

The United States Of America's *Long* Slide From Christian Nation To Khazarian "Jewish" Zionism

Part I

1/10/95 RICK MARTIN

It began simply enough. The single photocopied page arrived at *CONTACT* several weeks ago. It was a letter from the Librarian of the Supreme Court of the United States and it was dated Dec. 2, 1975. It said, merely, "Your letter dated Nov. 25, 1975, which is addressed to the Chief Justice has been referred to me to answer.

"You will find statements to the effect that the United States is a Christian Nation in the following opinions of the Supreme Court: *Church of the Holy Trinity v. United States*, 143 U.S. 457 at 471 (1892); *Zorach v. Clauson*, 343 U.S. 307 at 313 (1952); *McGowan v. Maryland*, 366 U.S. 420 at 561 (1961)."

After reading this brief letter, I had a nagging feeling that there was a story here. So, with an internal nudge, I began looking through various historical documents. Until researching this document I did not know the full extent of the "body of law" surrounding our nation's acknowledgement of God. What you are about to read, although admittedly long, is a history lesson you never got in school. Stay with it and the seemingly unrelated pieces will, I believe, fall into place. One other point. Some of the quotations you are about to read are taken directly from the court opinions. These documents which the court cites are from the 1600s and 1700s and are illustrative of English usage of those times, with many irregular spellings. These "errors" are reflected in the original court documents and are also shown here.

THE FOUNDING FATHERS' REVERENCE FOR GOD

The fact that this nation was formed by God-fear-

ing (meaning to honor, respect and revere), Bible-reading men and women is indisputable. Their belief in God and His direct involvement in the affairs of men is evidenced by many of the quotations which follow. Our founders' driving need for freedom to worship their God is likewise indisputable. They were ever quick to give credit to God where credit is due.

The Mayflower Compact, written and signed in 1620:

"In the name of God, amen, we whose names are underwritten...having undertaken for the glory of God, and advancement of the Christian faith, and the honor of our King and country, a voyage to plant the first colony in the northern parts of Virginia, do by these presents, solemnly and mutually in the presence of God and one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politic."

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

July 4, 1776

"When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the Earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."

Closing the *Declaration* with, "And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protec-

Editor's note: This is SOME snapshot of a nation's downfall! If only the powerful message of this document were part of our nation's history courses, then our country would—could—NEVER have fallen to the depths of moral and spiritual poverty under which we presently labor. However, we all know WHO are the parasites in control of both Education AND the textbook companies—as just part of their machinery of mind control.

But don't lose hope just yet! Right now, truth is coming out of hiding as never before in our modern era, emerging across this entire country at the grass-roots level of concern and education. Because of the timely importance of this document to these spirited nation-reclamation activities, we have chosen to share this information as a single unit, rather than serialize it in smaller segments over several issues of CONTACT.

This document is thus an eye-opening, special stand-alone insert offered within the 1/10/95 issue of CONTACT. For additional copies, please check with the CONTACT office, for availability and price, at 1-800-800-5565.

— Dr. Edwin M. Young, Editor-In-Chief

tion of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor.”

THE BILL OF RIGHTS DEC. 15, 1791

Article I: “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.”

And, turning to several very substantial court rulings regarding constitutional violations—“All laws which are repugnant to the *Constitution* are null and void.” *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. (2 Cranch) 137, 174, 176, (1803).

“Where rights secured by the *Constitution* are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation which would abrogate them.” *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436 P. 491.

“An unconstitutional act is not law; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties; affords no protection; it creates no office; it is in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though it had never been passed.” *Norton v. Shelby County*, 118 U.S. 425 p. 442.

At a critical juncture during the Constitutional Convention, Benjamin Franklin gave the delegates this reminder:

“How has it happened, Sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of lights to illuminate our understandings?”

“I have lived, Sir, a long time, and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth; that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid?”

“I...believe that without His concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel.”

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM AND TOLERANCE KEY CONCEPTS FOR THE NEW REPUBLIC

Our founders’ driving need for freedom to worship their God is likewise indisputable. Catherine Drinker Browne’s book titled *Miracle at Philadelphia*, describes the religious diversity and debates at the time of the Constitutional Convention.

[QUOTING:]

George Washington’s proclamation of 1777, requiring oaths of allegiance from all who had formerly sworn to uphold Britain, had angered certain elements in Congress: allegiance to the United States might diminish a man’s allegiance to, say, the sovereign state of Georgia.

Most of the states included a religious qualification in their oaths for officeholders; many of these discriminated against Catholics, Jews, Deists and unbelievers. Beyond the cardinal principle that church and state must be separate, religion in America was a matter for local option and had been since the beginning. When the Reverend Hugh Peters of Salem, Massachusetts, had been asked, *circa 1636*, what they did with dissenters in New England, he said they put them over the river. Yet if Virginia had started out as Anglican, Massachusetts as Puritan, Pennsylvania as Quaker, they had gradually won to a wider conception and wider liberty—within Protestant limits, that is—a limit defined with nice but unconscious irony by President Ezra Stiles of Yale College as “universal, equal, religious, protestant liberty.” [*The Protestant churches are the products of the Reformation of the 1500s. The term*

“Protestant” derives from the *protestatio* issued in 1529 by the Lutheran rulers in the Holy Roman Empire against the repressive Diet of Speyer. It became the name for all who argued against the papal claim of universal supremacy.] Within these boundaries the states quite early practiced a surprising diversity—presbyter and priest alike would have called it an anarchy—which was to become a strength to the nation rather than a weakness. All across the continent would range the church spires of different sects whose congregations lived, if not in harmony, at least in nominal peace. “I am a friend to a variety of sects,” said Edmund Randolph, “because they keep one another in order.”

