Murphy, Counsel of Record for Richard Hodges, Director, Ohio Department of Health, et al., c/o: State Solicitor, Office of the Attorney General, 30 East Broad Street, 17th Fl., Columbus, OH 43215-3428, (614) 466-8980, Eric.Murphy@OhioAttorneyGeneral.gov

• Douglas Hallward-Driemeier, Counsel of Record, Valeria Tanco, et al., c/o: Ropes & Gray LLP, 700 12th Street, N.W., Suite 900, Washington, DC 20005, (202) 508-4776, Douglas.Hallward-Driemeier@RopesGray.com

• Joseph F. Whalen, Counsel of Record, Associate Solicitor General, Office of the Attorney General, 425 Fifth Avenue North, Nashville, TN 37243, (615) 741-3499, Joe.Whalen@ag.tn.gov

• Carole M. Stanyar, Counsel of Record, for April DeBoer, et al., 221 N. Main Street, Suite 300, Ann Arbor, MI 48104, (313) 819-3953, CStanyar@wowway.com

• Aaron D. Lindstrom, Counsel of Record, Solicitor General, Michigan Department of Attorney General, P.O. Box 30212, Lansing, MI 48909, (517) 373-1124, LindstromA@Michigan.gov

• Daniel J. Canon, Counsel of Record, Gregory Bourke, et al., c/o: Clay Daniel Walton Adams, PLC, 101 Meidinger Tower, 462 South 4th Street, Louisville, KY 40202, (502) 561-2005 x216, Dan@JusticeKY.com

• Leigh Gross Latherow, Counsel of Record, Steve Beshear, Governor of Kentucky, c/o: VanAntwerp, Monge, Jones, Edwards & McCann, LLP, P.O. Box 1111, Ashland, KY 41105, (606) 329-2929, LLatherow@vmje.com

Furthermore, I hereby certify that, contemporaneous to my service by FedEx 3rd-party commercial carrier and/or USPS, I am also serving all parties, ***and all known amici*****,** by email—and possibly also the court, if it is permitted protocol.

Also, I hereby certify that, in addition to the foregoing and in addition to any availability of my brief that The Court may make available for download, I am also making available both this supplemental brief **–and all other documents in this case** for open-source (free) download, as soon as practically possible on the front-page news of The Register, whose links are as follows:

http://www.GordonWatts.com
and:
http://www.GordonWayneWatts.com

PROOF (CERTIFICATE) OF COMPLIANCE (proposed *Amicus*)

Pursuant to Rule 33.1(h), I am hereby certifying that my proposed *amicus* brief (a scanned image of which is in the appendices and also posted online on my namesake blog, listed immediately above), which I am asking for leave to be filed, complies with the word limitations of This Court: It has **10,043** "total" words, according to the program that I used to create it, Open Office, version 3.1.0, OOO310m11 (build:9399), Copyright 2000-2009 Sun Microsystems Inc. **This is not under the 9,000-word limit imposed by Rule 33.1(g).** However, when I exclude the parts excluded by Rule 33.1(d), namely: the questions presented, the list of parties in the cover page and the corporate disclosure statement, the table of contents, the table of cited authorities, the listing of counsel at the end of the document and the cover page, and the appendix, then the total word-count drops to **8,932**, just under **the 9,000-word limit** imposed upon Amici of this type. Therefore, my proposed *Amicus Curiae* brief (which is dated Sunday 01 march 2014) is in compliance with applicable Rules of This Court.

PROOF (CERTIFICATE) OF COMPLIANCE (this 2nd Supplemental Brief)

The page-limit for extraordinary writs on 8½" x 11" format are 15 pages for a Supplemental Brief, such as this one, per Rule 33.2(b). Since the Exclusions in Rule 33.1(d) apply ("The word limits do not include the questions presented, the list of parties and the corporate disclosure statement, the table of contents, the table of cited authorities, the listing of counsel at the end of the document, **or any appendix.**"), therefore, I do not need to count the appendix below, and thus this brief is far under the 15-page upper limit imposed on Supplemental Briefs of this type.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing (including my both Certificate of Service and both Certificates of Compliance, above) is true and correct.

Executed on **Friday, 20 March 2015.**

_____
(Signature)

INDEX TO THE APPENDICES

Instrument **Docket/Tab#**

Testimonial from TheBlaze, March, 19, 2015 news item
Source: http://www.TheBlaze.com/stories/2015/03/19/she-was-raised-by-lesbian-mothers-but-this-womans-open-letter-reveals-why-she-opposes-gay-marriage/ **– Appendix: A –**

"Dear Gay Community: Your Kids Are Hurting," The Federalist (Mar.17,2015), referenced by TheBlaze, *supra*
Source: http://TheFederalist.com/2015/03/17/dear-gay-community-your-kids-are-hurting/ **– Appendix: B –**

Appendix: A – Testimonial from TheBlaze, March, 19, 2015 news item
Source: ***http://www.TheBlaze.com/stories/2015/03/19/she-was-raised-by-lesbian-mothers-but-this-womans-open-letter-reveals-why-she-opposes-gay-marriage/***

www.theblaze.com/stories/2015/03/19/she-was-raised-by-lesbian-mothers-but-this-womans-open-letter-reveals-why-she-opposes-gay-mari

BLAZE

STORIES THEBLAZE TV RADIO SUBSCRIBE BLOG CONTRIBUTORS

She Was Raised by Lesbian Mothers. But This Woman's Open Letter Reveals Why She Now Opposes Gay Marriage.

