



# **The Battle for Measure 9**

**The forgotten true story of how  
pro-family conservatives  
(temporarily)**

**WON**

**the LGBT war on civilization  
in 1992  
as told by a  
first-hand witness**

**Dr. Scott Lively**

# **The Battle for Measure 9**

**The forgotten true story of how  
pro-family conservatives  
(temporarily)**

**WON**

**the LGBT war on civilization  
in 1992  
as told by a  
first-hand witness**

**Dr. Scott Lively**

**The Battle for Measure 9: The forgotten true story of how pro-family conservatives  
(temporarily) WON the LGBT war on civilization in 1992 as told by a first-hand witness**

is published by Dr. Scott Lively  
PO Box 2373, Springfield, MA 01101

Copyright Scott Lively 2022  
All rights reserved

First Edition  
ISBN

# The Battle for Measure 9

[A work in progress]

## Table of Contents

Introduction

### **THE HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL CONTEXT**

- The LGBT Strategy to Legalize Sexual Deviance .... Page 6.
- The “Born Gay” Hoax .... Page 9.
- How Homosexuals Hijacked the Holocaust .... Page 12.
- LGBT Cultural Piracy and the Southern Poverty Law Center .... Page 15.

### **THE MEASURE 9 BATTLEFIELD**

- My View from the Front Lines .... Page 17.
- The Empire Strikes Back .... Page 19.
- The Mother of All Hate Hoaxes .... Page 21.
- The Four Lawsuits .... Page 24.
- The No on 9 Tidal Wave .... Page 33.
- Why Measure 9 was Defeated .... Page 37.

### **MEASURE 9'S IMPACT ON THE NATIONAL CULTURE WAR**

- The Five Stages of Homofascism .... Page 39.

### **CONCLUSION**

- Culture War Victory Still Possible for Conservatives .... Page 43.
- Endnotes .... Page 46.

# The Battle for Measure 9

## Introduction

In the summer of 2022 I received an email from a television news producer in Portland, Oregon, informing me that he was planning to do an in-depth retrospective on the Ballot Measure 9 campaign of 1992 and asked me if I would be willing to do an extensive interview with him about it. I had been the chief spokesman and media liaison for that campaign in my capacity as State Communications Director of the sponsoring organization, the Oregon Citizens Alliance (OCA).

It has been my standard policy for many years to shun television news interviews unless they are live or live-on-tape because of the nearly inevitable misrepresentation of my views by corporate media journalists and their editors through selective editing and other dirty tricks. I first learned that lesson – the hard way – during my seven year stint with OCA. So I was very wary of this interview request, but decided to accept it in the belief that a retrospective of this kind might possibly be more informational than propagandistic. I also reasoned that if they were going forward with this project anyhow, I would probably be person best suited to both tell the story accurately from the first-person perspective and to weather whatever storm of malicious misrepresentation they created, if they chose to go that direction (which was more likely than not).

As it turned out, the producer informed me a few weeks later that he had taken a job in another media market out of state. His email included an introduction to another producer whom he had tapped to carry on with the project, but I declined to respond, and that person never followed up, and so I believe the project died on the vine.

However, in the intervening weeks between those contacts I had given extensive thought to what I wanted to say about the Measure 9 campaign in the interview, and had begun taking notes and putting together an outline. I had always wanted to tell the full, fascinating story of the Measure 9 battle, and had written a summary of some of the highlights and lowlights in my autobiographical work *My Life in His Hands* (which I have excerpted for use in this booklet). So I decided to go forward with the retrospective on my own, in my own way, because it is a true story of a little-known but very consequential chapter in the history of the American culture war that deserves to be memorialized as it actually occurred, and not how it has been spun and misrepresented over the years by the political left.

That is how this booklet came to be, and I hope you find it interesting and educational.

Dr. Scott Lively 11/2/2022

# The Battle for Measure 9

## The Historical and Cultural Context

### The LGBT Strategy to Legalize Sexual Deviance

Thirty years ago, on Nov. 3, 1992 (the day Bill Clinton was elected president), the people of Oregon voted on Ballot Measure 9, the "No Special Rights Act," which would have amended the Oregon constitution to prohibit the state from adding "sexual orientation" as a basis for civil rights minority status and prevent homosexuals from illegitimately gaining the legal, political and social entitlements that came with it.

Measure 9 was a world-class political slug-fest and the first truly major battle of the LGBT culture war following the *Bowers v. Hardwick* ruling of the U.S. Supreme Court (SCOTUS) in 1986. *Bowers* had affirmed the constitutional right and power of states to regulate sexual conduct in the public interest, specifically homosexual sodomy. That was a massive setback for the "gay liberation" movement because *Bowers* represented the culmination of a nearly four-decade-long LGBT strategy to gain constitutional protection for homosexual conduct as a "privacy right" under the Due Process clause of the 14th Amendment.

SCOTUS had long before interpreted the 14th Amendment to prevent state governments from infringing on "fundamental rights" and had expanded what constituted "fundamental rights" beyond those enumerated in the Constitution to include other "rights," such as "privacy," *IF* they could be shown to be "deeply rooted in this Nation's history and tradition" or "implicit in the concept of ordered liberty."

The "father" of the "right to privacy" was Justice Louis Brandeis, the secularized Jewish Marxist son of "heretical Sabbatean" Frankist<sup>1</sup> (anti-Torah) parents who believed their religious duty was to "transgress as many moral boundaries as possible." Brandeis co-authored an 1890 article in *Harvard Law Review* "widely regarded as the first publication in the United States to advocate a right to privacy, articulating that right primarily as a 'right to be let alone.'"<sup>2</sup> And he was made an associate justice of the Supreme Court by Woodrow Wilson in 1916 where he advocated relentlessly for its adoption as constitutional law.

While there are many aspects of the right to privacy that promote and affirm benign and civilization-enhancing human rights, there was a darker side that reflected the Frankist mindset.

When finally it was embraced intellectually by SCOTUS as a fundamental right, "privacy" became the primary vehicle for advancing a Frankist and Marxist "social justice" agenda pursuing sexual anarchy through judicial activism, most famously in the landmark case first adopting the "right to privacy" as law: the 1965 *Griswold v. Connecticut* case (contraception on demand for married couples). It was dramatically expanded in the recently overturned 1973 *Roe v. Wade* decision (judicially legislating abortion on demand).

But the political driving force behind the "right to privacy" as a vehicle for social engineering had since at least the 1940s been the "gay liberation" movement led by the first lasting homosexual rights organization in America, The (Marxist) Mattachine Society (founded in 1950 by Marxist pederast Harry Hay). Its goal and vision, as articulated by early Mattachine leader Dale Jennings was, tellingly, to promote "the right to be left alone."

That in a nutshell is the legal and historical background of how and why Bowers came before the court in the 1980s.

However, Justice Byron White's 5-4 majority opinion in *Bowers* soundly slammed the door on the LGBT "right to privacy" strategy. White, a Catholic JFK appointee and perhaps the last truly conservative Democrat on the court, left no room for doubt, declaring emphatically "to claim that a right to engage in such conduct is 'deeply rooted in this Nation's history and tradition' or 'implicit in the concept of ordered liberty' is, at best, facetious." A strong concurring opinion by Chief Justice Warren Burger cited the "ancient roots" of prohibitions against homosexual sex, quoting William Blackstone's description of homosexual sex as an "infamous crime against nature," worse than rape, and "a crime not fit to be named." Burger concluded: "To hold that the act of homosexual sodomy is somehow protected as a fundamental right would be to cast aside millennia of moral teaching."<sup>3</sup>

Devastated, the armies of homosexual and Marxist activists retreated to their war rooms. After Bowers, they needed an entirely new strategy. They pivoted quickly from Due Process to their best alternative legal track and political theme: that homosexuals should be constitutionally protected as a civil rights minority under the Equal Protection clause of the 14th Amendment.

That juridical path had been opened in the *Eisenstadt v. Baird* (1971) case, granting to single people an access to contraception on demand which had been limited to married couples in *Griswold*. Importantly, by basing this new "right" in "equal protection" instead of "privacy," the court didn't just create a separate path to "gay liberation," it utterly demolished the legal and moral distinction between sex in marriage vs. sex outside of marriage (fornication). It was arguably the most consequential example of false equivalence in the reasoning of the court on sexual issues in its history to that date.

But this separate path faced separate hurdles. To be granted special civil rights protections and benefits under the Equal Protection clause, a group had to be formally recognized as a "suspect

class," which category included only "discrete and insular minorities" determined by "a variety of factors, including but not limited to whether the person has an inherent trait, whether the person has a trait that is highly visible, whether the person is part of a class which has been disadvantaged historically, and whether the person is part of a group that has historically lacked effective representation in the political process."<sup>4</sup>

In practice, it boiled down to a three-part test: 1) a history of social discrimination, 2) an immutable condition, and 3) political powerlessness.

The post-Bowers strategy thus centered on a national propaganda and social engineering campaign that was outlined by key LGBT strategists in an astonishingly frank 1987 Guide Magazine article titled "The Overhauling of Straight America"<sup>5</sup> – which was later re-framed and rephrased in a more typical euphemistic style in the book "After the Ball: How America Will Conquer Its Fear and Hatred of Gays in the 90's" (1990).

Neither the elements of the legal test nor the ultimate goal of eventual legal victory at SCOTUS were mentioned in the article, but the campaign it launched was designed to convince lawmakers and the public that homosexuals met the elements of the test.

The cornerstone of the new strategy was the "born gay" hoax.



## The “Born Gay” Hoax

While the notion that homosexuals were "born gay" goes back to Karl Heinrich Ulrich, the "grandfather of gay rights" in the mid-1880s in Germany, the idea was not truly central to the American LGBT movement prior to *Bowers*, and many if not most "gays" treated sexuality as a matter of choice – a choice that should be protected in their view under the right to privacy.

But after the publication of their strategic social engineering blueprint ("The Overhauling of Straight America") it became obligatory for all homosexuals and allies to learn, parrot and promote a new narrative in which LGBTs 1) were victims of gross societal discrimination; 2) that this was especially grievous because homosexual status was an innate and unchangeable condition, not a behavioral choice; and 3) that these "sexual minorities" would never be safe from hatred and violence until good-hearted people throughout society rose up to protect them in the cause of social justice and to enact laws against "homophobic" discrimination.

For the advancement of that narrative and agenda, the LGBTs began forming "human rights committees" in the late 1980s and early '90s, primarily at the city level, both to create a sense of urgency about "discrimination" as a social crisis and to bundle "sexual minorities" together with legally established legitimate minority groups to foster the perception of equivalence. Racial minorities nearly always served as figureheads of these committees (and indeed, the black civil rights movement was fully hijacked through this process) but the driving force was always the LGBT movement.