The Federal Convention did not discuss religion. The relationship of church and state, already well established, was no part of its business. Yet there sat no delegate whose ideas of government or political philosophy were not profoundly influenced by his religious beliefs and training. Deism was in the air. Two generations ago it had made the westward crossing, to the immense perturbation of the faithful. Here was a religion free of creed; the Newtonian universe, the classical revival, the discovery of new seas and new lands had enlarged the world but crowded the old dogma rudely. Ezra Stiles, who boasted that he could “freely live and converse in civil friendship with Jews, Romanists and all the sects of Protestants,” was constrained to add at the end, “and even with Deists.” Dr. Franklin could have defined this creedless religion; with Jefferson and John Adams, the Doctor shared the Deistical outlook. “Natural religion,” Deists called their faith. There is a God, they said, but He is to be found through reason rather than through revelation. God created this world but He did not interfere with its workings; a man’s heaven and hell were of his own making. Deism was a way of looking at the cosmos; it was a state of mind and the orthodox shuddered at the word, declaring it “all the same with the old philosophical paganism.”

Beyond the State House walls, people had no way of knowing if the Convention’s “new plan” would require test oaths of government officers. In Pennsylvania the test oath had been a hot issue. The Convention received a letter from a man well known in the city: Jonas Phillips, a merchant who had been politically active as a Revolutionary, had fought with the Philadelphia militia, and helped to found the Mikveh Israel Congregation. “Sires,” the letter began, “I, the subscriber being one of the people called Jews of the City of Philadelphia, a people scattered and dispersed among all nations, do behold with concern...” Phillips went on to quote Section 10 of the Pennsylvania Constitution, requiring every state representative to swear that he believed in God and acknowledged the *Old and New Testaments* to be divinely inspired. To take any such oath, wrote Phillips, “is absolutely against the religious principles of a Jew and is against his conscience.” Moreover, it was “well known among all the citizens of the thirteen united States that the Jews have been true and faithful Whigs, [Editor’s note from *The New American Desk Encyclopedia: Whig, an English and a U.S. political party. In England, the term was applied in 1679 to Protestant opponents of the English Crown led by Shaftesbury. The Whigs enjoyed a period of dominance 1714-60, notably under Robert Walpole. Largely out of office under Charles Fox, they were increasingly associated with Nonconformism, merchantile, industrial and reforming interests. After the Whig ministries of 2nd Earl Grey and Lord Melbourne, the Whigs helped form the Liberal Party in the mid-1800s. The U.S. Whig Party was formed in 1836 from diverse opponents, including the National Republicans, of Andrew Jackson and the Democrats. Its leaders were Henry Clay and Daniel Webster, and a national economic policy was its principal platform! Whig President W. H. Harrison died in office and was succeeded in 1841 by John Tyler, who was disowned by the Whigs when he vetoed their tariff and banking bills. Henry Clay, the next Whig candidate, lost the 1844 election.*

During the second Whig presidency (1849-53; Zachary Taylor and Millard Fillmore), the party was already divided by the issues of slavery and national expansion; the Compromise of 1850 did not last and Winfield Scott was heavily defeated in the 1852 election. The party never recovered, and many Whigs joined the new Republican Party.] and during the late contest with England they had been foremost in aiding and assisting the States with their lives and fortunes. They have supported the cause, have bravely fought and bled for liberty which they cannot enjoy.”

Jonas Phillips, in the dark as to the Convention’s real doings, or perhaps not daring to mention a national *Constitution*, put his plea in local terms, referring to the constitution of his own state. If the Honorable Convention, he said, could see fit to alter the said oath and leave out the part concerning the *New Testament* Scriptures, then the “Israelites will think themselves happy to live under a government where all religious societies are on an equal footing.” The letter ends on a note of prayer and praise. “May the people of these States rise up as a great and young lion. May they prevail against their enemies...May God extend peace to them and their seed after them as long as the Sun and Moon endureth. And may the Almighty God of our Father Abraham, Isaac and Jacob endue this noble Assembly with wisdom, judgment and unanimity in their councils...”

It was wonderful and touching; we do not know in what terms it was answered. We do know that Article VI, after various refinements in committee, exacted from federal and state officers an oath to support the *United States Constitution*—“but no religious Test,” it added, “shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States.” The clause, a triumph for toleration, provided rich ammunition for anti-Constitutionalists during the ratification period. Could not God be acknowledged in the preamble at least?—they demanded. Judge William Williams of Connecticut suggested as much in a letter to the *American Mercury* (February, 1788): “We the people of the United States, in a firm belief of the being and perfections of one living and true God, the creator and supreme Governor of the world...”

Luther Martin in the Maryland convention for ratification was to declare that *Article VI* had been adopted by the Convention without much debate. “However,” he went on in a high flight of sarcasm, much italicized in the printed version—“However, there were some members so unfashionable as to think that a belief of the existence of a Deity, and of a state of future rewards and punishments would be some security for the good conduct of our rulers, and that, in a Christian country, it would be at least decent to hold out some distinction between the professors of Christianity and downright infidelity or paganism.”

[END QUOTING]

SUPREME COURT OPINIONS

Supreme Court Justice Frankfurter, joined by Supreme Court Justice Harlan, in the opinion for *McGowan v. State of Maryland* 81 S.Ct. 1153 (1961), offers a lengthy but extremely informative ruling/lesson. Join now in discovering many aspects of our legal history concerning the *1st Amendment* which probably are unknown to you. Stay with it—the sheer volume of legal precedent is overwhelming.

SEPARATION OF CHURCH & STATE

[QUOTING:]

So deeply do the issues raised by these cases cut that it is not surprising that no one opinion can wholly express the views even of all the members of the Court who join in its result. Individual opinions in constitu-

tional controversies have been the practice throughout the Court's history. Such expression of differences in view or even in emphasis converging toward the same result makes for the clarity of candor and thereby enhances the authority of the judicial process.

For me considerations are determinative here which call for separate statement. The long history of Sunday legislation, so decisive if we are to view the statutes now attacked in a perspective wider than that which is furnished by our own necessarily limited outlook, cannot be conveyed by a partial recital of isolated instances or even's. The importance of that history derives from its continuity and fullness—from the massive testimony which it bears to the evolution of statutes controlling Sunday labor and to the forces which have, during three hundred years of Anglo-American history at the least, changed those laws, transmuted them, made them the vehicle of mixed and complicated aspirations. Since I find in the history of these statutes insights controllingly relevant to the constitutional issues before us, I am constrained to set that history forth in detail. And I also deem it incumbent to state how I arrive at concurrence with THE CHIEF JUSTICE'S principal conclusions without drawing on *Everson v. Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1, 67 S.Ct. 504, 91 L.Ed. 711.

