

Addenda #13 – December 2025, May 2026 Update

~~Detailing~~ Confirming the Revolution

In Addenda #13, I shared the story about former Colorado governor Richard Lamm, who attended a October 2003 conference in Washington DC to discuss the huge influx of immigration, legal and illegal, into the United States. When it came Lamm's turn to speak, he began his comments with the following statement: "I would like to share with you my plan to destroy America... here's my plan, eight parts." ¹

While many on the right liked to claim that Lamm himself was advocating for the destruction of America and telling people how that destruction could be implemented, I argued that Lamm had the foresight to tell people how the Democrat party would attempt to implement the plan that he knew would eventually happen.

Lamm could visualize the eight steps Democrats would take to destroy America back in 2003. Make America a multi-lingual, multi-cultural society in which national identity and assimilation would not exist. Create groups of oppressed people, and have people believe these groups are victims of institutional racism and bias and cannot succeed without massive government and societal intervention. Most importantly, make honest discussion and criticism of these things off limits by 'canceling' or persecuting those who dare criticize or question these policies. Mass immigration played a big part in the plan to destroy America.

"My seventh part then, I would make it impossible to enforce our immigration laws..." Lamm knew that mass immigration and a public acceptance of multi-culturalism would lead to the destruction of America. Between 11 and 18 million illegal immigrants entered the U.S. under the Biden administrations open borders policy in just four years. Besides the increased financial burden mass numbers of illegal immigrants have imposed on this country, we've read numerous stories about the increasing number of crimes committed by illegals, fraud involving social welfare programs and stories of how illegal immigrants displace U.S. born workers in the job market and depress wages.

I've continually argued that Democrats want large numbers of immigrants in the U.S. as a voting bloc to keep them in office and in power at the local, state and national levels. I defend my argument by noting that individuals who rely on public welfare are most likely to vote for the politicians and party that continually provides them with those benefits (yes, studies prove this). The majority of immigrants that have entered the U.S. during the Biden administration were not college graduates and professionals that could step into "professional" type jobs with good pay and benefits. They were poorly educated with little means of self-support. They're entry level food service, cleaning and maintenance workers, gardeners, landscapers and construction laborers. They require health benefits from Medicaid, housing and food assistance to exist in our country. While Republicans continually push for eligibility exclusions to taxpayer funded benefits, Democrats push for inclusion and find 'workarounds' when illegals don't qualify for assistance. ^{2, 3}

Christopher Murphy (Dem. CT) is a career politician. Elected to the Connecticut General Assembly at the age of 26, serving four terms 1999-2007. Murphy then served in the U.S. House of Representatives from 2007 to 2013, and the U.S. Senate from 2013 to present. In a 2024 MSNBC interview, Murphy told *All In* host Chris Hayes which group of people his party cares about the most. No, it wasn't Blacks, who overwhelmingly vote for Democrat candidates. It's not women, who Democrats pander to with promises of unrestricted abortion access. It's not the LGBTQ+ community, who Democrats continually push for additional "equality" legislation. It's illegal immigrants...

"Chris, that's [immigration strategy] been a failed play for 20 years. So, you are right that has been the Democratic strategy for 30 years, maybe, and it has failed to deliver for the people we care about most, the undocumented Americans that are in this country." ⁴

Yvette Diane Clarke (Dem. NY) is now a career politician. Clarke was elected to the New York City Council at age 37, serving one term from 2002-2006. In 2007, NY City voters elected Clarke to represent them in Congress, where she has served nine terms to present and is a member of the Congressional Progressive Caucus. Appearing in an October 2021 House Foreign Affairs Committee hearing on immigration, Clarke revealed who Democrats truly care about, and why...

"I'm from Brooklyn, New York... We have a diaspora that can absorb a significant number of these migrants and that, you know, when I hear colleagues talk about, you know, the, the, the doors of the inn being closed [and] no room in the inn, I, I'm saying, you know, I, I need more people [immigrants] in my district just for redistricting purposes." ⁴

Katherine (Katie) Porter (Dem. CA) is also a latecomer to the political scene, elected by California voters to Congress in 2018, serving three terms in the House of Representatives, but was defeated in the primary during her 2023 run for Senate. Porter, a temperamental, outspoken personality with a history of making volatile comments and abusing her staff, revealed who Democrats truly care about, and why during a recent gubernatorial debate ...