Usually, these committees focused their efforts on combating "hate crimes," and public opinion about these crimes was shaped by annual or more frequent reports on "hate crime" statistics, based largely upon unverified citizen reporting systems that served to create the impression that "hate" was a significant and growing problem in the community that could only be solved by anti-discrimination ordinances passed into law by local authorities. Incidental "hate crimes" (real or staged) in the community provided additional opportunities to push for these laws. If a local community was too conservative to include "sexual orientation" in the list of protected groups, it would be left out at first and added by amendment later.

This "Lavender Bulldozer" strategy, as I called it, was brilliantly diabolical and very effective. They used the left's control of the "blue" cities to work from the bottom up to establish the appearance of a nationwide trend of citizen support for the concept of homosexuals as a civil rights minority group meeting all the elements of the constitutional legal test. And wherever "sexual orientation" was granted anti-discrimination protections, the entire LGBT agenda would eventually follow, because opposition and dissent became – in essence – immoral if not actually illegal beyond the technical parameters of the law. And, of course, the left conspired to act as if all opposition was illegal. In virtually every jurisdiction where it passed, the anti-discrimination "shield" against losing one's home or job for "being gay" was in actual practice a "sword" for offensive culture war against

all dissenters – including some Christian bakers and other service companies made famous for refusing to submit to bullying.

Once the Lavender Bulldozer strategy had been proven at the municipal level, it was recreated across the cultural landscape, including the business realm, evolving over several decades into today's phenomenon of "woke" fascist control of huge swaths of corporate America.

But these were just side benefits of the LGBT campaign to gain special rights for themselves in constitutional law, which few people outside of their own circles realized was the ultimate goal.

The leaders of the Oregon Citizens Alliance were among those few who had looked behind the curtain and knew what was coming. In 1992, we designed Measure 9, the No Special Rights Act, to thwart the LGBT movement's effort. Its simple premise was that voluntary sexual conduct was not a proper basis for minority status, especially not conduct that was manifestly "abnormal, wrong, unnatural and perverse." As OCA state communications director it was my job to explain and defend Measure 9 in the media and directly to the voters.

My first and most basic line of argument was that if any people, by simply declaring themselves "gay," could get the same hard-won, enhanced rights that had been legitimately earned by blacks, it would make a mockery of the civil rights movement.

No less eminent a figure than Gen. Colin Powell agreed with that premise, stating in a letter to Democratic Rep. Pat Schroeder on May 18, 1992 ( just six months before the vote on Measure 9): "Skin color is a benign, non-behavioral characteristic. Sexual orientation is perhaps the most profound of all human behavioral characteristics. Comparison of the two is a convenient but invalid argument."

It is a testament to the importance of Measure 9 as an attempt to prevent eventual LGBT cultural hegemony, that Powell's eloquent summary of the truth about sexual orientation can hardly be found on the internet without prior knowledge of its verbiage, and great persistence. A quote that should hold a very prominent place in the history of the culture war is more heavily suppressed by Big Tech than even the pernicious talking points of Holocaust deniers. (I was only eventually able to cite it here because I kept a physical newspaper clipping from the Salem-Statesman Journal newspaper of June 6, 1992, in my personal records.) If Measure 9 had become constitutional law in Oregon, the culture war on homosexuality would not as likely have ended with the LGBTs and their allies having the power to censor and/or "cancel" dissenting voices.

I compare the suppression of Powell's quote to that of Holocaust deniers intentionally, because the LGBTs' successful hijacking of the black civil rights movement directly parallels its unsuccessful attempt to also hijack the Holocaust.

The LGBT attempted hijacking of the Holocaust is important to document here because it created

a common ground for Jews and Christians to work together against the LGBT political agenda in the Ballot Measure 9 campaign. Later in this booklet we will address the various ways that this cooperation created lasting benefits for the pro-family movement, but first let's review the history of the LGBT movement's cultural appropriation of Jewish heritage and symbolism.

## How Homosexuals Hijacked the Holocaust

*"You must not lie with a man as with a woman; that is an abomination ... you must not commit any of these abominations – neither your native-born nor the foreigner who lives among you ... anyone who commits any of these abominations must be cut off from among his people."*

[Leviticus 18:22-29 of the Jewish Torah and the Christian Bible]

The dominant campaign theme of our "No on 9" opponents was that the Oregon Citizens Alliance and me personally were "like the Nazis" for opposing LGBT civil rights status based on "sexual orientation." It was this deeply offensive and utterly false propaganda campaign that initially led me to team up with Orthodox Jewish Holocaust researcher Kevin Abrams to write *"The Pink Swastika: Homosexuality in the Nazi Party"* and to develop strong relationships with numerous pro-family conservative Jews around the nation. But in the process, I uncovered a conspiracy among the LGBTs to basically steal the Jewish Holocaust for themselves for political leverage.

Contrary to today's rising chorus of fringe historical revisionists of the anti-Zionist movement, the Holocaust was an actual plan and policy of Nazi Germany, totally consistent with the philosophy and practice of the eugenicist elites of the early 20th century. Adolf Hitler, John D. Rockefeller, John Harvey Kellogg, Margaret Sanger and Josef Mengele were the Klaus Schwabs, Justin Trudeaus, Gavin Newsoms, Jacinda Arderns and Anthony Faucis of their generation: protean transhumanist sociopaths for whom humanity was mere cattle whose utility could and should be improved by scientific experimentation and selective breeding/culling.

Addressing the future of eugenic advancement in "Mein Kampf" (1924), Hitler praised the United States as the "one state in which at least weak beginnings toward a better conception are noticeable. Of course, it is not our model German Republic, but the United States." He would devote his life to overcoming that shortcoming.

Eugenics was the heart of Hitlerian ideology and the source for such diverse Nazi policies as the Master Race theory, the Lebensborn Aryan human breeding farms, the bizarre "science" of phrenology (skull measurements), Dr. Mengele's lab experiments on concentration camp prisoners and, of course, hatred of the "inferior races," especially the Jews, whom occult queen Helena Blavatski condemned in her book "The Secret Doctrine" as the holdovers of the primitive "root race" that preceded modernity's superior Aryan "root race" in her theory of the cyclical evolution of humankind.

Crazy Blavatsky's "Theosophical Society" was represented in Germany by Guido von List and Jorge Lanz von Liebenfels who together formed the Armanen Order that played a huge role both in Hitler's personal life and in the creation of the Nazi Party. They were the first to use the swastika in Germany more than a decade before the Nazi Party was formed, and Lanz von Liebenfels was rightly called "The Man Who Gave Hitler His Ideas" in a 1958 book by Wilfried Daim. Hitler was an

avid reader and collector of Liebenfels magazine Ostara, which blended occultism and eugenics. I have fully documented this history in Chapter 2 of *The Pink Swastika*.

(I can personally attest that the Theosophical Society still operates around the world, having stumbled onto one of its lodges when I lived in heavily occult-influenced Portland, Oregon. And a revived version of the Armanen Order also exists in Germany.)

So, yes, the Holocaust was a real historical event, and the malign ideology that spawned it is alive and well today. Attempts by nut-jobs to rehabilitate uber-eugenicist Hitler as a wrongly "canceled" and misunderstood hero of nationalism are as traitorous to humanity as they are stupid.

However, my focus in this article is the Holocaust as a symbol of victimization of the Jews specifically, and how the LGBT movement has, to a limited extent, hijacked it to serve their own political agenda.

Kevin Abrams and I wrote "*The Pink Swastika*" in large part to debunk the myth of a "Gay Holocaust" in Nazi Germany equivalent to what the Jews suffered. We proved their claims were wildly exaggerated and that their adoption of the inverted pink triangle (used by the Nazis to identify the relatively small number of homosexual in labor camps – not the death camps) was a cynical political ploy to hijack the Holocaust, just as they had hijacked the rainbow flag and control of the black civil rights movement from the Black Panthers and Jesse Jackson's "Rainbow Coalition."<sup>6</sup>

In addition to our book, we created the International Committee for Holocaust Truth in 1996, whose most prominent members were the late Drs. Judith Reisman and Howard Hurwitz, and Rabbi Yehuda Levin. We then published a report for the ICHT titled "Refuting 'Gay Holocaust' Revisionists," which I reworked for my article "How American 'Gays' are Stealing the Holocaust," which was published as Part 3 of my book "The Poisoned Stream" (1997).

Working with a national network of Orthodox rabbis, we used those tools to thwart the "Gay Holocaust" plot and forced the LGBTs to drop the pink triangle strategy. In response, they shifted to the rainbow as their banner, and they down-scaled and moved their Holocaust hijack efforts out of the public view.

In 1997, during my summer law program studying International Human Rights at the University of Strasbourg (France), I took a weekend trip to nearby Munich, Germany, to visit the Dachau concentration camp in my research for the third edition of "*The Pink Swastika*." There I was disappointed to find (even then) the pink triangle prominently represented in the form of a stone monument, establishing a propaganda beachhead that (I now know) was later expanded to a high-visibility "Gay Holocaust" memorial in downtown Munich itself, psychologically emphasizing the special importance of the "gays" relative to the Jews as a victim class.

Ironically, the new Munich memorial (which I only just learned about) commemorates the site of a "gay bar" that was the prime meeting place of Ernst Roehm's butch-homosexual SA Brownshirts, whose role as chief Nazi perpetrators overwhelmingly dwarfs the significance of the relatively few homosexual victims they persecuted (for effeminacy and/or Communist affiliation).

I had not given much thought to the "Gay Holocaust" hoax since the late '90s until a recent walk along the waterfront in New Orleans brought me face to face with its high-visibility Holocaust memorial, prominently featuring the LGBT rainbow. That brought all the memories of the Measure 9 campaign – and the Brownshirt-style bullying of the "gay" fascists we suffered – flooding back, along with a resolve to speak out anew against their continuing historical revisionism.