Because the long colonial struggle for disestablishment—the struggle to free all men, whatever their theological views, from state-compelled obligation to acknowledge and support state-favored faiths—made indisputably fundamental to our American culture the principle that the enforcement of religious belief as such is no legitimate concern of civil government, this Court has held that the *Fourteenth Amendment* embodies and applies against the States' freedoms that are loosely indicated by the not rigidly precise but revealing phrase "separation of Church and State." *Illinois ex rel. McCollum v. Board of Education*, 333 U.S. 203, 68 S.Ct. 461, 92 L.Ed. 648. The general principles of church-state separation were found to be included in the *Amendment's* Due Process Clause in view of the meaning which the presuppositions of our society infuse into the concept of "liberty" protected by the clause. This is the source of the limitations imposed upon the States. To the extent that those limitations are akin to the restrictions which the *First Amendment* places upon the action of the central government, it is because—as with the freedom of thought and speech of which Mr. Justice Cardozo spoke in *Palko v. State of Connecticut*, 302 U.S. 319, 58 S.Ct. 149, 82 L.Ed. 288—it is accurate to say concerning the principle that a government must neither establish nor suppress religious belief, that "With rare aberrations a pervasive recognition of that truth can be traced in our history, political and legal." *Id.*, at page 327, 58 S.Ct. at page 152.

But the several opinions in *Everson and McCollum*, and in *Zorach v. Clauson*, 343 U.S. 306, 72 S.Ct. 679, 96 L.Ed. 954, make sufficiently clear that "separation" is not a self-defining concept. "[A]greement, in the abstract, that the *First Amendment* was designed to erect a 'wall of separation between Church and State,' does not preclude a clash of views as to what the wall separates." *Illinois ex rel. McCollum v. Board of Education*, supra, 333 U.S. at page 213, 68 S.Ct. at page 466 (concurring opinion). By its nature, religion—in the comprehensive sense in which the *Constitution* uses that word—is an aspect of human thought and action which profoundly relates the life of man to the world in which he lives. Religious beliefs pervade, and religious institutions have traditionally regulated, virtually all human activity. It is a postulate of American life, reflected specifically in the *First Amendment* to the *Constitution* but not there alone, that those beliefs and institutions shall continue, as the needs and longings of the people shall inspire them, to exist, to function, to grow, to wither, and to exert with whatever innate strength they may contain their many influences upon men's conduct, free of the dictates and

directions of the state. However, this freedom does not and cannot furnish the adherents of religious creeds entire insulation from every civic obligation. As the state's interest in the individual becomes more comprehensive, its concerns and the concerns of religion perforce overlap. State codes and the dictates of faith touch the same activities. Both aim at human good, and in their respective views of what is good for man they may concur or they may conflict. No constitutional command which leaves religion free can avoid this quality of interplay.

Innumerable civil regulations enforce conduct which harmonizes with religious canons. State prohibitions of murder, theft and adultery reinforce commands of the decalogue. Nor do such regulations, in their coincidence with tenets of faith, always support equally the beliefs of all religious sects: witness the civil laws forbidding usury and enforcing monogamy. Because these laws serve ends which are within the appropriate scope of secular state interest, they may be enforced against those whose religious beliefs do not proscribe, and even sanction, the activity which the law condemns. *Reynolds v. United States*, 98 U.S. 145, 25 L.Ed. 244; *Davis v. Beason*, 133 U.S. 333, 10 S.Ct. 299, 33 L.Ed. 637; *Cleveland v. United States*, 329 U.S. 14, 67 S.Ct. 13, 91 L.Ed. 12.

This is not to say that governmental regulations which find support in their appropriateness to the achievement of secular, civil ends are invariably valid under the *First* or *Fourteenth Amendment*, whatever their effects in the sphere of religion. If the value to society of achieving the object of a particular regulation is demonstrably outweighed by the impediment to which the regulation subjects those whose religious practices are curtailed by it, or if the object sought by the regulation could with equal effect be achieved by alternative means which do not substantially impede those religious practices, the regulation cannot be sustained. *Cantwell v. State of Connecticut*, 310 U.S. 296, 60 S.Ct. 900, 84 L.Ed. 1213. This was the ground upon which the Court struck down municipal license taxes as applied to religious colporteurs in *Follett v. Town of McCormick*, 321 U.S. 573, 64 S.Ct. 717, 88 L.Ed. 938; *Murdock v. State of Pennsylvania*, 319 U.S. 105, 63 S.Ct. 870, 87 L.Ed. 1292, and *Jones v. City of Opelika*, 319 U.S. 103, 63 S.Ct. 890, 87 L.Ed. 1290. In each of those cases it was believed that the State's need for revenue, which could be satisfied by taxing any of a variety of sources, did not justify a levy imposed upon an activity which in the light of history could reasonably be viewed as sacramental. But see *Cox v. State of New Hampshire*, 312 U.S. 569, 61 S.Ct. 762, 85 L.Ed. 1049, in which the court, balancing the public benefits secured by a regulatory measure against the degree of impairment of individual conduct expressive of religious faith which it entailed, sustained the prohibition of an activity similarly regarded by its practicants as sacramental. And see *Prince v. Commonwealth of Massachusetts*, 321 U.S. 158, 64 S.Ct. 438, 88 L.Ed. 645.

Within the discriminating phraseology of the *First Amendment*, distinction has been drawn between cases raising "establishment" and "free exercise" questions. Any attempt to formulate a bright-line distinction is bound to founder. In view of the competition among religious creeds, whatever "establishes" one sect disadvantages another, and vice versa. But it is possible historically, and therefore helpful analytically—no less for problems arising under the *Fourteenth Amendment*, illuminated as that *Amendment* is by our national experience, than for problems arising under the *First*—to isolate in general terms the two largely overlapping areas of concern reflected in the two constitutional phrases, "establishment" and "free exercise," * and which emerge more or less clearly from the background of events and impulses which gave those phrases birth.