"The sanctuary state policy is designed to make sure that our state resources — the taxpayer dollars, the public servants that we have — are focusing on doing their jobs, which is not cooperating with the federal immigration authorities. These are Californians. They contribute to our economy. They pay taxes. And they're one of the only ways that our state has been growing in recent years." ⁵ (population growth = representation and federal funds)
Katie Porter; California gubernatorial debate, May 5, 2026

"Over the past 25 years California has had its slowest rates of population growth ever recorded. The primary driver of this slowdown has been California residents moving to other states. California has been losing residents to other states for more than two decades."

Who's Leaving California—and Who's Moving In?; Public Policy Institute of California, January 21, 2026

"More and more Americans are leaving California, while fewer are deciding to move there, meaning the Golden State has been facing an exodus of residents in recent years... a report by the American moving company U-Haul, which was released on January 5, the state has had the greatest out-migration for the sixth year in a row."

Map Shows States Causing California Exodus; Newsweek, January 22, 2026

A Clear and Present Danger – Threat #1: Progressive Democrat Marxism

“The Golden State lost \$91.4 billion in net income between 2019 and 2023 as people fled the region, representing the largest deficit in the country, according to IRS data.

In 2022-2023 alone it saw a \$11.9 billion net income outflow — again, the biggest loss among any state that year, according to the latest figures released last week.”

Staggering amount of cash that left California during mass exodus — and where everyone fled to; New York Post, March 25, 2026

“... it’s not just working families leaving the state. Major companies are leaving California — moving their headquarters and production facilities to other states — with many of them citing lower tax burdens and fewer regulations as well as employees’ demand. Others are leaving California due to high crime rates and a woke political culture that has become unsustainable.”
California Policy Center; October 2025

> *California saw a sharp increase of 400,000 undocumented immigrants between 2021 and 2023—mainly concentrated among those with some protection from deportation, such as asylum seekers.*

> *California has more undocumented immigrants than any other state [2.25 million as of 2023]*
Public Policy Institute of California ‘Fact Sheet’; January 2026

The problems California and other Democrat controlled states have, are directly tied to their “woke political culture”. California, New York, Illinois, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Maryland and Pennsylvania, all Democrat controlled states, lost a combined 262,464 tax paying residents between 2022 and 2023 because of high taxes, according to IRS data.⁶ The loss of tax revenue from individuals as well as businesses, is a big problem to progressive Democrat states with spending problems. California has a “structural” budget deficit projected to range from \$20 billion to \$35 billion annually. New York is facing a three year cumulative deficit of \$34.3 billion while Illinois faces a three year cumulative deficit of \$12.1 billion and New Jersey faces a three year cumulative deficit of almost \$10 billion.

Seven states lost one seat in the U.S. House of Representatives after the 2020 Census showed population losses or much slower increases, including California, New York and Illinois. Since 2020, California, New York and Illinois lost a combined 3 million total residents according to U.S. Census Bureau data. If these ‘Blue state’ population losses and ‘Red state’ population increases continue, California is projected to lose 4 additional seats, New York 2 seats and Illinois 1 seat after the 2030 census results are final. The loss of political power (representation) in policy decisions as well as the distribution of federal budget spending will only worsen these states structural budget deficits.⁷

House seats also equal Electoral College votes, more bad news for Democrats. Jonathan Cervas, a redistricting and apportionment expert at Carnegie Mellon University, estimates states that were won by Kamala Harris in the 2024 presidential election will lose 7 Electoral College votes while states that were won by Donald Trump will gain 10 Electoral College votes for the 2032 election cycle.⁸ This makes Democrat wins more difficult in future presidential elections and is the reason why Democrats continually push for “comprehensive immigration reform” in Congress, with the initial goal of “legalization” for undocumented immigrants and the eventual goal being naturalization, U.S. citizenship and voting rights.

The last comprehensive immigration reform was enacted almost four decades ago. The Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, resulted in 2.7 million illegal immigrants being granted U.S. citizenship. Since then, Congress has failed to pass major immigration reform five times, most recently the Border Act of 2024, and the illegal immigrant population has soared to an estimated 14 million. It was Senator Chris Murphy, who admitted the people his party cares about “the most” are illegal aliens, that introduced this bill into Congress, which would not stop the ability to create migrant parole programs, would not have ended the Biden administration “catch and release” policy and would not stop migrants from using meritless asylum claims to enter and remain in the United States indefinitely. This bill, according to critics, would have encouraged even more migrants to make illegal border crossings.⁹

Think of what 14 million illegal immigrants, largely Hispanic and almost 90% of voting age, being granted U.S. citizenship and voting rights would do to local, state and national elections. More than 11 million new voters targeted by Democrats for “protected status” legislation and government assistance. Educational attainment is an important benchmark in determining whether an individual will be economically and socially successful in life and be a self-sustaining, productive member of society or will require government assistance through social welfare programs to survive. This holds true for native born Americans as well as immigrants. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, newly arrived immigrants (legal and illegal together) are much larger in number, less educated, and poorer than newcomers before Covid.