## LGBT Cultural Piracy and the Southern Poverty Law Center

In April of 1991, when the Oregon Citizens Alliance first submitted the language for what would become Measure 9 to the Secretary of State (to oppose the LGBT campaign for special rights based on “sexual orientation) “gay” strategists were running national piracy campaigns against both Blacks and Jews to commandeer their socio-political machinery to advance their own selfish agenda. As addressed above, the most memorable of the early efforts was their takeover of Jesse Jackson’s corporate “shakedown” system (the original germ of today’s “woke” corporatism), which he began calling the National Rainbow Coalition in conjunction with his 1984 run for president. A decade or so later, the no longer useful “useful idiot” Jackson was left by the roadside while the LGBTs drove away in his “vehicle for social change,” the “repurposed” rainbow flag (first used by the Black Panthers) fluttering from its antennae.<sup>7</sup>

The LGBT hijack of the Jewish Holocaust was addressed in the previous chapter, but there is more to that story which is important to tell in setting the stage for the Measure 9 battle in Oregon. Specifically, it relates to the far-left hate-profiteering shark pod, the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) which heavily assisted in that piracy by hypocritically covering up a homosexual/Nazi connection in it’s most famous anti-Nazi legal victory.<sup>8</sup>

From 1986 (the year of the *Bowers v Hardwick* ruling) until a huge sexual harassment scandal in 2019, the SPLC was headed by J. Richard Cohen. Cohen was rumored to be a homosexual but I cannot find the source I once relied on in making that accusation because the Internet has since been washed clean of documentation about the life and work of J. Richard Cohen except for the most bland and superficial facts – not even a Wikipedia page! (How could that be for a social-engineering mastermind of his significance?)

In any case, there is a major Oregon connection to the SPLC’s most famous legal victory during Cohen’s tenure: the takedown of California Neo-Nazi Tom Metzger in 1988, exploiting the murder of Ethiopian graduate student Mulugeta Seraw (just a few blocks from where I was then living in Portland). The killer was the presumed homosexual street prostitute, “death-metal” band leader, and Metzger protege Ken “Ken Death” Mitske. Before hooking up with Metzger, Mieske was plausibly rumored to have been a house-boy for famous Portland film director Gus Van Sant, a homosexual made famous by his films about “gay” teenage hustlers including “My Private Idaho” (1991) and a lesser-known short film in 1988 titled “Ken Death Gets Out of Jail”<sup>9</sup> (celebrating Mieske’s release from prison following a burglary conviction).

The SPLC cynically suppressed the homosexual aspect of the Metzger/Mieske case, even as it added yours truly to its “hate group” list for daring to document Nazi homosexuality in *The Pink Swastika*. But more importantly, the heavily (secularized) Jewish SPLC began equating anti-Black and anti-Jewish racism with “homophobia,” helping to make that perspective a cornerstone of leftist ideology and to justify LGBT appropriation of their respective “moral authority” despite the strong objections of the then still family-centered Black community and of Orthodox Jews.

Thus, thanks in significant part to political cover provided by the SPLC, the left's propaganda campaign against Measure 9 and OCA was allowed to draw from both Black and Jewish victim-symbolism – characterizing OCA leaders and supporters as KKK members and Nazis interchangeably – with NO push-back on the political misuse of either the civil rights movement or the Nazi/Holocaust narrative by leftist Jewish gatekeepers at the SPLC. That was critically important, because even then the SPLC was considered America's premier authority on "hatred and bigotry" generally and "white supremacy" specifically. But I'm getting ahead of the story.

In October of 1987 Oregon Governor Neal Goldschmidt, wanting to establish the state's bone-fides on "gay" issues and pander to a rising class of Democrat (and presumably SPLC-funding) homosexual mega-donors, issued an Executive Order granting civil rights minority status on the basis of sexual orientation. In response, the newly formed Oregon Citizens Alliance, used Oregon's very populist-friendly ballot initiative system to run a successful referendum overturning that order. It was a huge victory that established OCA as a significant political force and proved that Oregonians were far more conservative than the elites and their media toadies wanted the world to believe. Governor Goldschmidt's political career later ended in disgrace upon the revelation he had raped a teenage girl during his first term as Mayor of Portland.<sup>10</sup>

One of those homosexual mega-donors to whom Goldschmidt was pandering was the notorious accused pederast Terry Bean, an Oregon "gay rights" activist and political lobbyist since the early 1970s and later co-founder of the world's largest LGBT organization, the Human Rights Campaign.<sup>11</sup> Bean, a very wealthy real estate investor, famously became the first homosexual "money bundler" on Barack Obama's fundraising team. Bean was a close associate and ally of another disgraced Portland Mayor, Sam Adams, whose own sordid sex scandal involved a teenage boy.<sup>12</sup>

As I wrote in my article of January 23, 2019 *Ed Buck and Terry Bean: The DNC's Poster-Boys of Perversion*: "Mr. Bean was indicted back in 2014 or 15 for allegedly gang-raping (along with his boyfriend) a teenage boy in Eugene, Oregon (coincidentally one of the nation's oldest and most fruitful breeding-grounds for ultra-far-left Antifa fascism). Yet, Bean was able to buy his way out of trouble by publicly offering a \$220,000 cash settlement to the victim, who subsequently disappeared, depriving the prosecutor of his most essential witness. The court then, in an unprecedented ruling given the seriousness of the case, dismissed the indictment. (A civil payoff to void a criminal charge is legal in Lane County, but previously unheard of for serious crimes — such is the power of political correctness to bend rules to the breaking point whenever homosexuals are involved in any public matter)." There is much more to the story here<sup>13</sup>.

All of these examples of gross corruption and perversion share a common element: the egregious abuse of power by gate-keeping leftists in furtherance of the LGBT agenda. The SPLC, the corporate media, elected officials, civil rights figureheads, and even prosecutors and judges all conspired to subvert justice to advance the overthrow of the Judeo-Christian social order. Alone in Oregon against that cabal stood the OCA and Ballot Measure 9. The political war that then ensued is the topic of the next section.



# The Battle for Measure 9

## The Measure 9 Battlefield

### **My View from the Front Lines**

This section is drawn mostly from my autobiographical book *My Life in His Hands: A Testimony of God's Grace and Goodness*. In it I told the inside story of Measure 9 from the first-person perspective in testimonial form. These long excerpts from *My Life* are followed by some additional recollections to round out the story.

There have been times in my life when I wondered what God wanted from me, or which was the better path to choose among options. But for a period of about five years, from 1989 to 1994, I experienced a kind of certainty about my calling that was as compelling to me as it must have been to the Old Testament prophets. I had a fire-in-the-bones passion for Christian activism that consumed me, and an awareness in my spirit of just what I was supposed to do.

Within just a few months of receiving my calling, I closed down my business and went full-time into ministry. I didn't have a plan or a position, but I knew this was what I was supposed to do. Along about this time, I realized that the protests and pickets I had been organizing were not going to close down the abortion clinics. I had organized (with the support of local pro-life leaders) what was, up to that date, the largest clinic protest in Portland. We drew around 800 people for what we called the Easter Eve Prayer Vigil in 1990. Little changed, however. The population seemed divided into two entrenched camps on the issue, and from a political standpoint, there didn't seem to be much value in continuing those protest efforts (which is not to disregard the important personal impact such demonstrations can have on abortion-bound women).

I had heard of a relatively new organization called Oregon Citizens Alliance, which was trying to stop abortion through political means, specifically a pro-life ballot measure for the 1990 election. I made an appointment to meet the OCA chairman, Lon Mabon. In that meeting I agreed to try to organize Multnomah County for the campaign, but after just one visit to the OCA office, I knew that I wanted to work there. On that first visit I also met the OCA Communications Director, Bill Bennett, and was invited by him to submit an article for the OCA publication, *The Alliance*.

Nobody knew at that time, least of all me, that I would soon take Bill's place in the organization. The Lord had prepared the job that He wanted me to do. By the time Bill retired a few months

later, I had, with his help and blessing, already taken over most of his functions. Just a few years earlier, I had been a homeless alcoholic; now I was becoming a spokesman for a statewide Christian political organization: writing its articles and editorials, holding press conferences, conducting interviews on radio and television, and debating with politicians and college professors in public venues. Where did these abilities come from? They were the gift of God, bestowed upon me solely by His grace to accomplish His purposes.

Still, my life's major work had not yet been revealed. The pro-life ballot campaign was just a time of training.

In the 1992 election cycle, which began in the very early spring of 1991, Lon had a staff meeting in which he announced that our next campaign was going to be on the issue of homosexuality. He wanted to stop the homosexual agenda once and for all by having homosexuality defined in the state constitution as abnormal, unnatural and perverse conduct. It was, and remains, the most ambitious ballot measure campaign ever attempted on the homosexual issue in America. I didn't know much about the "gay" agenda at that time, so it didn't seem like such a big deal when Lon later took me aside and asked me to take a more upfront role in that campaign than I had previously taken. I was pleased and honored, but had no idea what I was in for as the spokesman for Ballot Measure 9 (and later Measure 13). For the next four years Lon and I worked shoulder-to-shoulder in the toughest political battles ever seen in that state.

## The Empire Strikes Back

The official first day of the Measure 9 campaign was when we submitted our proposed ballot measure language to the Secretary of State. It was in April of 1991. Although we had yet to collect a single signature on a petition, the liberal politicians that ran the state government acted as if a bomb had exploded in their midst.

Within a few hours of our filing, then-Governor Barbara Roberts held an emergency press conference to denounce the measure and OCA as “paranoid.” I don’t recall whether it was in this press conference or a later one that she literally accused us of being “like the Nazis.” This was the *governor* saying these things, not the leaders of the Oregon “gay” movement. She set the tone for the “No on 9” campaign, however, and in the next three days every major newspaper in the state editorialized against us, using terms such as “KKK,” “Nazis” and “hate-mongers.” The “mainstream” media weakly attempted to maintain a façade of impartiality in the campaign, but their actual coverage of the issue was so thoroughly biased it was astounding. During the entire election cycle, without exaggeration, we were bashed continuously and viciously by every major print and broadcast media outlet in the state.

Our offices were in Wilsonville at that time, about halfway between Portland and Salem. Immediately after the news stories hit, we began to receive bomb threats. I don’t remember exactly how many such threats we received, but there were several. With each evacuation of the building, our business neighbors grew less and less sympathetic. We soon lost our lease there and, since no one else would rent to us under the circumstances, we were forced to buy our own building.

Along with the bomb threats came almost daily threats of injury and death. We asked the phone company to intervene in the matter and were told simply to keep a log of the dates, times and what was said and they would take action based upon that. We stopped keeping records after filling twenty-one 8 ½ x 11-inch single-spaced pages (the phone company never took any action). It got to be somewhat amusing after a while. I remember one day receiving four death threats before 10:00 AM. After a while I realized that it was all nothing more than an intimidation campaign. The “gay” activists would never have taken the risk of maiming or killing one of us because that would have destroyed their carefully cultivated image as victims and turned public opinion against them. Nevertheless, when I was asked by the state police to wear a bullet-proof vest during the last weeks of the Measure 9 campaign, I complied.

