

Theory for Nobel & Pulitzer (RIP to ALL)

by Leslie A. Fischman

Submitted: 09/08/17

I.

1 does not equal anything outside of what is proven within 1 and 2 and 1 and 2 does not provide insight to anything other than what its written for and stated for and addressed for. When a 1 2 is written 1 2 exists for 1 2, if it applies to a 3 not written in 1 or 2 that does not prove support any existence of 3 for what? If you need anything to exist not written to cause a 3 what was your 3 for? To misuse a clearly stated 1 followed by a 2 to see if 3 now is because of a 1 or a 2? If 2 follows 1 and any 3 follows a 2: 3 follows 2, 2 does not cause 1 if 2 does not cause 1 then how can 3 cause 2 or 1. Whether we have a 3 or not should therefore make no difference to 1 or 2, 3s are made when a 2 is made, everything that follows follows the preceding because the preceding was written a 2 was written with[out] or without a 3 necessary because a 3 cannot be written if 1 and 2 are not made, any 3 independent can not exist without a 2 just like 2 cannot exist without 1. cc: #USSupremeCourt (Point 3) of (2): (1 of 2)

II.

Main Point: Smart or Retarded does not prove either Smart or Retarded, Proof of one Smart does not make any or all or some or one Retarded, Smart is not for identifying or Disproving Retarded. Who hurts who? Neither Smart or Retarded should effect one another unless purpose is to attack a status to achieve the opposing sides status, if one does not cause the other, establishment or destruction of either side cannot therefore cause the other to be right or wrong better than justified or not. Bad does not Prove Retarded. And Bad causes, Retarded is Bad's purpose is to justify being what Bad. Bad does not equal Retarded. You cannot use another's position in life to achieve, take away, switch, take place of, prove, displace, to justify (define) make clear any #misuse of a term often occurs when it's needed to make clear a difference from right and wrong. If wrong is at issue then its clear Bad is at issue, whether caused by Retarded or Bad bc of whatever Bad thinks justifies being a Bad for, NEVER equates to Bad = Retarded (Don't misinterpret a vulnerable population to justify a wrong, existence of a wrong, to explain or identify whether: Bad or Retarded. If we know of one known purpose (justifications of wrongs) than not right EVER to explain or define sides clear to who's right or wrong unless necessary to do so. Smart or Retarded (Causes) as it relates to Bad (and use of bad to clear wrongs establish sides whether purposeful is will never be wrong if Bad causes Retarded. Not all wrongs are based on Smart or Retarded, that's an assumption of causes as it relates to what you find relevant. Tip: Know yourself, Trust yourself, Report Everything, Let #LawEnforcement Know when you see Bad to protect who (Causes for Retarded) if that so matters to you to prove or disprove wrongs you identify with see know hear think #whocares you know you best. #ThinkforYourself nobody's struggles or hardships or disabilities NEVER affect Smart, Retarded, Well, Sick etc? Your focus is

your focus no one is ever #wrong because of focus issues, if you earn a place or position in life, everything else is obvious to right, wrong, smart, retarded etc. We see and know ourselves best others understandings of us should never be important to argue for existence of what: rights or wrongs #bywho #whocares #lawenforcement knows everything. Retarded is not caused by Wrongs obviously if its clear Bad causes Retarded. (New Focus: Existence of Bad clarifies what wrongs, to whom and why? If any justification of Bad is made something Wrong any Wrong is easily identified needs not be proven. Just because Bad (Shows Wrongs) does not mean Wrongs caused Bad or establishment of a Bad. There's no causal connection if you state Bad causes Retarded, Retarded is Automatically Not Bad. #whatsyourpoint? Point at Issue: Retarded caused by Bad does not justify any or all or some or one Wrong, if no position is necessary to identify prove not either or the other need be clarified by destruction proof of any side (See Above). Wrongs exist even if Bad, Smart, Retarded, or Blinde if used to Prove Rights and Wrongs then why weaken any sides waste of time proving or disproving any side. That's not my job. cc: #USSupremeCourt #IdentifyYourself.

III.

(Point 2 of 2) by #lesliefischman aka #mymollydoll (1 connects to 2, because 1 was written, 2 was written, 2 was not written because of 1, if 2 follows 1, how can 1 connect to 2 only if 1 is written does 2 later make sense in any way as it applies to 1 because if 1 of 2 and 2 of 2 are stated connections obviously 2 follows 1). Who the F cares replies #NYCY relates to what. Stop f-king gluing negatives to positives THEN try to understand existence of a negative point to PROVE OR JUSTIFY anything that is clearly Wrong on its face right or wrong Smart or Retarded, Guided by who probably by some Wrong to Prove estb cause understand a Bad to see what?!?!? #FrankGehry Whether Bad causes Good? Rights and Wrongs don't create standings in life to prove or justify wrongs or rights. If trying to prove wrongs to estb Bad identity bad, You ARE Wrong to achieve set up circumstance until a Bad occurs to Justify a Cause needed to prove bad. If Bad caused Retarded then we already know a Bad existed at some point in time which caused Retarded. If you think identifications are required to improve disprove establish displace result in Wrong to: Good Smart Bad Retarded or Blinde. Who's wrong? You were wrong, neither nor any sides need be established to prove anything if Bad exists Wrong exists a (Cause) cannot therefore prove in reverse existence of Bad for what? Never justify wrongs of others who are Bad to See if Wrongs occur the[n] blame Causes as resulting from your establishment of Wrong to Show Bad See Bad Understand Bad See if Caused Bad [to] see if why[,] what's the point of clarifying Bad Caused anything Wrong if clearly Wrongs are Bad who the f-k cares who['s] Wrong: If Bad Causes: Retarded Smart Wrong Right #whothefuckcares what you think if it f-king caused Bad and Bad Caused Retarded then Establishment of Anything should have no effect on: Smart, Retarded, Right, or Wrong. Unless Wrongs continue then Causes MUST be because of a Bad, [BREAK 7:55PM], sides do not establish disprove establish reinforce causes for Bads or Wrongs, if we already understand Wrongs are Caused by Bad, obviously if Retardation Exists then some Bad occurred to Cause that. Who's bad? Therefore cannot be proven if a Wrong is necessary or a Result is necessary to Prove any side or causes. That's Wrong. Wrong is necessary or a Result is necessary to Prove any side or causes.

That's Wrong. Wrong does not Equal Retarded!!!! If Bad caused Wrongs Retarded that has no effects on Smart, Rights, or any other Wrongs. Sides don't justify Sides if they exist on their own, don't justify Sides if they exist on their own, any connections needed to be made to see anything is obviously caused by whatever was Wrong or Needed a Wrong to Justify Bad or Retarded [omit "I"], or whether Bad caused Retarded as it relates to a later Wrong, later Wrongs are f-king Wrong, if you need a Wrong to Justify Past Wrongs then you are Wrong, Bad not Retarded clearly if you Caused Bad Bad was caused by Retarded, and Bad is Wrong Retarded is proof of existence of Bads and Wrongs Existing whether Retarded or Smart. #whatsyourpoint if a Point need be proven to show rights and wrongs to prove wrongs justify wrongs then clearly you were wrong: Retarded, Smart, Right, or Wrong. Bad does not Cause Wrongs if Bad caused Retarded, Retarded is then being misused at any later point in time to Understand Causes to Identify Bad to See Causes to Identify Bad to See Causes is not Right, Causes for Retardation do not justify ANY Wrongs past or present. (Y #USSupremeCourt).