The 2025 Current Population Survey showed that the share of new arrivals with no education beyond high school increased from 36 percent in 2018 to 46 percent in 2024, with a similar decline in the number of immigrants that had a college degree.¹⁰

The report showed the decline in overall education is due to a huge increase in the number of new adult immigrants with no education beyond high school, which was up 103 percent since 2018. This surge in immigrants with less education has added roughly 3.5 million to the nation’s low-income population between 2020 and 2024, as the median earnings of new adult immigrants decreased dramatically compared to that of U.S. born workers. The Center for Immigration Studies survey done in 2023 reported that 59 percent of households headed by an illegal immigrant use at least one welfare program and are especially likely to receive food benefits and Medicaid relative to native households.¹¹

A 2024 report by the Pew Research Center gave some detailed information on long-standing partisanship of different racial and income level groups. “For decades, gender, race and ethnicity, and religious affiliation have been important dividing lines in politics. This continues to be the case today.” The report shows that the Democrat Party has lost the advantage it had maintained from the mid-2000s through 2020 when more than 50% of U.S. voters identified as Democrat or Leaning Democrat. By 2023, voters were almost evenly split between identifying as or leaning Democrat and Republican, with the 3% Democrat party lost now identifying as Independent.¹² Still, Democrats had a distinct advantage with certain racial groups.

A Clear and Present Danger – Threat #1: Progressive Democrat Marxism

In 2023, 44% of Democratic and Democratic-leaning voters are Hispanic, Black, Asian, another race or multiracial, as compared with just 23% in 1996. according to the Pew report. The Roper Institute at Cornell University shows how “groups” voted in every presidential election. In 1996, 84% of Black voters voted for the Democrat Candidate Bill Clinton and in 2024, 86% voted for Kamala Harris. In 1996, 73% of Hispanic voters voted for Bill Clinton and in 2024, 51% voted for Kamala Harris.

In 1996, the number of Black or African Americans of voting age was roughly 22.8 million. In 2023, the number of Black or African Americans of voting age was roughly 30.9 million. That’s a growth in the number of Black voters of 8.1 million over 28 years.

In 1996, the number of Hispanic or Latinos of voting age was roughly 18.6 million. In 2023, the number of Hispanic or Latinos of voting age was roughly 49.5 million. That’s a growth in the number of Hispanic or Latino voters of 30.9 million over 28 years. Data from U.S. Census Bureau Estimates for Race, Age and Sex & Citizen Voting Age Population by race

Using the Roper Center data, the Black “Democrat voting bloc” increased by just 7 million while the Hispanic “Democrat voting bloc” increased by more than 15 million. This is what Chris Murphy was referring to when he said Hispanic illegal immigrants were the people the Democrats cared about the most. Blacks no longer matter to the Democrat party; they are not growing their voting bloc like Hispanics are. Family income of voters is also associated with partisanship according to the Pew Research report. 58% of voters with lower family incomes identify with or lean Democrat, while just 36% identify as or lean Republican. Excluding 2008 & 2012 when Barack Obama was the candidate, an average of 86.7% of Blacks have voted for the Democrat presidential candidate since 1992, while 63.2% of Hispanics voted for the Democrat presidential candidate in *all* elections since 1992. The significance of this should not be discounted. Of that estimated 14 million illegal immigrants that currently live in the United States, roughly 11.5 million of them would be Hispanics of voting age. Democrats saw the value in increasing their voting bloc and maintain power in government: they put on a “full court press” to favor illegal immigrants.

> On his first day in office in January 2021, President Biden proposed the *U.S. Citizenship Act of 2021*, that would have provided amnesty and a “pathway to citizenship” for as many as 11 million illegal immigrants that lived in the U.S. at that time. Democrats introduced the bill into Congress in February, but the bill failed to advance to the floor for a vote. Democrats reintroduced the Act into Congress again in 2023 and 2025.