More harmful than the threats were the political dirty tricks. One day we came in to find our phone service disconnected; another time our mail service was discontinued (homosexual activists called these providers and pretended to be OCA administrators). We suffered continual vandalism: superglue in the locks, rocks through the windows, foul items and substances delivered to us in the mail. My home church, Portland Foursquare, was regularly targeted for graffiti, usually swastikas in bright orange spray paint. In the city of Eugene, businesses which supported our

campaign had bricks (wrapped in swastika-emblazoned hate mail) thrown through plate-glass windows. In one instance a window was smashed in my car. A bullet was fired into a window casing of Lon Mabon's home.

One of their most despicable tactics was the creation of phony OCA campaign flyers with hateful messages that were faxed to businesses all over the state. The flyers had headlines such as "Kill the Homosexuals" and had our name and address printed across the bottom. I personally sent out a press release about this attack which received not one word of coverage -- except that two weeks later some of the same media outlets approached us as if they had discovered the flyers on their own. They then grilled us on camera as if we had created and circulated the flyers ourselves and were trying to deny responsibility for it. It was frustrating, to say the least.

The media participation in the No on 9 campaign is epitomized in a series of anti-OCA editorials in *The Oregonian* -- by far the largest newspaper and probably the most influential media outlet in the state. In a move that violated the most fundamental principles of journalistic ethics, the publisher ran 6 or 7 successive editorials *on the front page* of the newspaper in the final days of the campaign. Instead of receiving criticism from the journalistic community (proving just how liberal is the profession as a whole), he was nominated for a Pulitzer Prize.

Then there were the lawsuits. I was personally sued four times for a total of over 11 million dollars, but OCA itself was involved in nearly constant litigation. I will recount my four lawsuits in a separate section. That is a whole story in itself, with numerous examples of divine intervention.

When we finally got our ballot title after a protracted legal battle with the Secretary of State (we faced this with every ballot measure because each time the Secretary of State's office used its discretionary power to write a ballot title and description that reflected the homosexuals' perspective rather than ours) we were able to print our petitions and collect signatures. The "gays" organized what they called "Bigot Buster Squads," which were teams of homosexual activists dispatched from a central office to disrupt our signature collection efforts wherever we went. These goon squads, reminiscent of the Nazi Brownshirts, would literally block people from coming to our tables to sign the petitions, insulting and threatening anyone who stepped forward to sign. There were frequent incidents of vandalism: liquids, including paint, were thrown on our volunteers, filled signature sheets were snatched and ripped to shreds, on several occasions our volunteers were physically attacked and punched.

These attacks were serious criminal acts, not to mention an outrageous assault on the democratic process itself, but the police usually did *not* intervene. This was especially true in Portland, where Police Chief Tom Potter, later the mayor, openly served as a member of the No on 9 campaign (his daughter was an outspoken lesbian activist).

## The Mother of All Hate Hoaxes

Potter's complicity was also suspected (but never proved) in the most outrageous stunt of all: a series of staged "hate crimes," at the home of Azalea Cooley, an African-American lesbian, apparently confined to a wheel-chair. Over a period of months Cooley reported frequent cross-burnings in the front yard of her home (21 of them). Despite numerous stakeouts, no one was ever caught planting the crosses, until two "'rogue" cops, acting on their own initiative (because they believed someone in law enforcement was tipping off the perpetrators), set up a stakeout of their own just a few days before the election. They caught Cooley herself, *walking* out the front door of her house with a cross and a can of gasoline.

Incredibly, even knowing that Cooley had been arrested for the crime, the No on 9 campaign featured her in their final campaign event, a huge No on 9 parade through Portland. Cooley lead the parade -- in her wheelchair. In typical fashion, the Oregon media refused to cover the story except (very minimally) in the Portland area, where too many people knew what had happened for the story to be completely suppressed.

There were numerous other staged hate crimes, but none so gloriously discredited as the Cooley cross burnings: the "gays" ransacked their own offices and blamed it on OCA, a Catholic church (whose priest was reputedly homosexual) was "vandalized" with suspiciously politically-correct graffiti in the sanctuary (e.g. using the term "gay" instead of the sort of pejoratives one would expect in "hate speech"), and a steady stream of self-reported "hate-motivated incidents" were submitted to the ("gay"-controlled) human rights commissions. Few if any of these incidents were ever validated, but they were regularly reported as news.

These are just a few of many examples of the sort of opposition we faced in the Oregon political battles. Taking on the Oregon "gay" movement was like battling an army of demons. We endured four years of the most intense spiritual and political warfare imaginable, but fell a hair's breadth short of winning politically (49-51% in our second attempt in 1994). What I gained in those campaigns, however, was a unique knowledge and insight into the "gay" movement, its agenda and its strategies. And I was shown by the Lord that this conflict between Christians and "gay" activists (which has since assumed global dimensions) is in fact the heart of the culture war and arguably *the* spiritual battle of our time, rivaling even the challenge of Islam.

For everyone to whom much is given, of him much will be required. I know that what I endured through those campaigns is a validation of this scripture, and a proof that nothing that God allows in the lives of His children is useless or accidental. All of the hardships and deprivations of my youth, all of the edge-of-survival resourcefulness I had learned on the road, all of the single-minded passion for ministry I had acquired since being saved combined to make me the perfect person for God's service in that task for that time. What the devil had meant for evil, God turned to good.

One incident during this period especially showed me the spiritual nature of our struggle and the presence of God's guiding hand. It was a public debate held at the City Club of Portland between myself and Oregon ACLU President Charles Hinkle. The City Club was the headquarters of Oregon's wealthy, liberal elite, and Charlie Hinkle, a leading constitutional lawyer and an ordained minister in the United Church of Christ, was their champion on the "gay" issue. I was still a fairly new Christian with no credentials but a high school diploma and no professional stature.

The event was staged to maximally benefit the pro-"gay" position. The large room, except for one table of OCA faithful, was filled with open homosexuals and their most ardent allies. A full complement of Portland's liberal media was there, and at least one broadcast media outlet was carrying the debate live.

I was already very nervous, even before being greeted (literally) with hisses and jeers at my introduction. After opening comments, Charlie posed the first question of the debate to me. I have no memory of the question, but I will never forget the feeling of panic that swept over me as I realized I did not have an answer for it. It was the sort of moment every public speaker dreads. All eyes were upon me, awaiting a response, and I had nothing to say. I did the only thing that I could think to do -- I passed on the question, as the "gays" in the audience snickered.

Suddenly, I felt an amazing peace sweep over me. It was the "peace that passes all understanding" (Philippians 4:7) and I was filled with the Holy Spirit. From that moment, the tide of the debate shifted inexorably in my favor as God gave me utterance to ask and answer each question in my turn.

Finally we came to the closing comments. Charlie went first. He used his time to portray Oregon "gays" as innocent victims of hatred and bigotry, and OCA as their persecutor. He rooted his argument in Scripture, specifically John 8:3-11, the story of the woman caught in adultery. With all the rhetorical skill of a veteran trial lawyer and the authoritative bearing of a pastor, he crafted a picture in which Jesus stood forward as a merciful protector of the "gays," and in which I was a judgmental man ready to cast the first stone. In a moving conclusion, he turned toward me with the words, "Please, Scott Lively, put down your stone!"

I don't remember what I had prepared to deliver as my closing statement, but it was abandoned in that moment as I received what I believe was divine inspiration. "Charlie," I said, "what I have in my hand is not a stone, it is a brick. It is a brick wrapped in swastikas and hateful words, a brick that was thrown through the storefront window of a Measure 9 supporter, and it was thrown by someone on your side of this issue." I then proceeded to provide other examples that showed that the "gays" were not victims but aggressors. Finally, I addressed the Biblical context of his closing statement. "Your side always leaves out the most important part of the story about the woman caught in adultery. Yes, Jesus extended mercy to her, but as he did so, his final words were, 'Go and sin no more' (John 8:11). So, Charlie, to Oregon's 'gay' community I say the same: accept God's mercy but go and sin no more."

To his credit, as the moderator prepared to dismiss the audience, Charlie leaned over and admitted, "That was a very effective close." And as we all left the building, the "gays" and their allies were all scowls, while our tiny pro-family contingent was happy and smiling. David had defeated Goliath, solely by the power of the Holy Spirit.

## The Four Lawsuits

*"[We] have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God. And not only so, but we glory in tribulations also: knowing that tribulation works patience; And patience, experience; and experience, hope." Romans 5:2-4*

Few things in life are more intimidating than lawsuits, which is why they were a favorite tool of the Oregon "gay" movement to try to drive me out of the political process. God had made me an effective spokesman for His standard regarding homosexuality, so I was a primary target of their attacks.

The first lawsuit was for battery and stemmed from one of the earliest campaign events of the 1992 election cycle. OCA had prepared an educational video called *The Gay Agenda*, which featured film footage from various "Gay Pride" parades with commentary by pro-family leaders. It was quite a shocking film and very effectively contradicted the benign but false public image that the homosexual community had cultivated in Oregon. I had scheduled the inaugural showing of the film at my church, Portland Foursquare, and advertised it as an "invitation only" affair.

One of the Portland "gay" newspapers had managed to infiltrate our mailing list and was notified of the event in our newsletter. They sent one of their reporters, a lesbian activist, with instructions to sneak into the meeting. Unfortunately, our volunteers who had been stationed at the front door to check invitations left their posts just after the film started, and she was able to walk right in. However, looking quite obviously like a Portland lesbian, she was immediately confronted and admitted she was with the "gay" press. After she refused to leave, I was called over to deal with the problem.

To make a long story short, after trying to reason with her for several minutes, I physically picked her up and put her out of the building. I didn't use any more force than was necessary to get her out the door, and did not in any way hurt her, nor would I have. In retrospect, I shouldn't have done it, even though I was well within my legal rights. Having been raised with three little sisters (who were often just as stubborn and belligerent), I just didn't think twice about it.

The entire incident lasted less than a minute, but it was to influence the course of my life from that day forward. Frankly, these remain some of my most unpleasant memories, and it is uncomfortable even now to relive them, but I want to show how once again, God brought good from evil.

The lesbian activist tried to have me arrested, but the police refused. She then went to the District Attorney, who also refused. They both told her that I had the legal right to eject her. She was guilty of criminal trespass from the moment I told her that she was not welcome at the event. The Assistant District Attorney who interviewed her even wrote as much in his report. However, the "gay" community recognized the propaganda value of the incident (as they spun it) and within a



few weeks I was served with a civil lawsuit for battery. Lon Mabon and OCA were also named in the suit.