* Footnote to above paragraph: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof..." Madison had

proposed an amendment that "The civil rights of none shall be abridged on account of religious belief or worship, nor shall any national religion be established, nor shall the full and equal rights of conscience be in any manner, or on any pretext, infringed." *Annals of Cong.*

In assuring the free exercise of religion, the Framers of the *First Amendment* were sensitive to the then recent history of those persecutions and impositions of civil disability with which sectarian majorities in virtually all of the Colonies had visited deviation in the matter of conscience.*

* Footnote to above paragraph: "See Cobb, *The Rise of Religious Liberty in America* (1902), *passim*; Sweet, *The Story of Religion in America* (Rev. ed. 1939), 54, 76-77, 98-112, 129, 139-142; Sweet, *Religion in Colonial America* (1942), *passim*; I Channing, *History of the United States* (1933), 356-381, 470-474. And see Jefferson's Notes on Virginia, in II *Writings of Thomas Jefferson* (Memorial ed. 1903) 217-219. The Virginia Convention which ratified the Federal *Constitution* proposed as a needed amendment to it: "That religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence; and therefore all men have an equal, natural, and unalienable right to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience, and that no particular religious sect or society ought to be favored or established, by law, in preference to others."

This protection of unpopular creeds, however, was not to be the full extent of the *Amendment's* guarantee of freedom from governmental intrusion in matters of faith. The battle in Virginia, hardly four years won, where James Madison had led the forces of disestablishment in successful opposition to Patrick Henry's proposed Assessment Bill levying a general tax for the support of Christian teachers, was a vital and compelling memory in 1789. The lesson of that battle, in the words of Jefferson's *Act for Establishing Religious Freedom*, whose passage was its verbal embodiment, was "that to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves, is sinful and tyrannical; that even the forcing him to support this or that teacher of his own religious persuasion, is depriving him of the comfortable liberty of giving his contributions to the particular pastor, whose morals he would make his pattern, and whose powers he feels most persuasive to righteousness, and is withdrawing from the ministry those temporal rewards, which proceeding from an approbation of their personal conduct, are an additional incitement to earnest and unremitting labours for the instruction of mankind..." What Virginia had long practiced, and what Madison, Jefferson and others fought to end, was the extension of civil government's support to religion in a manner which made the two in some degree interdependent, and thus threatened the freedom of each. The purpose of the Establishment Clause was to assure that the national legislature would not exert its power in the service of any purely religious end; that it would not, as Virginia and virtually all of the Colonies had done, make of religion, as religion, an object of legislation.

Of course, the immediate object of the *First Amendment's* prohibition was the established church as it had been known in England and in most of the Colonies. But with foresight those who drafted and adopted the words, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion," did not limit the constitutional proscription to any particular, dated form of state-supported theological venture. The Establishment Clause withdrew from the sphere of legitimate legislative concern and competence a specific, but comprehensive, area of human conduct: man's belief or disbelief in the verity of some transcendental idea and man's expression in action of that belief or disbelief. Congress may not make these matters, as such, the

subject of legislation, nor, now, may any legislature in this country. Neither the National Government nor, under the Due Process Clause of the *Fourteenth Amendment*, a State may, by any device, support belief or the expression of belief for its own sake, whether from conviction of the truth of that belief, or from conviction that by the propagation of that belief the civil welfare of the State is served, or because a majority of its citizens, holding that belief, are offended when all do not hold it.

With regulations which have other objectives the Establishment Clause, and the fundamental separationist concept which it expresses, are not concerned. These regulations may fall afoul of the constitutional guarantee against infringement of the free exercise or observance of religion. Where they do, they must be set aside at the instance of those whose faith they prejudice. But once it is determined that a challenged statute is supportable as implementing other substantial interests than the promotion of belief, the guarantee prohibiting religious "establishment" is satisfied.

[END QUOTING]

"SUNDAY LEGISLATION"

Further on in the same opinion from *McGowan v. State of Maryland*,

[QUOTING:]

For these purposes the span of centuries which saw the enunciation of the Fourth Commandment, Constantine's edict proscribing labor on the venerable day of the Sun, and the Sunday prohibitions of Carolingian, Merovingian and Saxon rulers, and later of the English kings of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, may be passed over. What is of concern here is the Sunday institution as it evolved in modern England, the American Colonies, and the States of the Union under the *Constitution*. The first significant English Sunday regulation, for this purpose, was the statute of Henry VI in 1448 which, after reciting, "the abominable injuries and offences done to Almighty God, and to his Saints, * * * because of fairs and markets upon their high and principal feasts, * * * in which principal and festival days, for great earthly covetise, the people is more willingly vexed, and in bodily labour soiled, than in other * * * days, * * * as though they did nothing remember the horrible defiling of their souls in buying and selling, with many deceitful lies and false perjury, with drunkenness and strifes, and so specially withdrawing themselves and their servants from divine service * * *," ordained that all fairs and markets should cease to show forth goods or merchandise on Sundays, Good Friday, and the principal feast days. A short-lived ordinance of Edward VI a century later, limiting the ban on bodily labor to Sundays and enumerated holy days, demonstrated in its preamble a similar sectarian purpose, and in 1625 Charles I, announcing that "there is nothing more acceptable to God than the true and sincere service and worship of him * * * and that the holy keeping of the Lord's day is a principal part of the true service of God," prohibiting all meetings of the people out of their parishes for sports and pastimes on Sunday, and all bear-baiting, bull-baiting, interludes, common plays, and other unlawful exercises and pastimes on that day. Several years later the same king declared it reproachful of God and religion, and hence made it unlawful, for butchers to slaughter or carriers, drovers, waggoners, etc., to travel on the Lord's day; then, in 1677, "For the better Observation and keeping Holy the Lord's Day," the statute, 29 Charles II, c. 7, which is still the basic Sunday law of Britain, was enacted: "that all and every Person and Persons whatsoever, shall on every Lord's Day apply themselves to the Observation of the same, by exercising themselves thereon in the Duties of Piety

and true Religion, publicly and privately; * * * and that no Tradesman, Artificer, Workman, Labourer or other Person whatsoever, shall do or exercise any wordly Labour, Business or Work of their ordinary Callings, upon the Lord's Day, or any part thereof (Works of Necessity and Charity only excepted;) * * * and that no Person or Persons whatsoever, shall publicly cry, shew forth, or expose to Sale, any Wares, Merchandizes, Fruit, Herbs, Goods or Chattels whatsoever, upon the Lord's Day * * * ." In 1781, a statute, 21 Geo. III, c. 49, reciting that various public entertainments and explications of scriptural texts by incompetent persons tended "to the great encouragement of irreligion and profaneness," closed all rooms and houses in which public entertainment, amusement or debates, for an admission charge, were held.