Mar. 19, 2015 8:30am | Billy Hallowell

42.4K
SHARES

Share This Tweet This

A woman who was raised by two lesbian mothers has come forward to explain why she transformed from an activist in favor of gay marriage to an opponent of same-sex nuptials, saying the traditional family structure is the most successful and beneficial to children.

"My mom raised me with her same-sex partner back in the '80s and '90s. She and my dad were married for a little while. She knew she was gay before they got married, but things were different back then," Heather Barwick wrote in an open letter published in the Federalist. "She left him when I was 2 or 3 because she wanted a chance to be happy with someone she really loved: a woman."

Barwick said she lived with her mother and her partner in a "very liberal and open-minded area" and was treated well by both women. She said her father, by contrast, "wasn't a great guy."

Appendix: B – "Dear Gay Community: Your Kids Are Hurting," The Federalist (Mar.17,2015), referenced by TheBlaze, *supra*
Source:* *http://TheFederalist.com/2015/03/17/dear-gay-community-your-kids-are-hurting/

"Dear Gay Community: Your Kids Are Hurting"

"I loved my mom's partner, but another mom could never have replaced the father I lost."

By Heather Barwick
March 17, 2015, The Federalist

Gay community, I am your daughter. My mom raised me with her same-sex partner back in the '80s and '90s. She and my dad were married for a little while. She knew she was gay before they got married, but things were different back then. That's how I got here. It was complicated as you can imagine. She left him when I was two or three because she wanted a chance to be happy with someone she really loved: a woman.

My dad wasn't a great guy, and after she left him he didn't bother coming around anymore.

Do you remember that book, "Heather Has Two Mommies"? That was my life. My mom, her partner, and I lived in a cozy little house in the 'burbs of a very liberal and open-minded area. Her partner treated me as if I was her own daughter. Along with my mom's partner, I also inherited her tight-knit community of gay and lesbian friends. Or maybe they inherited me?

Either way, I still feel like gay people are my people. I've learned so much from you. You taught me how to be brave, especially when it is hard. You taught me empathy. You taught me how to listen. And how to dance. You taught me not be afraid of things that are different. And you taught me how to stand up for myself, even if that means I stand alone.

I'm writing to you because I'm letting myself out of the closet: I don't support gay marriage. But it might not be for the reasons that you think.

Children Need a Mother and Father

It's not because you're gay. I love you, so much. It's because of the nature of the same-sex relationship itself.

Growing up, and even into my 20s, I supported and advocated for gay marriage. It's only with some time and distance from my childhood that I'm able to reflect on my experiences and recognize the long-term consequences that same-sex parenting had on me. And it's only now, as I watch my children loving and being loved by their father each day, that I can see the beauty and wisdom in traditional marriage and parenting.

Same-sex marriage and parenting withholds either a mother or father from a child while telling him or her that it doesn't matter. That it's all the same. But it's not. A lot of us, a lot of your kids, are hurting. My father's absence created a huge hole in me, and I ached every day for a dad. I loved my mom's partner, but another mom could never have replaced the father I lost.

I grew up surrounded by women who said they didn't need or want a man. Yet, as a little girl, I so desperately wanted a daddy. It is a strange and confusing thing to walk around with this deep-down

unquenchable ache for a father, for a man, in a community that says that men are unnecessary. There were times I felt so angry with my dad for not being there for me, and then times I felt angry with myself for even wanting a father to begin with. There are parts of me that still grieve over that loss today.

I'm not saying that you can't be good parents. You can. I had one of the best. I'm also not saying that being raised by straight parents means everything will turn out okay. We know there are so many different ways that the family unit can break down and cause kids to suffer: divorce, abandonment, infidelity, abuse, death, etc. But by and large, the best and most successful family structure is one in which kids are being raised by both their mother and father.

Why Can't Gay People's Kids Be Honest?

Gay marriage doesn't just redefine marriage, but also parenting. It promotes and normalizes a family structure that necessarily denies us something precious and foundational. It denies us something we need and long for, while at the same time tells us that we don't need what we naturally crave. That we will be okay. But we're not. We're hurting.

Kids of divorced parents are allowed to say, "Hey, mom and dad, I love you, but the divorce crushed me and has been so hard. It shattered my trust and made me feel like it was my fault. It is so hard living in two different houses." Kids of adoption are allowed to say, "Hey, adoptive parents, I love you. But this is really hard for me. I suffer because my relationship with my first parents was broken. I'm confused and I miss them even though I've never met them."

But children of same-sex parents haven't been given the same voice. It's not just me. There are so many of us. Many of us are too scared to speak up and tell you about our hurt and pain, because for whatever reason it feels like you're not listening. That you don't want to hear. If we say we are hurting because we were raised by same-sex parents, we are either ignored or labeled a hater.

This isn't about hate at all. I know you understand the pain of a label that doesn't fit and the pain of a label that is used to malign or silence you. And I know that you really have been hated and that you really have been hurt. I was there, at the marches, when they held up signs that said, "God hates fags" and "AIDS cures homosexuality." I cried and turned hot with anger right there in the street with you. But that's not me. That's not us.

I know this is a hard conversation. But we need to talk about it. If anyone can talk about hard things, it's us. You taught me that.

Heather Barwick was raised by her mother and her mother's same-sex partner. She is a former gay-marriage advocate turned children's rights activist. She is a wife and mother of four rambunctious kids.