I was not terribly worried about the lawsuit. In fact, I had absolute confidence that it would come to nothing. I trusted the Lord that He would deliver us (I was still immature enough as a Christian to believe that God's blessing always meant the fulfillment of my own perceived needs). I was so sure of the result that I made virtually no preparation for the trial, except what our attorney insisted upon. He, a brand new attorney fresh from law school, volunteered because he shared our Christian values. I believe that it was his very first trial. I do not fault him in any way for the result of our trial. He did his utmost for us in the face of what I believe was an inevitable result due to the political nature of the case and the power of our adversaries.

I am about to describe the circumstances surrounding the trial as I remember them, and as I believe they occurred. These are my personal perceptions and opinions, and I relate them from the perspective of a victim of what I believe was a carefully coordinated and orchestrated conspiracy. I cannot prove some of the things I believe about the actions or motives of my opponents during this time. Indeed, I cannot say that some of the things I will relate were not mere coincidence. I will simply tell the story as accurately as possible and let you decide for yourself.

The "gays" were very thorough in their preparation. First, they hired a veteran civil litigator. Second, they continually postponed the trial so that it was finally held in the last weeks of the 1992 election, when it offered the greatest propaganda value. Third, they coordinated their efforts with the liberal Portland media to gain the largest possible audience for what they had planned.

What should have been a half-day trial was staged over four full days in downtown Portland, the heart of the "gay" power base in Oregon. Our *pro tem* judge (a non-judge temporarily assigned to the bench to handle our case) was a corporate lawyer for Nike (well known to be a pro-"gay" company – and a backer of the No on 9 campaign). Sitting in the back of the courtroom for the trial was an actual judge, a leader of the "Gay and Lesbian Law Association," whose purpose (I believe) was to make sure the *pro tem* steered the trial toward our defeat. It was a jury trial, but as in all such trials, the judge holds most of the power.

The first two days were used by the plaintiff to put on her case. A lesbian chiropractor testified that she (the lesbian plaintiff) had required over a year of treatment for injuries suffered in the incident (a completely preposterous assertion). A psychiatrist testified that the plaintiff has been so emotionally traumatized in the incident that she could no longer work in her chosen field of photo journalism and had to take a menial job in a warehouse. The plaintiff's mother was flown in to testify that her daughter had changed so much due to the trauma that she could hardly recognize her. The plaintiff herself, who had showed up to the OCA event dressed as a "butch" lesbian, appeared in court looking sweet, innocent and very feminine. In her own testimony she

characterized her trespass at the OCA event as the equivalent of infiltrating the Ku Klux Klan, and painted me (and OCA) as comparable to the Nazis.

Despite the lies and distortions, I remained confident that we would prevail. Most of all, I trusted that the Lord would deliver us, but I also knew we had an evidentiary “ace-in-the-hole”: the written report of the Assistant District Attorney in which it was recorded that the lesbian activist had admitted to criminally trespassing at our event.

The real problems started when it came time for us to put on our case. The *pro tem* judge had been hostile to us from the start, but when we began to make points with the jury, he got angry. When we came to the place in our defense where we were to introduce the D.A.’s report, things went from bad to worse.

Under the laws of evidence, any statement made outside of the courtroom is hearsay if it is offered to prove the truth of the thing asserted. It is a law designed to preserve the reliability of testimony. You can overcome the hearsay objection by showing the trustworthiness of the statement in some other way, such as by referring to a previous written record of the statement.

Here’s how it’s supposed to work: You ask the witness on the stand to give direct testimony from memory. If he can’t remember, you get to show him a previous written record of what he said to help him refresh his memory and then ask the question again. If he still can’t remember, you can establish that the written record is authentic and that the witness’s record was truthful when he wrote it, then enter the document into the record under the “past recollection recorded” exception to the hearsay rule.

In our case, the Assistant District Attorney (under penalty of perjury on the witness stand) claimed he could not remember speaking with the lesbian activist. I was stunned. Call me naïve, but it had not occurred to me that the DA might “fail to recall” what he had written. Our attorney then proceeded to the next step in the process, and began to offer the record to the DA to refresh his memory. At this critical juncture the judge interrupted the trial and told our attorney that he was not going to allow it, but our attorney argued with him and the judge, visibly angry, backed down.

The D.A. then reviewed his notes, looked up and said that he still did not recall speaking with the plaintiff.

Our final option was the introduction of the document itself as a “past recollection recorded.” However, as our attorney started to introduce it into evidence, the judge stopped the trial. In a dramatic move, he had the bailiff clear all the jurors from the courtroom, and then turned to our attorney. As he stood there facing the judge, I could see sweat trickling down the side of his face. The judge leaned forward and, with unconcealed hostility, threatened to punish him with sanctions (a monetary fine) if our attorney dared to proceed to put the document into evidence. It was the critical turning point in the trial. Unfortunately, he capitulated to the judge. As I said,

I do not blame the attorney. In my opinion, this judge would have found some other way to sabotage us if we had prevailed in this point, but since he had succeeded at keeping out this testimony, his purpose was mostly accomplished.

In the end, I was found liable for battery for ejecting the lesbian activist from our private meeting and assessed a judgment of \$22,000. It could have been much worse (they had sued for \$400,000) but in the end the jury limited the damages to the amount of lost wages she had supposedly suffered in leaving photo journalism due to psychological trauma. I didn't believe it at first. I had been certain to the end that God would deliver us. I now know that He had other goals for me, and that this lawsuit would cause me to more easily follow His leading to become a lawyer.

The worst part of this incident, however, was not the trial, but the media coverage of it. Whenever there was a break in the trial, everyone would have to leave the courtroom and wait in the hallway until it was reopened. The media was always there in the hallway waiting for us. For four days they generated their own media circus about the trial, as if I were some major criminal on trial for a capital crime. The evening news, dominated by Measure 9 since the beginning of the campaign, became a regular hate-fest against OCA.

One of the low points of the trial occurred during such a break. I was sitting on a bench in the hallway when I was approached by a female reporter with one of the TV stations. She sat down next to me and started to make friendly conversation. I hadn't yet met this reporter so I thought she might be a genuinely sympathetic person (hope springs eternal). Once I had warmed up to her, however, the conversation turned and she said, "You know there is this rumor going around that you were caught having 'gay' sex in the bushes at Laurelhurst Park. Is that true?" As I started to respond with outrage, I could see the cameraman out of the corner of my eye and realized that I was being set up to be filmed in an angry outburst. Fortunately, I had the composure to check myself and just smiled. "No, that's not true," I said, and moved off down the hallway.

There was barely concealed exultation in the evening news on the day the decision against us was handed down. I learned a lot about humility on that day and in the following weeks.

Within a couple of days the No on 9 Committee began running a new television ad across the state. Three segments played over a soundtrack with an ominous tone. The center segment featured a picture of my face and a voiceover that said "A lesbian is beaten by an official of the OCA." This was, of course an outrageous lie. She hadn't even alleged this in her lawsuit. When I threatened to sue the television stations, the "gays" changed the advertisement. They left everything else the same, but replaced the word "beaten" with "battered."

They were technically correct, since battery is legal term that includes any "offensive touching" of another person. However, to non-lawyers, battery is synonymous with beating, and so they lost none of their propaganda value by the change of terms. However, I lost any chance of prevailing in a lawsuit against them.

The “gays” ran their advertisement throughout Oregon for the remaining weeks of the campaign. I believe they spent over a million dollars on it. Whatever good reputation I had earned through the earlier months of the campaign was destroyed by their slander. Overnight I became a figure of notoriety, and the object of hatred and ridicule of the Left. In my own neighborhood in Portland, the “gays” hung posters of me on telephone poles under the title “Hang Your Head In Shame, Scott Lively.” It became common for me to overhear people in supermarkets and other public places whispering things like “There’s that OCA guy.” Yet, God gave me a double measure of His grace throughout all of this and I never lost my sense of confidence that my service was pleasing to Him. That was all that really mattered.

[The other lawsuits occurred during the Measure 13 campaign from 1992-1994, but I am including them here because it provides additional context about life in Oregon during and after the Measure 9 campaign.]

### **The Second Lawsuit**

The “gays” second lawsuit against me was for defamation, and it took place in Lane County, Oregon, home of the University of Oregon in the City of Eugene. In my opinion, Eugene, Oregon is one of the three most radically leftist cities in America, along with Berkeley, California and Madison, Wisconsin. Eugene is today one of the primary centers of the anarchist movement in the US (these anarchists are the black-garbed street thugs that frequently destroy property at international gatherings of world leaders). On my most recent stop in Eugene a few years ago, about 30 anarchist youths were hanging around outside the courthouse (the very site of this second lawsuit) wearing black masks and carrying signs saying “Kill the Police,” and the like. It was just a typical day in Eugene. [This testimony pre-dates the rise of Antifa.]

I’m only reporting this to give you the sense of what it was like to face a lawsuit in Lane County. Certainly not every resident was a liberal zealot, but there were enough of them for us to be concerned about the makeup of a local jury on a case against Scott Lively and OCA.

The case arose from a press release I had written about political mischief in the local Human Rights Commission. A Human Rights Commission is one of the “gay” movement’s key vehicles for advancing their political agenda in a local community. These commissions are normally formed as part of a strategy for homosexuals to link up with liberal members of ethnic minorities, who then promote the idea that opposition to homosexuality is the equivalent of racism and equally deserving of public condemnation and punishment. My press release was designed to expose the fact that the “gays” were really running the commission (this is nearly always true, but usually unknown to the public). I said in my press release that the new head of the human rights commission was a homosexual. Ironically, I did not name him in the press release, having read in the news that he was upset at all the publicity. I was trying to do him the courtesy of leaving his name out, since it only mattered for our purposes that the “gays” were calling the shots politically.

However, it was technically not yet true that this person was head of the commission, because he had been nominated but not ratified by the City Council. I didn't know this, having gotten the story second-hand from an inside source who had omitted some of the facts.

The former head of the commission, a man named G. W., had vacated the post some months prior. Though it was clear from the facts in the press release that our accusation was not directed at W., there was enough ambiguity in it to hang a lawsuit on and so we were soon served with a summons and complaint for defamation of W. (in yet another ironic twist, this pro-“gay” advocate was claiming to have been defamed by being called homosexual). The request was for damages of one million dollars.

Eventually, Lon Mabon and I were back in the courtroom again, sitting side by side at the defense table. At the table with us was the same attorney who had defended us in Portland. By this time he was much more experienced and very competent. Against us was a team of three female lawyers who gave every indication of being lesbians (I don't recall if they publicly identified themselves as such).