These Sunday laws were indisputably works of the English Establishment. Their prefatory language spoke their religious inspiration, exceptions made from time to time were expressly limited to preserve inviolable the hours of the divine service, and in their administration a spirit of inquisitorial piety was evident. But even in this period of religious predominance, notes of a secondary civil purpose could be heard. Apart from the counsel of those who had from the time of the Reformation insisted that the Fourth Commandment itself embodied a precept of social rather than sacramental significance, claims were asserted in the eighteenth century on behalf of Sunday rest, in part, in the service of health and welfare. Blackstone wrote that " * * * besides the notorious indecency and scandal of permitting any secular business to be publicly transacted on that day in a country professing Christianity, and the corruption of morals which usually follows its profanation, the keeping one day in the seven holy, as a time of relaxation and refreshment as well as for public worship, is of admirable service to a state, considered merely as a civil institution. It humanizes by the help of conversation and society, the manners of the lower classes, which would otherwise degenerate into a sordid ferocity and savage selfishness of spirit; it enables the industrious workman to pursue his occupation in the ensuing week with health and cheerfulness; it imprints on the minds of the people that sense of their duty to God so necessary to make them good citizens, but which yet would be worn out and defaced by an unremitted continuance of labor, without any stated times of recalling them to the worship of their Maker."

[END QUOTING]

Continuing, further into the opinion from *McGowan v. State of Maryland*:

[QUOTING]

In England's American settlements, too, civil Sunday regulation early became an institution of importance in shaping the colonial pattern of life. Every Colony had a law prohibiting Sunday labor. These had been enacted in many instances prior to the last quarter of the seventeenth century, and they were continued in force throughout the period that preceded the adoption of the *Federal Constitution* and the *Bill of Rights*. This is not in itself, of course, indicative of the purpose of those laws, or of their consistency with the guarantee of religious freedom which the *First Amendment*, restraining the power of the central Government, secured. Most of the States were only partly disestablished in 1789. Only in Virginia and in Rhode Island, which had never had an establishment, had the ideal of complete church-state separation been realized. Other States were fast approaching that ideal, however, and everywhere the spirit of liberty in religion was in the ascendant. Ratifying Conventions in New York, New Hampshire and North Carolina, as well as in Virginia and Rhode Island, proposed an anti-establishment amendment to the *Constitution* or signified that in their understanding the *Constitution* embodied such a safe-

guard. All of these five States had Sunday laws at the time that their Conventions spoke. Indeed, in four of the five, their legislatures had reaffirmed the Sunday labor ban within five years or less immediately prior to that date.

The earlier among the colonial Sunday statutes were unquestionably religious in purpose. Their preambles recite that profanation of the Lord's day "to the great Reproach of the Christian Religion," or "to the great offence of the Godly welafected among us," must be suppressed; that "the keeping holy the Lord's day, is a principal part of the true service of God"; that neglecting the Sabbath "lulls downe the judgements of God upon that place or people that suffer the same * * * ." The first Pennsylvania Sunday law announces a purpose "That Looseness, irreligion, and Atheism may not Creep in under the pretense of Conscience * * * ." Sometimes reproach of God is made an operative element of the offense.*

* In a footnote to the above paragraph, "The New Haven Code of 1656 provides: "Whosoever shall prophane the Lord's Day, or any part of it, either by sinful servile work, or by unlawful sport, recreation or otherwise, whether wilfully, or in a careless neglect, shall be duly punished by fine, imprisonment, or corporally, according to the nature and measure of the sinner, and offence. But if the court upon examination, by clear and satisfying evidence, find that the sin was proudly, presumptuously, and with a high hand committed against the known command and authority of the blessed God, such a person, therein despising and reproaching the Lord, shall be put to death, that all others may fear and shun such provoaking Rebellious courses. *Numb.* 15: from 30 to 36 verse." The Plymouth Colony law of 1671 is similar. And see the act published in the Bay Colony in 1647, by which to "deny the moralitie of the fourth commandment" is branded among other heresies and made punishable by banishment. *Laws and Liberties of Massachusetts*, 1648 (reprinted 1929), 24.

Prohibitions of Sunday labor are frequently coupled with admonitions that all persons shall "carefully apply themselves to Duties of Religion and Piety, publicly and privately * * *," and are found in comprehensive ecclesiastical codes which also prohibit blasphemy, lay taxes for the support of the church, or compel attendance at divine services.

But even the seventeenth century legislation does not show an exclusively religious preoccupation. The same Pennsylvania law which speaks of the suppression of atheism also ordains Sunday rest "for the ease of the Creation," and shows solicitude that servants, as well as their masters, may be free on that day to attend such spiritual pursuits as they may wish. The Rhode Island Assembly in 1679 enacted:

"Voted, Whereas there hath complaint been made that sundry persons being evill minded, have presumed to employ in servile labor, more than necessity requireth, their servants, and alsoe hire other mens' servants and sell them to labor on the first day of the week: * * * bee it enacted * * *. That if any person or persons shall employ his servants or hire and employ any other man's servant or servants, and set them to labor as aforesaid [he shall be penalized]."

In the latter half of the eighteenth century, the Sunday laws, while still giving evidence of concern for the "immorality" of the practices they prohibit, tend no longer to be prefixed by preambles in the form of theological treatises. Now it appears to be the community, rather than the Deity, which is offended by Sunday labor. New York's statute of 1788 no longer refers to the Lord's day, but to "the first day of the week commonly called Sunday." Where preambles do appear, they display a duplicity of purpose. The Massachusetts Act of 1792 begins:

"Whereas the observance of the Lord's Day is highly promotive of the welfare of a community, by affording necessary seasons for relaxation from labour and the cares of business; for moral reflections and conversation on the duties of life * * * ; for public and

private worship of the Maker, Governor and Judge of the world; and for those acts of charity which support and adorn a Christian society: And whereas some thoughtless and irreligious persons, inattentive to the duties and benefits of the Lord's Day, profane the same, by unnecessarily pursuing their worldly business and recreations on that day, to their own great damage, as members of a Christian society; to the great disturbance of well-disposed persons, and to the great damage of the community, by producing dissipation of manners and immoralities of life. * * *

An enactment of Vermont in 1797 is similar.