> In July 2023, Democrats introduced a bill into Congress *Renewing Immigration Provisions of the Immigration Act of 1929*, to amend the existing Immigration Act of 1929, that would allow illegal immigrants that have lived in the United States for at least seven years, to provide lawful permanent resident status to those individuals. (The bill made exceptions for illegals convicted of crimes or terrorism.)

> During the 2024 Presidential election campaign cycle, Progressive Democratic Senator Elizabeth Warren called for “comprehensive immigration reform,” including a “pathway to citizenship”, that would give amnesty, for ALL illegal immigrants, regardless of criminal

history. Warren stated that, if elected president, Kamala Harris would “work with Congress to get that done.”

> In July 2025, Democrats reintroduced the *Renewing Immigration Provisions of the Immigration Act of 1929* into Congress.

Five bills, introduced into Congress over the past five years, to give as many as 14 million illegal immigrants amnesty, granting them lawful resident status, the opportunity to become U.S. citizens and voters. Democrats don’t care if they have criminal histories, have murdered people, trafficked drugs, weapon, women or children. They will be eligible for free healthcare, family assistance, food assistance and housing assistance, all at a tremendous cost to U.S. taxpayers, at a time in which federal budget deficits are already unsustainable. Note: Taxpayers paid out an estimated \$20.8 billion to illegal immigrants in 2023 alone. ¹³

Democrats don’t care about illegal immigrants. They don’t care about the cost to U.S. citizens and immigrants who followed the legal path to become permanent residents. Democrats only want illegal immigrants for their votes. Chris Murphy said it in 2024: for “... the people we care about most, the undocumented Americans that are in this country,”

It was never about the safety or wellbeing of illegal immigrants.

It was never about improving their lives by moving them to another country.

It was always about CONTROL!

It was always about the fundamental transformation of the United States.

It was always about overthrowing the system, overthrowing society.

A Clear and Present Danger – Threat #1: Progressive Democrat Marxism

U.S. Presidential Election Results

Year	Party	Candidates	Electoral	Popular	Percentage	Voting		
						Whites	Blacks	Hispanics
1992								
Dem.		Bill Clinton	370	44,909,889	43.01%	39%	83%	61%
Rep.		George W. Bush	168	39,104,545	37.45%	41%	10%	25%
Ind.		Ross Perot	0	19,742,267	18.91%	21%	7%	14%
Total Votes Cast / Turnout				104,426,659	59.50%	62%	57%	45%
1996								
Dem.		Bill Clinton	379	47,402,357	49.24%	44%	84%	73%
Rep.		Bob Dole	159	39,198,755	40.71%	46%	12%	21%
Ind.		Ross Perot	0	8,085,402	8.40%	9%	4%	6%
Total Votes Cast / Turnout				104,426,659	59.50%	62%	57%	45%
2000								
Dem.		Al Gore	266	50,999,897	48.00%	42%	90%	62%
Rep.		George W. Bush	271	50,456,062	46.00%	55%	9%	35%
Total Votes Cast / Turnout				105,405,100	59.50%	62%	57%	45%
2004								
Dem.		John Kerry	251	59,028,444	48.27%	41%	88%	53%
Rep.		George W. Bush	286	62,040,610	50.73%	58%	11%	44%
Total Votes Cast / Turnout				122,295,345	63.80%	67%	60%	47%
2008								
Dem.		Barack Obama	365	69,498,516	52.93%	43%	95%	67%
Rep.		John McCain	173	59,948,323	45.65%	55%	4%	31%
Total Votes Cast / Turnout				131,313,820	63.60%	66%	65%	50%
2012								
Dem.		Barack Obama	332	65,915,795	51.06%	39%	93%	71%
Rep.		Mitt Romney	206	60,933,504	47.20%	59%	6%	27%
Total Votes Cast / Turnout				129,085,410	61.80%	64%	66%	48%
2016								
Dem.		Hillary Clinton	227	62,984,828	48.18%	37%	89%	66%
Rep.		Donald Trump	304	65,853,514	46.09%	57%	8%	28%
Total Votes Cast / Turnout				136,669,276	61.40%	65%	59%	48%
2020								
Dem.		Joseph Biden	306	81,283,501	51.31%	41%	87%	65%
Rep.		Donald Trump	232	74,223,973	46.85%	58%	12%	32%
Total Votes Cast / Turnout				158,429,631	66.80%	71%	63%	54%
2024								
Dem.		Biden / Harris	226	75,017,613	48.32%	42%	86%	51%
Rep.		Donald Trump	312	77,303,580	49.80%	57%	13%	46%
Total Votes Cast / Turnout				155,238,302	65.30%	70.50%	60%	51%