There were few noteworthy moments in this trial until the final day, when both sides had completed their cases and the court had reconvened for the rendering of the jury's verdict. W.'s attorneys were so confident of victory, that the lead counsel came into the courtroom literally rubbing her hands together and licking her lips as though she was about to sit down to a feast prepared in her honor. Minutes later she looked shell-shocked as the verdict came back in our favor: not liable. God gave us the victory in this case, against all odds.

### **The Third and Fourth Lawsuits**

The final lawsuits resulted from a single incident, and were eventually consolidated into a single suit, but the fact that they were filed separately is important to the story.

One day at my OCA office I was visited by an elderly woman who was desperate for help for her daughter. The daughter was in a legal dispute with her husband over the custody of their three young children and the court had awarded custody to him. Unfortunately for the children, their father was a homosexual, now living with his boyfriend, and both of them reputedly had full-blown AIDS. The father's condition was apparently so advanced that his driver's license had been taken from him because he was having brain seizures (that did not stop him from driving the children around in his car).

The mom was a perfectly capable parent and there was no reason, other than political correctness, for the children to be taken from her.

The grandmother had come to me in the hopes that OCA could bring some public attention to this case and perhaps force a reversal of the court's decision. We agreed, then held a press conference on the steps of the courthouse and passed out a flyer stating the facts of the case.

It wasn't long before we were hit with two new lawsuits, one each from the father and the boyfriend. Each suit sought five million dollars in damages for invasion of privacy. To cause us greater expense (we surmised) the suits were filed in separate counties. This was a serious problem because OCA was by this time struggling financially, in large part due to the legal costs from the previous lawsuits.

For the first time we faced "legitimate" legal exposure. The flyer we passed out at the press conference might possibly (I now know) have been ruled an invasion of privacy. The "gays" had more to use against us than just the hope of political bias on the part of judge and jury. In fact, our political enemies apparently felt that case was so strong against us that they helped the plaintiffs to retain one of the top attorneys in the state, a former state appeals court judge. It looked like our goose was cooked.

Lawsuits take a very long time to run their course, and the anxiety that inevitably occurs increases as a trial nears. I had now lived under a cloud of legal uncertainty almost constantly for three or four years, but the emotional stress had grown much worse as the months wore on in this suit. Then, just a few weeks before trial, I had a visit from the husband of the woman who had solicited our help, the children's grandfather. He had an amazing story to tell.

It seems that early in the case the father and the boyfriend had broken up. (Allegedly, a physical altercation between the two of them had resulted in the hospitalization of the father.) When the father got out of the hospital, he brought a new boyfriend into the house, along with a young woman with a toddler, who was to serve as a nanny for the four children now living in the household.

One day, a neighbor spied the toddler running out of the side door of the house. He was covered with bruises. It seems that the child had refused to eat, and as punishment the men had put him in the basement and taken turns going down to beat him. The neighbor called the police and the men were arrested and charged with torture of the toddler.

Obviously, Children's Protective Services is called in on a matter like this to remove the children. Acting quickly, the mom had hired an attorney and gotten back temporary custody of her kids. However, Oregon being the "gay"-influenced state that it is, Children's Protective Services had apparently promised the father that custody of his own three children would be returned to him. The District Attorney's office had apparently also cut a deal with all three adults that they would get probation and no jail time.

I am reporting all of this second-hand, of course, as it was recounted to me by the grandfather, who was in the courtroom for the trials of the three adults. By God's providence, the "gays" strategy unraveled. For some reason the three defendants were separated in the process of sentencing. The new boyfriend and the young woman went first and received their "slap on the hand." However, the father appeared later, and for some reason was assigned a different judge. This judge, after reviewing the file, including the photos of the little toddler, looked up at the district attorney and said "You've got a lot of nerve bringing this plea bargain into my courtroom." He then turned to the father and said "You're going to jail."

Portland at this time had a major problem with overcrowding at the jails, and so the father was sent home with instructions to report to jail at a future date.

That night, the father and the new boyfriend committed double suicide.

We showed up at court on the day of our trial, and had a settlement conference in the hallway with the original boyfriend who filed one of the two invasion of privacy lawsuits against us. As soon as he learned that we knew what had happened, he decided to drop the case. As I pointed out to him, no jury in the world convict us for invading the privacy of this "family." If we had succeeded in the original goal for which we had held the press conference, these children would not have suffered such terrible trauma.

In the end, the mom won permanent custody of her children, and there were no further repercussions to the incident. For the sake of the children OCA agreed not to publicize the circumstances I've described here, though such publication would surely have helped to rehabilitate our reputations.

The four lawsuits were tough to endure, but God used them for His purposes and my good. They are the reason I am a lawyer today. Looking back, I can see His hand through it all. Of the \$11,400,000.00 potential damages I faced, the total judgment against me was just \$22,000. And God provided every penny of that sum through the generosity of friends and supporters.

Even so, the thought of paying this money to the lesbian activist was at first very difficult emotionally. It seemed like giving her a reward for persecuting me. Yet, in prayer I was reminded of two things. First, that Jesus asks us to "turn the other cheek" when we personally are injured by others and to "love your enemies, bless those who curse you, do good to those who hate you, and pray for those who spitefully use you and persecute you" (Matthew 5:39,44). Second, that every thing I have comes from and belongs to God. It was all his money, and if He wanted me to pay it to her, He must have had a very good reason.

What could have been emotionally and spiritually damaging to me (causing lasting bitterness and unforgiveness) instead became a blessing. I paid the judgment "as unto the Lord" as an act of submission to Him and received spiritual enrichment of far greater value -- thank you, Jesus.

[I should acknowledge here that *My Life in His Hands* was first published in the Spring of 2007, five years before I would face the fifth and most consequential lawsuit of my career: the outrageous SMUG v Lively civil suit that lasted 6 ½ years in US federal court – ridiculously accused of “Crimes Against Humanity” for preaching against homosexuality in Uganda. It was an obscene travesty of justice and abuse of power by a hard-left judge that cost \$1.5 million to defend before I eventually won. But that is a story for another time.]



## The No on 9 Tidal Wave

*The following is an article I wrote in early 2016, which includes a summary of things that OCA faced in the Measure 9 campaign and the transition to the Measure 13 campaign which were not already addressed above. It is followed by a review of other relevant items that deserve to be memorialized in this booklet.*

It is very tough to be a pro-family leader in this dark hour. A tidal wave of "gay" cultural supremacy is sweeping away the marriage-based foundations of our society, perpetuated by "elites" in defiance of the people.

I started my pro-family ministry in the late 1980s when the LGBT strategic plan was well under way and its activist army was very widely deployed in all the social and political spheres of influence. Yet its power was still mostly hidden, like the bulk of the iceberg that took down the Titanic.

CA Congressman Bill Dannemeyer had just published his book, "*Shadow in the Land*," and Enrique Rueda's book was out, "*The Homosexual Network*," both of which chronicled how the "gays" had taken over the American Psychiatric Association (APA) and forced it to declare homosexuality no longer a mental disorder -- clearing the way for homosexual to become (among other things previously restricted to them) teachers and day care workers.

I remember the public controversy that raged in those days, when the "gays" and their allies erupted in outrage when anyone suggested they would ever push their agenda on schoolchildren. Ha! But good luck getting that Genie back in the bottle short of revolution.

In those days it seems like we would stop the "gay" agenda. The National Association for Research and Therapy of Homosexuality (NARTH) was proving the efficacy of reparative therapy. Exodus International had become the central clearing-house for a huge network of "ex-" "gay" organizations. Christian radio was thoroughly dominated by pro-family giants like Dr James Dobson of Focus on the Family and Dr. D. James Kennedy of Coral Ridge Ministries. Jerry Falwell's "Moral Majority" was very active, as was Pat Robertson's Christian Coalition (of which I was a board member of the Oregon chapter). And there were many more state and national groups -- all devoted to opposing the homosexual agenda.

In Oregon, where I had just joined the Oregon Citizens Alliance (OCA) as its state communications director, the movement was strong and optimistic. OCA had repealed Governor Neil Goldschmidt's executive order granting minority status (special rights) to homosexuals in 1986, the same year the US Supreme Court affirmed the right of states to criminalize sodomy and regulate sexual conduct in the public interest in the case of *Bowers v Hardwick*.

In the 1992 election cycle, OCA took the lead nationally in trying to stop the “gays” from adding “sexual orientation” to existing antidiscrimination law -- which was their big push in the 1990s, laying the groundwork for all of the rest of their agenda.

“No Special Rights” was our theme in statewide OCA ballot measures in 1992 and 1994 (which were close votes but unsuccessful -- though I believe we were cheated out of a win by massive voter fraud in 1994).

THEN, however, our allies in Colorado (where OCA had established a fledgling chapter to help guide their efforts) picked up the baton and succeeded in passing their own version of our No Special Rights Act: Colorado’s Amendment 2.

THIS was the pivotal moment and the social/political peak of the American pro-family movement. Amendment 2 forbade homosexuality from being included in antidiscrimination laws, and we knew it was a slam-dunk win legally, because the Supreme Court had clearly established that minority status required 1) political powerlessness, 2) immutable characteristics (like skin color) and 3) a history of discrimination. The “gays” absolutely, positively could not qualify!!

Amendment 2 was the fruit of a long season of Christian-led popular uprising against the normalization of homosexuality. This was the beginning of the end of the “gay” agenda -- so we thought.

Then, as now, We the People attempted to set our own social policy by proper use of the democratic process. Then, as now, the elites emerged from the shadows at the critical moment to protect and advance their own contradictory social/cultural goals through political/judicial manipulation.

We saw this first in Oregon. At the height of the 1992 election season when it looked like we could actually win despite an astonishing, unprecedented effort to stop us, the Chairman of the State GOP, Craig Berkman, did a joint in-person television commercial with with his Dem counterpart to denounce the No Special Rights Act: a grievous stab in the back by the establishment "elites.

Afterward, we retooled the No Special Rights Act and in the 1993/94 election cycle ran it in 26 cities and counties, *winning all 26 consecutive local elections by margins as high as 80%*. Then, the GOP-controlled legislature “preempted the field,” declaring that only the state legislature had the power to decide these issues, *invalidating all 26 of our wins with the stroke of a pen.*

In Colorado, the GOP was not as easily co-opted and the elites couldn’t stop Amendment 2 from being passed. So they turned to the federal judiciary, and their champion on the Supreme Court, Justice Anthony Kennedy -- the man who wrote the majority opinion in all four of the key pro-“gay

rights” SCOTUS decisions -- including the most recent “gay marriage” case, *Obergefell v Hodges*, and the *Lawrence v Texas* case in 2003 that overruled *Bowers v Hardwick*!