More significant is the history of Sunday legislation in Virginia. Even before the English statute of 29 Charles II, that Colony had had laws compelling Sunday attendance at worship and forbidding Sunday labor. In 1776, the General Convention at Williamsburg adopted a *Declaration of Rights*, providing, *inter alia*, that " * * * all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience * * *," and in the same year the acts of Parliament compelling church attendance and punishing deviation in belief were declared void, dissenters were exempted from the tax for support of the established church, and the levy of that tax was suspended. Eight years later came the battle over the Assessment Bill. Under Madison's leadership the forces supporting entire freedom of religion wrote the definitive quietus to the Virginia establishment, and Jefferson's *Bill for Establishing Religious Freedom* was enacted in 1786:

"I. Whereas Almighty God hath created the mind free; that all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burthens, or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness, and are a departure from the plan of the Holy author of our religion, who being Lord both of body and mind, yet chose not to * * * propagate it by coercions on either, as was in his Almighty power to do; that the impious presumption of legislators and rulers, civil as well as ecclesiastical, who being themselves but fallible and uninspired men, have assumed dominion over the faith of others, setting up their own opinions and modes of thinking as the only true and infallible, and as such endeavouring to impose them on others, hath established and maintained false religions over the greatest part of the world, and through all time; * * * that to suffer the civil magistrate to intrude his powers into the field of opinion, and to restrain the profession or propagation of principles on supposition of their ill tendency, is a dangerous fallacy, * * * that it is time enough for the rightful purposes of civil government, for its officers to interfere when principles break out into overt acts against peace and good order; and finally, that truth is great and will prevail if left to herself, * * *.

"II. *Be it enacted* * * * That no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burthened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief; but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinion in matters of religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge, or affect their civil capacities."

In this bill breathed the full amplitude of the spirit which inspired the *First Amendment*, and this Court has looked to the bill, and to the Virginia history which surrounded its enactment, as a gloss on the significance of the Amendment. See the opinions in *Everson v. Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1, 67 S.Ct. 504, 91 L.Ed. 711. The bill was drafted for the Virginia Legislature as No. 82 of the Revised Statutes returned to the Assembly by Jefferson and Wythe on June 18, 1779. Bill No. 84 of the Revision provided:

"If any person on Sunday shall himself be found labouring at his own or any other trade or calling, or shall employ his apprentices, servants or slaves in labour, or other business, except it be in the ordinary household offices of daily necessity, or other work of

necessity or charity, he shall forfeit the sum of ten shillings * * *."

This bill was presented to the Assembly by Madison in 1785, and was enacted in 1786. Apparently neither Thomas Jefferson nor James Madison regarded it as repugnant to religious freedom. Nor did the Virginia legislators who thirteen years later reaffirmed the *Bill for Establishing Religious Freedom* as "a true exposition of the principles of the *Bill of Rights* and *Constitution*," by repealing all laws which they deemed inconsistent with it. The Sunday law of 1786 was not among those repealed.

[END QUOTING]

AMERICANS ARE A RELIGIOUS PEOPLE

In the Supreme Court ruling for the *Church of the Holy Trinity v. United States*, 143 U.S. 457 at 471 (1892):

[QUOTING:]

"4. It being historically true that the American people are a religious people, as shown by the religious objects expressed by the original grants and charters of the colonies, and the recognition of religion in the most solemn acts of their history, as well as in the constitutions of the states and the nation, the courts, in construing statutes, should not impute to any legislature a purpose of action against religion."

[END QUOTING]

Continuing elsewhere in the ruling,

[QUOTING:]

But, beyond all these matters, no purpose of action against religion can be imputed to any legislation, state or national, because this is a religious people. This is historically true. From the discovery of this continent to the present hour, there is a single voice making this affirmation. The commission to Christopher Columbus, prior to his sail westward, is from "Ferdinand and Isabella, by the grace of God, king and queen of Castile," etc., and recites that "it is hoped that by God's assistance some of the continents and islands in the ocean will be discovered," etc.

The first charter of Virginia, granted by King James I. in 1606, after reciting the application of certain parties for a charter, commenced the grant in these words: "We, greatly commending, and graciously accepting of, their Desires for the Furtherance of so noble a Work, which may, by the Providence of Almighty God, hereafter tend to the Glory of his Divine Majesty, in propagating of Christian Religion to such People, as yet live in Darkness and miserable Ignorance of the true Knowledge and Worship of God, and may in time bring the Infidels and Savages, living in those parts, to human Civility, and to a settled and quiet Government; DO, by these our Letters-Patents, graciously accept of, and agree to, their humble and well-intended Desires."

The fundamental orders of Connecticut, under which a provisional government was instituted in 1638-39, commence with this declaration: "Forasmuch as it hath pleased the Allmighty God by the wise disposition of his diuyn prudence so to Order and dispose of things that we the Inhabitants and Residents of Windsor, Hartford, and Wethersfield are now cohabiting and dwelling in and vpon the River of Conectecotte and the Lands thereunto adioyneing; And well knowing where a people are gathered together the word of God requires that to mayntayne the peace and vnion of such a people there should be an orderly and decent Gouernment established according to God, to order and dispose of the affayres of the people at all seasons as

occasion shall require; doe therefore assotiate and conioyne our selues to be as one Publike State or Comonwealth; and doe, for our selues and our Successors and such as shall be adioyned to vs att any tyme hereafter, enter into Combination and Confederation together, to mayntayne and preseeue the liberty and purity of the gospell of our Lord Jesus wch we now pffesse, as also the disciplyne of the Churches, wch according to the truth of the said gospell is now practised amongst vs."

In the charter of privileges granted by William Penn to the province of Pennsylvania, in 1701, it is recited: "Because no People can be truly happy, though under the greatest Enjoyment of Civil Liberties, if abridged of the Freedom of their Consciences, as to their Religious Profession and Worship: And Almighty God being the only Lord of Conscience, Father of Lights and Spirits; and the Author as well as Object of all divine Knowledge, Faith, and Worship, who only doth enlighten the Minds, and persuade and convince the Understandings of People, I do hereby grant and declare," etc.