Sources: Federal Election Commission, How Groups Voted: Roper Center, Cornell University

As of 2022:			As of 2025 (estimates)
Illegal immigrants in the U.S.	10,990,000		14,000,000
Of voting age 18 and over	9,760,000	89%	12,432,000
Of Hispanic origin	10,560,000	96%	13,000,000
Of voting age 18 and over	9,377,000	89%	11,500,000

A Clear and Present Danger – Threat #1: Progressive Democrat Marxism

Addenda #13 Update references:

1. A Clear and Present Danger – Threat #1: Progressive Democrat Marxism; Addenda #13, December 2025
A Clear ?? and Present Danger website
<https://anunclearandpresentdanger.com/#e2209099-40d7-4ba6-8b6f-3be573c8a10e>
2. Partisanship by family income, home ownership, union membership and veteran status; Pew Research Center, April 9, 2024
<https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2024/04/09/partisanship-by-family-income-home-ownership-union-membership-and-veteran-status/>
3. The Welfare Trap: How Democrats Use Social Programs to Keep American Dependent; Foreign Policy Intel, March 5, 2025
<https://foreignpolicyintel.substack.com/p/the-welfare-trap-how-democrats-use>
4. Blue State Senator Admits Who Democrats ‘Care About Most’ In Resurfaced Video; Daily Caller, March 24, 2026
<https://dailycallernewsfoundation.org/2026/03/24/blue-state-senator-admits-who-democrats-care-about-most-in-resurfaced-video/>
5. Katie Porter faces backlash online after saying illegal immigration drives California's population growth; meaww.com News, May 7, 2026
<https://news.meaww.com/katie-porter-faces-backlash-online-after-saying-illegal-immigration-drives-californias-population-growth>
6. Americans Are Moving to States with Lower Taxes and Sound Tax Structures; Tax Foundation, April 20, 2026
<https://taxfoundation.org/data/all/state/state-migration-trends-map-americans-moving-population-changes/>
7. Big Changes Ahead for Voting Maps After Next Census; Brennan Center for Justice Analysis, December 20, 2024
<https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/analysis-opinion/big-changes-ahead-voting-maps-after-next-census>
8. Democrats could face an uphill Electoral College after 2030, new projections show; Politico, January 28, 2026
<https://www.politico.com/news/2026/01/28/2030-electoral-college-projections-00750488>
9. The big lie about the ‘bipartisan border security bill’; The Hill, August 6, 2024
<https://thehill.com/opinion/4812643-border-act-2024-reforms-biden/>
10. The Declining Education Level of Newly Arrived Immigrants; Center for Immigration Studies Report, February 19, 2025
<https://cis.org/Report/Declining-Education-Level-Newly-Arrived-Immigrants>
11. Welfare Consumption by Illegal Immigrants Is Inevitable — as Long as They’re Here; Center for Immigration Studies Report, March 6, 2025
<https://cis.org/Richwine/Welfare-Consumption-Illegal-Immigrants-Inevitable-Long-Theyre-Here>
12. Changing Partisan Coalitions in a Politically Divided Nation; Pew Research Center, April 9, 2024
<https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2024/04/09/changing-partisan-coalitions-in-a-politically-divided-nation/>
<https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2024/04/09/partisanship-by-family-income-home-ownership-union-membership-and-veteran-status/>
13. The Fiscal Burden of Illegal Immigration On United States Taxpayers 2023; Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR) Research Report,
https://www.fairus.org/sites/default/files/2023-03/Fiscal%20Burden%20of%20Illegal%20Immigration%20on%20American%20Taxpayers%202023%20WEB_1.pdf

Addenda #8 – October 2025 & July 2025, Addenda #6 – May 2025: Update May 2026
Re: Ch. 2, Targeted Casualty: The “Nuclear Family”

Jurupa Valley High School in California has a student enrollment of 1,638 students, including 391 seniors in the class of 2026. One of those seniors, AB Hernandez, a biological boy, has been the subject of much controversy over his participation on the girls volleyball and track and field teams over the past three years, including a 2025-2026 volleyball season in which 10 opponents forfeited matches rather than to face a biological male opponent on the court. During the 2024-2025 spring track and field season, Hernandez decisively beat biological female high school athletes all spring, taking podium gold medals away from several female competitors, who had career high performances denigrated by a biological male competitor, and forcing them to accept lower placements. In May 2025, Hernandez won two gold medals and one silver medal in the Division 3 competitions at the CIF State Track and Field Championships. ^{1, 2, 3}

AB Hernandez is again at the center of controversy this spring, crushing his biological female competition.