However, the first of the four, the Amendment 2 case, *Romer v Evans* (1996) was arguably the most significant of them all, because Kennedy found a way NOT to subject Amendment 2 to normal constitutional analysis. He simply and audaciously declared that Colorado had no legitimate state interest in denying minority status to homosexuals, only “animus” (hatred), and thus the court needed to go no further in their analysis of the case. What?! With that utterly lawless ruling, the elites invalidated the will of the people, and ensured that nothing could stop the advance of the “gay” agenda. While at the same time they taught the left to simply cry “hate” as the secret to defeating all conservative initiatives.

[The third case, of the four, chronologically, was *United States v Windsor* (2013) which ruled that the federal Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) was an unconstitutional violation of the Due Process clause of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment.]

That was really the beginning of the end of the pro-family vision of returning America to family values. We would continue to have some occasional victories, but the eventual supremacy of “gay rights” over the legitimate constitutional rights of religious liberty and freedom of speech was made inevitable in 1996 by “Justice” Kennedy, the worst enemy of the natural family in the history of the court.

What I have seen first-hand in battle after battle in the culture war is that the will of the people just doesn’t seem to matter. The “elites” are determined to advance the LGBT agenda at all costs.

Today [2016], the hottest place on the battlefield is North Carolina, where the people’s will to protect their girl children from transsexual men (who demand the right to enter their bathrooms) has been codified by the legislature. No less a figure than NC’s Governor Pat McCrory has gone public to warn that the “gay’s” Human Rights Campaign (HRC) is more powerful than the vaunted National Rifle Association, long held by politicians across the spectrum to be the most powerful advocacy group in the United States.

HRC is funded in part by GOP billionaire donor Paul Singer, who funded an HRC dossier naming me as Global Public Enemy #1 of it’s international agenda.

But Singer is only one of the corporate elitists who are now exposed as puppet-masters -- pulling the strings that control American government and trample will of the people on LGBT issues. He, and his like-minded cronies at Target Corporation (willing to lose a million boycotting customers to promote transgender bathrooms), are challenging the notion that “We the People” control our

own democratic system.

Yes, these are dark times but I'm not giving up no matter how bad things look. For those of us who abide in Christ, "democracy" has always been an illusion. We serve the monarchy of the King of Kings and our certain victory is in Him.

## Why Measure 9 was Defeated

Before we leave this section of the book I feel it is important for me to explain why I think we lost this election in Oregon: the single biggest factors being the betrayal of the Oregon Republican Party and of the Roman Catholic Church. I addressed the GOP above but the Roman Catholic Church in Oregon committed its own act of betrayal of the pro-family cause in an 11<sup>th</sup> hour decision NOT to endorse Measure 9 despite its conformity to biblical morality and (until then) the strong support of Catholic believers across the state. This was the decision of then-Archbishop William Levada.

Before I bash Levada and the RCC hierarchy for just cause, let me pause here to state unequivocally that I love my Catholic brethren, whom I consider to be authentic Christians of a legitimate Christian denomination, some of whose doctrines I strongly disagree with. But, because I believe that *salvation is by faith alone in Christ alone* (Romans 10:9-13), I conclude that believers who honestly share that faith have total liberty in Christ to choose to adhere to Roman Catholicism, or Calvinism or Pentecostalism, or Messianic Judaism or any of the other hundreds of confessions/denominations across the world. No faith confession is free of flaws which might affect one's sanctification process but thankfully flawed doctrines do not invalidate one's justification (Romans 8:39). I have proudly included faithful Roman Catholics on past governing boards I've set up, and count as one of my highest honors being hosted by Cardinal Janis Pujats of Riga, Latvia to jointly teach a class with him on understanding the history, goals and tactics of the LGBT movement at a Catholic seminary in 2007.

Here is the opening paragraph of Levada's Wikipedia page as of November 7, 2022:

"William Joseph Levada (June 15, 1936 – September 26, 2019) was an American cardinal of the Catholic Church. From May 2005 until June 2012, he served as Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith under Pope Benedict XVI; he was the highest ranking American in the Roman Curia. He was previously the Archbishop of Portland in Oregon from 1986 to 1995, and then Archbishop of San Francisco from 1995 to 2005. While serving as archbishop, he was criticized for covering up sexual abuse by priests within his jurisdiction. Levada was created a cardinal in 2006 by Benedict XVI."

Reading between the lines from a front-lines culture-war perspective, Levada's willingness to play ball with the demonic elites on the most pivotal grassroots battle in the LGBT culture war arguably propelled him to the top of the power pyramid. He was rewarded first with transfer to San Francisco – the Shangri-La of homosexual culture – and then succeeded Cardinal Ratzinger (Pope Benedict) himself as the Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith – the highest body of moral authority on issues of sexuality in the RCC – despite the cloud of controversy that

hung darkly over him in the pederast-priest scandal.

My guess is that Levada was himself a homosexual and one of the key members of the Vatican “gay mafia”<sup>14</sup> that Pope John Paul II privately battled, and Pope Benedict publicly warned against just before he “resigned” (was deposed) in a transfer of power to “Pope” Francis which many conservative Catholics contend was a coup orchestrated by Francis and Barack Obama.<sup>15</sup> Yes, I know this sounds like a crazy conspiracy theory, but more and more the people of the world are recognizing that many former conspiracy “theories” are actually factual. One important fact to remember, is that Levada was the single most powerful American Catholic during the entire season of the culture war in which LGBT hegemony was imposed on this country while official Catholic opposition to their agenda was muted at best.

I must add here that I think Pope Benedict was a righteous man who attempted to navigate an impossible political quagmire with grace and resolve, but like President Trump in his first term, did not have actual control of the government under his supposed jurisdiction. The Vatican “deep state” was and is just as corrupt as the American one and both Benedict and Trump started with just a beachhead which each significantly enlarged through skill and persistence. But neither ever had full control, and both were removed from office by powerful forces of wickedness. Francis and Biden are the obvious puppets of similar deep state forces whose common denominator is Barack Obama. (Let’s never forget that in 2015 Obama and Francis tag-teamed the launch of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development at the UN<sup>16</sup> – which is the foundation upon which Klaus Schwab’s World Economic Forum has built the geopolitical machinery for imposing transhumanism and the Great Reset upon the world.)

In any case, I believe the anti-family activism of Berkman and Levada was the political sabotage that killed the Measure 9 campaign in Oregon. We – meaning the larger coalition of pro-family activists using our No Special Rights theme – did, however, win in Colorado’s Amendment 2 with a 53% majority. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Romer\\_v.\\_Evans](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Romer_v._Evans) It took a far bigger betrayal at a far higher political level to kill Amendment 2. That was only accomplished by the utterly lawless invalidation of the people’s will by Justice Anthony Kennedy in the *Romer v Evans* case.

# **The Battle for Measure 9**

## **Measure 9's Impact on the National Culture War**

This section of the book is not yet complete, and so the following article is offered as a placeholder because it offers what I believe is one of my most important observations about the national culture war – indeed the global culture war – that I would likely not have understood without having served on the front lines in the battle for Measure 9. I expect to eventually publish a full book or booklet on this topic.

### **The Five Stages of Homofascism: A Primer on “Gay Supremacy” in America**

Comments of Dr. Scott Lively on the 4th Anniversary of Obergefell v Hodges, June 26, 2019, US Supreme Court, Washington DC

I am Dr. Scott Lively and I’m here to explain how the LGBT movement gained legal, cultural and political supremacy over Christianity in America in just 50 years. It advanced through five stages and four supreme court rulings.

The Five Stages of Homofascism are:

1. Tolerance
2. Acceptance
3. Celebration
4. Forced Participation in LGBT Culture
5. Punishment of Dissenters

The original goal of the LGBT movement in the 1950s was tolerance, what Dale Jennings of the Mattachine Society called “The right to be left alone.”

But exactly 50 years ago in the Stonewall riots, homofascism was born – when the movement set

its sights on replacing family-centered society with sexual anarchy. Their detailed agenda was published soon after as “The 1972 Gay Rights Platform,” and they launched a united national campaign for “sexual freedom” to be recognized as a constitutional right.

In response, the pro-family movement arose during the Reagan administration in the 1980s to defend marriage and the natural family. In 1986, Justice Byron White (appointed by JFK) dealt a death blow to the LGBT “sexual freedom” strategy in the majority opinion of *Bowers v Hardwick*, expressly recognizing the right of states to regulate all sexual conduct in the public interest, but specifically homosexual sodomy.

Undeterred, the “gays” launched a new strategy in the late 1980s to characterize so-called “sexual orientation” as an immutable condition and to classify themselves as a civil rights minority. They made the “born that way” argument the centerpiece of their propaganda narrative, and then hijacked the Black civil rights movement to implement their political agenda, essentially stealing Jesse Jackson’s “Rainbow-Push Coalition” for themselves and adopting the rainbow flag as their banner.

All across America LGBT activists then used their growing power in the Democrat party to create “Human Rights Commissions” at the local and state level which in turn pushed for the passage of anti-discrimination laws in which sexual orientation was bundled together with established civil rights minority classes. Wherever resistance to normalizing homosexuality was strong, they followed a two step process, adding sexual orientation later, usually after a media campaign focusing on “hate crimes” reporting (most of which was unverified and almost certainly fraudulent). In all cases the Human Rights Commission tactic was driven by the “gays,” though rarely openly.

In response, the Oregon Citizens Alliance (of which I was Communications Director) pioneered the No Special Rights Act in 1992 to prohibit sexual orientation from being included in anti-discrimination laws. A version of our No Special Rights Act passed in Colorado as Amendment 2, becoming the basis for the supreme court case *Romer v Evans* in 1996.

*Romer* was the first of four major cases by which swing voter Justice Anthony Kennedy (the worst enemy of the family in the history of the court) established “Gay Supremacy” in America.

Our pro-family movement had essentially won the culture war with Amendment 2, because the well established test for identifying a “suspect class” (civil rights minority) in constitutional law included two elements that the “gays” could not meet: political powerlessness and an immutable condition like skin color.



But Kennedy simply disregarded the law, saying that Amendment 2 was not a valid exercise of state power because in his opinion it was motivated by “animus” (hatred) – in one stroke both voiding Amendment 2 while simultaneously coaching the political left to cry “Hate” at any conservative policy they wanted to invalidate in the future.

Kennedy followed up on *Romer* with *Lawrence v Texas* (2003) in which he used the pretext of striking down Texas’ virtually unenforced sodomy laws to repeal *Bowers v Hardwick*. (Reportedly Lawrence and his sodomy partner staged the scene to ensure his arrest to create legal standing to sue the state.)