Coming nearer to the present time, the *Declaration of Independence* recognizes the presence of the Divine in human affairs in these words: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness." "We, therefore, the Representatives of the united States of America, in General Congress, Assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the Name and by Authority of the good People of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare," etc.; "And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the Protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor."

[END QUOTING]

REVERENCE FOR GOD UNDERLIES STATE CONSTITUTIONS

Still quoting from *Church of the Holy Trinity v. United States*:

[QUOTING:]

If we examine the constitutions of the various states, we find in them a constant recognition of religious obligations. Every constitution of every one of the 44 states contains language which, either directly or by clear implication, recognizes a profound reverence for religion, and an assumption that its influence in all human affairs is essential to the well-being of the community. This recognition may be in the preamble, such as is found in the constitution of Illinois, 1870: "We, the people of the state of Illinois, grateful to Almighty God for the civil, political, and religious liberty which He hath so long permitted us to enjoy, and looking to Him for a blessing upon our endeavors to secure and transmit the same unimpaired to succeeding generations," etc.

It may be only in the familiar requisition that all officers shall take an oath closing with the declaration, "so help me God." It may be in clauses like that of the constitution of Indiana, 1816, art. 11, S 4: "The manner of administering an oath or affirmation shall be such as is most consistent with the conscience of the deponent, and shall be esteemed the most solemn appeal to God." Or in provisions such as are found in articles 36 and 37 of the declaration of rights of the constitution of Maryland, (1867:)"That, as it is the duty of every man to worship God in such manner as he thinks most acceptable to Him, all persons are equally entitled to protection in their religious liberty: wherefore, no person ought, by any law, to be molested in his person or estate

on account of his religious persuasion or profession, or for his religious practice, unless, under the color of religion, he shall disturb the good order, peace, or safety of the state, or shall infringe the laws of morality, or injure others in their natural, civil, or religious rights; nor ought any person to be compelled to frequent or maintain or contribute, unless on contract, to maintain any place of worship or any ministry; nor shall any person, otherwise competent, be deemed incompetent as a witness or juror on account of his religious belief: provided, he believes in the existence of God, and that, under his dispensation, such person will be held morally accountable for his acts, and be rewarded or punished therefore, either in this world or to the world to come. That no religious test ought ever to be required as a qualification for any office of profit or trust in this state, other than a declaration of belief in the existence of God; nor shall the legislature prescribe any other oath of office than the oath prescribed by this constitution." Or like that in articles 2 and 3 of part 1 of, the constitution of Massachusetts, (1780: "It is the right as well as the duty of all men in society publicly, and at stated seasons, to worship the Supreme Being, the great Creator and Preserver of the universe. * * * As the happiness of a people and the good order and preservation of civil government essentially depend upon piety, religion, and morality, and as these cannot be generally diffused through a community but by the institution of the public worship of God and of public instructions in piety, religion, and morality: Therefore, to promote their happiness, and to secure the good order and preservation of their government, the people of this commonwealth have a right to invest their legislature with power to authorize and require, and the legislature shall, from time to time, authorize and require, the several towns, parishes, precincts, and other bodies politic or religious societies to make suitable provision, at their own expense, for the institution of the public worship of God and for the support and maintenance of public Protestant teachers of piety, religion, and morality, in all cases where such provisions shall not be made voluntarily." Or, as in sections 5 and 14 of article 7 of the constitution of Mississippi, (1832:) "No person who denies the being of a God, or a future state of rewards and punishments, shall hold any office in the civil department of this state."

[END QUOTING]

Still further in the opinion:

[QUOTING:]

"There is no dissonance in these declarations. There is a universal language pervading them all, having one meaning. They affirm and reaffirm that this is a religious nation. These are not individual sayings, declarations of private persons. They are organic utterances. They speak the voice of the entire people. While because of a general recognition of this truth the question has seldom been presented to the courts, yet we find that in *Updegraph v. Com.*, 11 Serg. & R. 394, 400, it was decided that, "Christianity, general Christianity, is, and always has been, a part of the common law of Pennsylvania: * * * not Christianity with an established church and tithes and spiritual courts, but Christianity with liberty of conscience to all men." And in *People v. Ruggles*, 8 Johns. 290, 294, 295, Chancellor Kent, the great commentator on American law, speaking as chief justice of the supreme court of New York, said: "The people of this state, in common with the people of this country, profess the general doctrines of Christianity as the rule of their faith and practice; and to scandalize the author of these doctrines is not only, in a religious point of view, extremely impious, but, even in respect to the obligations due to society, is a gross violation of decency and good order. * * * The free, equal, and undisturbed enjoyment of religious opinion, whatever it may be, and

free and decent discussions on any religious subject, is granted and secured; but to revile, with malicious and blasphemous contempt, the religion professed by almost the whole community is an abuse of that right. Nor are we bound by any expressions in the *Constitution*, as some have strangely supposed, either not to punish at all, or to punish indiscriminately the like attacks upon the religion of Mahomet or of the Grand Lama; and for this plain reason, that the case assumes that we are a Christian people, and the morality of the country is deeply ingrafted upon Christianity, and not upon the doctrines or worship of those impostors." And in the famous case of *Vidal v. Girard's Ex'rs*, 2 How. 127, 198, this court, while sustaining the will of Mr. Girard, with its provision for the creation of a college into which no minister should be permitted to enter, observed: "It is also said, and truly, that the Christian religion is a part of the common law of Pennsylvania."

If we pass beyond these matters to a view of American life, as expressed by its laws, its business, its customs, and its society, we find everywhere a clear recognition of the same truth. Among other matters note the following: The form of oath universally prevailing, concluding with an appeal to the Almighty; the custom of opening sessions of all deliberative bodies and most conventions with prayer; the prefatory words of all wills, "In the name of God, amen;" the laws respecting the observance of the Sabbath, with the general cessation of all secular business, and the closing of courts, legislatures, and other similar public assemblies on that day; the churches and church organizations existing everywhere under Christian auspices; the gigantic missionary associations, with general support, and aiming to establish Christian missions in every quarter of the globe. These, and many other matters which might be noticed, add a volume of unofficial declarations to the mass of organic utterances that this is a Christian nation. In the face of all these, shall it be believed that a congress of the United States intended to make it a misdemeanor for a church of this country to contract for the services of a Christian minister residing in another nation?