Trans high school track star demolished the female competition by 8 FEET in the triple jump at a track meet in California

AB Hernandez, a transgender athlete, dominated the Division 3 Girls’ triple jump competition at the Ontario Relays in Southern California, setting a new meet record with a remarkable 40-foot jump—a full eight feet ahead of the second-place finisher.

CalfKicker, March 4, 2026

Transgender athlete AB Hernandez dominates three jumping events at California postseason track meet

Inside, the focus turned to the jumping events, where biological male AB Hernandez, a senior from Jurupa Valley, competed against women and finished first across all three competitions with dominant performances.

Fox News, May 9, 2026

Notable California Transgender Track Athlete, AB Hernandez, Repeats as CIF Champion
Sports Illustrated – High School, May 18, 2026

For the second straight year, AB Hernandez won multiple championship medals at the at the California Interscholastic Federation Southern Section D3 finals on May 16. ⁴

In the girls’ triple jump, Hernandez placed 1st with a jump of 41’ 7 ¼”. He beat the 2nd place finisher Malia Strange, a biological girl, by 2-feet, 3 ¼ inches.

In the girls high jump, Hernandez placed 1st with a jump of 5’8”. He beat the 2nd place finisher Gwynneth Mureika, a biological girl, by 2 inches.

In the girls’ long jump, Hernandez placed 1st with a jump of 20’ 4 ¾”. He beat the 2nd place finisher Gianna Gonzalez, a biological girl, by 4.5 inches.

His performances in the CIF Championship meet also displaced biological female athletes for Moorpark High School’s Top 10 Track & Field Venue Records.

With his finish in the girls high jump, Hernandez moved into a tie for 2nd place for the overall venue record.

With his finish in the girls long jump, Hernandez moved into 2nd place for the overall venue record, previously held by Kylee Davis (a biological girl) for four years.

With his finish in the girls triple jump, Hernandez moved into 1st place for the overall venue record, previously held by Tara Davis-Woodhall (a biological girl) for ten years.⁵

Trans Athlete AB Hernandez Forced to Share First Place With Cisgender Girls at Track Meet

She jumped higher than any other girl and took first place in three track and field contests. But a state athletic policy enacted last year forced transgender athlete AB Hernandez to share the podium on Saturday with cisgender girls who couldn't match her performance.

yahoo!sports, May 18, 2026

A law put into place last spring after Hernandez displaced numerous biological female athletes from the winners podium, forces transgender female athletes to “share” the podium spot as “co-winners” with biological girls. Trans activists were not pleased!



Top six finishers in the CIS Division 3 girls high jump competition. Gwynneth Mureika, a biological female, “shares” the First Place podium spot with AB Hernandez, a transgender female.

Nereyda Hernandez has been a vocal advocate of her son’s right to compete against biological girls. Nereyda was critical of the new policy allowing biological female athletes to receive duplicate podium placements and medals at state track competitions and angry that her son had to share the podium with a girl. In an interview after the meet, AB Hernandez claimed, “I’m just a normal kid going to school, playing sports.”

With all due respect to mother and son, no AB, you’re *not* a normal kid. You are a biological boy, who has and is still taking puberty blockers and female hormones to look like a girl.

Biological males typically outperform biological females in athletic events that rely on endurance, muscle strength, speed, and power. Puberty, in boys, occurs between the ages of 9 and 14. AB transitioned sometime during his freshman year in high school around age 14, so he was already going through the physical changes of puberty from maturing of adrenal glands and testosterone production. Undergoing “hormone therapy” diminishes those advantages but *does not* put transgender boys on the same physical level as biological girls.⁶ According to a collaboration of worldwide sports medicine, OBGYN, pediatric and endocrinology specialists; *“Biological sex is a primary determinant of athletic performance because of fundamental sex differences in anatomy and physiology dictated by sex chromosomes and sex hormones. Adult men are typically stronger, more powerful, and faster than women of similar age and training status. Thus, for athletic events and sports relying on endurance, muscle strength, speed, and power, males typically outperform females by 10%–30% depending on the requirements of the event. These sex differences in performance emerge with the onset of puberty and coincide with the increase in endogenous sex steroid hormones, in particular testosterone in males.”*⁷

These medical professionals go on to say, *“Gender involves perception of the individual as male, female, or someone who does not fit into one of these constructs, both by the individual and by society.”*

The scientific opinion of these medical professionals (follow the science!) is that gender is a *perception*, not a *scientific* fact. The physical traits of males who have gone through puberty, muscle mass and strength, specifically to athletes competing in field jumping events, means the lower limb power of biological males is 20% to 40% stronger than biological females.