Killing *Bowers* was a necessary prerequisite to legalizing “gay marriage” which happened the following year in Massachusetts, thanks to the full and immediate acquiescence of fake conservative then-governor Mitt Romney.

In response to the inevitable wave of “gay marriage” laws that followed in liberal states, the pro-family movement created the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) which quickly became law in 35 states and the federal government.

The supposed Catholic Kennedy again thwarted us in his ruling in *US v Windsor*, striking down the federal DOMA. Two years later he finished the job by creating a supposed constitutional right to “gay marriage” in *Obergefell v Hodges* by judicial fiat: icing the LGBT cake with a declaration in the ruling that homosexuality must now be accepted as “immutable.”

Having fulfilled his globalist mission to establish “Gay Supremacy” in America, Kennedy recently retired from the court after (I strongly suspect) assuring that his legacy would be preserved by the nomination of his former clerk Brett Kavanaugh to fill his vacancy. I sincerely hope I am wrong about Kavanaugh and will apologize profusely if in future cases he shows integrity in helping to reverse Kennedy’s errors.

So here we stand in 2019, four years after *Obergefell* and the LGBTs instant pivot to “transgenderism” (and pedophilia), watching small children being deliberately infected with hypersexual transgender insanity to the applause of the entire leftist bloc, and Congress seriously debating the so called Equality Act to criminalize Christianity in America.

Throughout this decades-long process America has been pushed inexorably by the leftist elites through the five stages of homofascism until today celebration of all things LGBT is the norm, forced participation in “gay” culture is increasing rapidly, and punishment of dissenters is a virtual mandate of social justice in the minds of the Millennials. God help us!

Can this process be reversed? I believe it can, but only if conservatives, including our presumed

five member majority on the supreme court remember what it is that conservatism exists to conserve: the God-fearing, family centered, constitutional republic our founders fought a bloody revolution to secure for us.

# The Battle for Measure 9

## Conclusion

[In progress]

### **Culture War Victory Still Possible for Conservatives**

Posted on July 23, 2017 by Pastor Scott

What we call the pro-family movement is a component of the larger conservative movement and deals with matters of sexuality and the natural family. Its American roots are in the cultural backlash to the Marxist revolution of the 1960s that turned family-centered society on its head and swapped the Judeo-Christian morality of our founding for Soviet-style “political correctness.”

Before the 1960s there wasn’t any need for a “pro-family” movement because family values had been the overwhelming consensus of the western world for centuries. Indeed, so surprised were Americans about the cultural revolution that it took nearly twenty years for the conservatives to mount a truly effective response to it. That came under Ronald Reagan in the 1980s.

The 60’s revolution was not grounded in the Marxist orthodoxy of Lenin and Stalin, but the Cultural Marxism of Herbert Marcuse’s Frankfurt School, which envisioned sexual anarchy, not a “workers revolt,” as the key to dismantling Judeo-Christian civilization. The natural core constituency for this ideology was the underground “gay” movement whose dream of social acceptance was not possible without a complete transformation of American sexual morality. Thus, beginning in the late 1940s, Marxist organizer Harry Hay, so-called “father of the American gay movement” was also “father” of the (then hidden) army of “gay” activists most responsible for the “culture war” that exploded in the 60’s and continues today.

America’s Marxist revolution was therefore a “sexual revolution” whose overwhelming success vindicated Marcuse’s destructive vision and became the primary tool of the one-world government elites for softening resistance to their domination by breaking the family-centered society which is every nation’s greatest source of strength, stability and self-sufficiency.

Importantly, though primarily driven behind the scenes by “gays,” the first goal was not legitimization of homosexual sodomy but the normalization of heterosexual promiscuity. This was

the motive and strategy that drove “closeted” 1940s and 50s homosexual activist Alfred Kinsey’s fraudulent “science” attacking the marriage-based sexual ethic as “repressive” and socially harmful. It also drove the launch of the modern porn industry, beginning with Hugh Hefner’s Playboy Magazine (Hefner called himself “Kinsey’s pamphleteer”). It drove and defined the battles in the courts where sexual morality was systematically “reformed” by Cultural Marxist elites on the US Supreme Court: contraception on demand to facilitate “fornication without consequences” (Griswold v Connecticut 1966), abortion on demand as the backup system to failed contraception (Roe v Wade 1973), and finally legalization of homosexual sodomy (Lawrence v Texas 2003).

Note the thirty year gap between Roe v Wade and Lawrence v Texas. That major delay in the Marxist agenda was achieved by the election of Ronald Reagan, under whom the pro-family movement became a major political force. That gap also highlights a critical fact: that “street activism” may be essential to any political cause but the real key to the culture war is the Supreme Court. By 1981 when Ronald Reagan took power the Marxists had nearly succeeded in collapsing the nation’s family and economic infrastructure and the LGBT juggernaut had come completely out of the shadows and taken its place at the head of the cultural blitzkrieg it had been steering from the beginning. Reagan stopped that juggernaut by putting Antonin Scalia on the Supreme Court, the lion of constitutional originalism and ally of Justice Byron White who wrote the majority opinion in Bowers v Hardwick (1986) which affirmed (not created) the constitutional right of states to criminalize homosexual sodomy and other harmful sexual conduct in the public interest.

Reagan and Scalia stopped the sexual revolution in its tracks and made it possible for the pro-family movement to begin restoring family values in society, which we strove diligently to do. I got my start in Christian social activism in those heady days and served as State Communications Director for the No Special Rights Act in Oregon in 1992 which forbade the granting of civil rights minority status based on sexual conduct. We fell short in Oregon but a Colorado version of our bill passed the same year. We had in essence won the culture war with that victory given that the Supreme Court had previously ruled that minority status designation required three things: a history of discrimination, political powerlessness, and immutable (unchangeable) status (such as skin color). We had a slam-dunk win on at least two of the three criteria and it would have been just a matter of time before we passed the No Special Rights law from coast to coast.

However, Reagan had been prevented by the elites from putting a second Scalia on the court in the person of Robert Bork, and was forced by the unprecedented political “borking” of Mr. Bork to accept their man Anthony Kennedy to fill the seat instead. Just ten years later, Kennedy served his function by writing the majority opinion killing the Colorado law in Romer v Evans (1996), audaciously declaring that the court didn’t need to apply its three-part constitution test to the No Special Rights Act because it was motivated by “animus” (hate) and thus did not represent a

legitimate exercise of the state's regulatory authority. The ruling was all the more outrageous given that it was only possibly through a blatant abuse of the court's own judicial authority. Kennedy's "disapproval = hate" lie set the tone for the political left from that point forward.

In *Lawrence v Texas*, Kennedy delivered the coup-de-grace to Justice Scalia by striking down *Bowers v Hardwick* and brazenly ruling that "public morality" cannot be the basis for law. Anthony Kennedy wrote the majority in all four SCOTUS opinions that have, in essence, established homosexual cultural supremacy in America, including the infamous and utterly unconstitutional *Obergefell v Hodges* (2015) "gay marriage" decision. He is, in my opinion, the worst and most culturally destructive jurist in the history of the court: the culprit (among many villainous candidates) most responsible for the current dysfunctional state of the family in America.

So where's the "bright future" amidst this lamentation? It's in the promise made and so-far kept by President Donald Trump to appoint only constitutional originalists to the supreme court. It is in the pleasantly surprising discovery that his first pick, Neil Gorsuch, seems from his first comments as a "supreme" to be a perfect choice to fill the "Scalia seat" on the court. It is in the hopeful rumors that Anthony Kennedy is about to retire, and the simple fact that ultra-hard leftist Ruth Bader Ginsberg and leftist Steven Breyer are of an age that their seats could at any time be vacated by voluntary or involuntary retirement.

In short, the bright future of the pro-family movement is in the hands of the man we hired to drain the swamp in Washington DC, and who hasn't yet backed down in that fight despite the remarkable scorched-earth campaign of destruction and discreditation being waged against him by the establishment elites of both parties, Hollywood and the media.

I must admit that after *Obergefell* I began to think that the pro-family movement had lost the culture war, but I now believe there is real hope, not just for reclaiming some lost ground, but possibly of reversing all of the "gains" of the hard left over the past half century. A solid majority of true constitutional originalists could actually restore the legal primacy of the natural family in America fairly quickly, and our cultural healing could quickly follow.

As the leftist elites and street activists continue their all-hands-on-deck attempted "borking" of President Trump, let's not forget why they're doing it. His political survival means the end of theirs. I can't think of a brighter future than that for our nation.

## Endnotes:

A short editorial comment is warranted here about our heavy reliance on the far-left dominated “wikipedia” as a source in this booklet. It is well known among experts on the law of evidence that a “statement against interest” is one of the most trustworthy forms of evidence, because of the self-evident human tendency to shade the truth in support of one’s personal interests. So a statement *against* one’s personal interest suggests such a strong concern for the truth it can even be used in legal trials as an exception to the rule against hearsay). Therefore, while we don’t necessarily trust wikipedia to tell the truth about things that *confirm* leftist narratives (because it is in their ideological interest to do that) we do tend to trust the things they say that *contradict* those narratives or are ideologically neutral.

1. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Frankism>
2. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The\\_Right\\_to\\_Privacy\\_\(article\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Right_to_Privacy_(article))
3. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bowers\\_v.\\_Hardwick](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bowers_v._Hardwick)
4. [https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/suspect\\_classification](https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/suspect_classification)
5. [http://library.gayhomeland.org/0018/EN/EN\\_Overhauling\\_Straight.htm](http://library.gayhomeland.org/0018/EN/EN_Overhauling_Straight.htm)
6. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rainbow/PUSH>
7. <https://www.scottlively.net/2020/08/06/the-lgbt-hijacking-of-black-power/>
8. <https://www.scottlively.net/2014/07/31/reflections-on-the-passing-of-ken-death-and-the-hypocrisy-of-the-splc/>
9. [https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0345513/?ref\\_=nm\\_film\\_dr\\_50](https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0345513/?ref_=nm_film_dr_50)
10. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Neil\\_Goldschmidt](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Neil_Goldschmidt)
11. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Terry\\_Bean](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Terry_Bean)
12. <https://www.kgw.com/article/news/timeline-of-mayor-adams-breedlove-scandal/283-734483>

13.

<https://www.scottlively.net/2019/01/23/ed-buck-and-terry-bean-the-dncc-poster-boys-of-per-version/>

14.

<https://nymag.com/intelligencer/2019/02/andrew-sullivan-the-vaticans-corruption-has-been-exposed.html>

15.

<https://www.theamericanconservative.com/pope-francis-mccarrick-gay-mafia-bombshell-vigano/>

16. <https://www.scottlively.net/2016/03/21/pope-francis-and-global-government/>