“Several longitudinal studies in transgender women show a reduction in hemoglobin/hematocrit (the latter equivalent to cisgender women after ~4 months), and lean body mass, muscle cross-sectional area, and muscle strength, but are typically stronger than cisgender women even 14 yr after initiation of GAHT.”

Science shows that even fourteen years *after* they received gender affirming hormone treatment (GAHT), transgender females are still “typically stronger” than biological females. AB Hernandez began receiving gender affirming hormone treatment at some point before or during his Freshman year around age 14, the period of time during which biological males are experiencing physical changes including the increased strength and muscle mass that gives them the distinct advantage in speed and strength over biological females.

AB Hernandez has said people who continually protest at track and field meets are “just weird... I’m a 16-year old girl with a mad attitude. You think I’m going to care?” Nereyda Hernandez has gone on record claiming that protests and criticism directed at her child by *Save Girls’ Sports* activists are “being fueled by politics during a midterm election cycle,” a claim that is not true. The protests against her son began last year, when biological female athletes and their parents rebelled against biological males with unfair physical advantages over biological females. Sprinters Justin Gatlin, Tyson Gay, Ben Johnson and Marion Jones were stripped of their Olympic Medals and temporarily banned from the sport. NCAA long

jump and triple jump champion Goodness Iredia, lost his titles and was banned from competition for three years. Shot putters Nadzeya Ostapchuk and Vita Pavlysh were stripped of Olympic medals / world titles and banned from competition. Tour de France cyclists Lance Armstrong and Floyd Landis were stripped of their titles and banned from sanctioned cycling events for life. These are just a few of the hundreds of athletes that have benefitted from the use of anabolic steroids, which increase muscle size, strength and performance, giving them a distinct advantage over athletes that competed using their biological physical attributes and training alone. AB Hernandez and a handful of other transgender females also benefit from retaining the sex differences from their biological male bodies. There should be a penalty for them to pay as well.

This, is why female athletes, their parents and supporters are speaking out and protesting against trans-female athletes. It's not about politics. It's not harassment or transgender hate. It's about fair competition in sports. It's about Title IX and providing equal opportunities for (biological) women and girls in sports. It's about the California Interscholastic Federation's "gender inclusion policy," that replaced biological sex with gender identity, resulting in biological female athletes losing position medals, podium spots and potentially college scholarships.

Addenda #8 Update references:

1. A Clear and Present Danger – Threat #1: Addenda #6 – May 2025
2. A Clear and Present Danger – Threat #1: Addenda #8 – July 2025
3. A Clear and Present Danger – Threat #1: Addenda #8 – July 2025, Update October 2025
<https://anunclearandpresentdanger.com/#e2209099-40d7-4ba6-8b6f-3be573c8a10e>
4. CIF-SS Finals, Official Results, AthleticNET, May 16, 2026
<https://www.athletic.net/TrackAndField/meet/623110/results>
5. Moorpark High School Top 10, Track & Field Venue Records
<https://www.athletic.net/TrackAndField/rankings/venue-records/62762/f>
6. Fact check: Do trans women have unfair athletic advantage? DW News, March 20, 2025
<https://www.dw.com/en/do-trans-women-have-an-unfair-athletic-advantage/a-58583988>
7. The Biological Basis of Sex Differences in Athletic Performance: Consensus Statement for the American College of Sports Medicine; American College of Sports Medicine, December 2023
https://journals.lww.com/acsm-msse/fulltext/2023/12000/the_biological_basis_of_sex_differences_in.21.aspx
8. How does hormone transition in transgender women change body composition, muscle strength and haemoglobin? Systematic review with a focus on the implications for sport participation; British Journal of Sports Medicine, Volume 55, Issue 15, August 2021
<https://bjsm.bmj.com/content/55/15/865>