[END QUOTING]

Moving to the Supreme Court ruling of *Zorach et al. v. Clauson et al.*, No. 431, Cite as 72 S.Ct. 679:

[QUOTING:]

The United States Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Douglas, held that the statute providing for the release of public school pupils from school attendance to attend religious classes was constitutional.

The people of the United States are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being, and therefore, when state encourages religious instruction or co-operates with religious authorities by adjusting schedule of public events to sectarian needs, it follows best traditions, for it then respects religious nature of people and accommodates public service to their spiritual needs; and to hold that, by reason of the First Amendment, a state may not so do, would be to prefer those who believe in no religion over those who do believe. Education Law N.Y. x 3210, subd. 1(b); U.S.C.A. Const. Amends. 1, 14.

The Government must be neutral when it comes to competition between religious sects, and it may not finance religious groups, undertake religious instruction, blend secular and sectarian education, or use secular institutions to force one or more religions on any person, and it may not make religious observance compulsory or coerce anyone to attend church, to observe a religious holiday, or to take religious instructions; but there is no constitutional requirement which makes it necessary for government to be hostile to religion and to throw its weight against efforts to widen effective scope of religious influence, and the government can close its doors or suspend its operations as to

those who want to repair to their religious sanctuary for worship or instruction.

[END QUOTING]

John Adams, second President of the United States, said: "Our *Constitution* was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other."

And, quoting from the *Essential Writings of Thomas Paine*:

"The natural rights of man according to Paine derive from the *equality and unity of man*, by which he means: ...that men are all of *one degree*, and consequently that all men are born equal, and with equal natural rights, in the same manner as if posterity had been continued by *creation* instead of *generation*; and consequently every child born into the world must be considered as deriving its existence from God. The world is as new to him as it was to the first man that existed, and his natural right in it is of the same kind."

LINCOLN SPEAKS

In a speech given on January 27, 1838, a young Abraham Lincoln delivered a speech before the Young Men's Lyceum of Springfield, Illinois. The following are portions of that speech.

[QUOTING:]

In the great journal of things happening under the Sun, we, the American People, find our account running, under date of the nineteenth century of the Christian era.—We find ourselves in the peaceful possession of the fairest portion of the Earth, as regards extent of territory, fertility of soil, and salubrity of climate.

...In history, we hope, they will be read of, and recounted, so long as the *Bible* shall be read;—but even granting that they will, their influence *cannot be* what it heretofore has been. Even then, they *cannot be* so universally known, nor so vividly felt, as they were by the generation just gone to rest. At the close of that struggle, nearly every adult male had been a participator in some of its scenes. The consequence was, that of those scenes, in the form of a husband, a father, a son or a brother, a *living history* was to be found in every family—a history bearing the indubitable testimonies of its own authenticity, in the limbs mangled, in the scars of wounds received, in the midst of the very scenes related—a history, too, that could be read and understood alike by all, the wise and the ignorant, the learned and the unlearned.—But *those* histories are gone. They *can* be read no more forever. They *were* a fortress of strength; but, what invading foreman could *never do*, the silent artillery of time *has done*; the leveling of its wall. They are gone.—They *were* a forest of giant oaks; but the all-resistless hurricane has swept over them, and left only, here and there, a lonely trunk, despoiled of its verdure, shorn of its foliage; unshading and unshaded, to murmur in a few more gentle breezes, and to combat with its mutilated limbs, a few more ruder storms, then to sink, and be no more.

They *were* the pillars of the temple of liberty; and now, that they have crumbled away, that temple must fall, unless we, their descendants, supply their places with other pillars, hewn from the solid quarry of sober reason. Passion has helped us; but can do so no more. It will in future be our enemy. Reason, cold, calculating, unimpassioned reason, must furnish all the materials for our future support and defence.—Let those materials be moulded into *general intelligence, sound morality*, and, in particular, *a reverence for the Constitution and laws*: and, that we improved to the last; that we remained free to the last; that we revered his name to the last; that, during his long sleep, we permitted no

hostile foot to pass over or desecrate his resting place; shall be that which to learn the last trump shall awaken our Washington.

Upon these let the proud fabric of freedom rest, as the rock of its basis; and as truly as has been said of the only greater institution, "*the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.*"

[END QUOTING]

**LINCOLN'S PROCLAMATION
OF A NATIONAL FAST-DAY**
August 12, 1861

[QUOTING:]

Whereas a joint Committee of both Houses of Congress has waited on the President of the United States,

and requested him to "recommend a day of public humiliation, prayer and fasting, to be observed by the people of the United States with religious solemnities, and the offering of fervent supplications to Almighty God for the safety and welfare of these States, His blessings on their arms, and a speedy restoration of peace":—

And whereas, when our own beloved Country, once, by the blessing of God, united, prosperous and happy, is now afflicted with faction and civil war, it is peculiarly fit for us to recognize the hand of God in this terrible visitation, and in sorrowful remembrance of our own faults and crimes as a nation and as individuals, to humble ourselves before Him and to pray for His mercy,—to pray that we may be spared farther punishment, though most justly deserved; that our arms may be blessed and made effectual for the reestablishment of law, order and peace, throughout the wide extent of our

country; and that the inestimable boon of civil and religious liberty, earned under His guidance and blessing, by the labors and sufferings of our fathers, may be restored in all its original excellence:—

Therefore, I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, do appoint the last Thursday in September next, as a day of humiliation, prayer and fasting for all the people of the nation. And I do earnestly recommend to all the people, and especially to all ministers and teachers of religion of all denominations, and to all heads of families, to observe and keep that day according to their several creeds and modes of worship, in all humility and with all religious solemnity, to the end that the united prayer of the nation may ascend to the Throne of Grace, and bring down plentiful blessings upon our Country.

[END QUOTING]

**LINCOLN'S PROCLAMATION
FOR THANKSGIVING**
October 3, 1863:

[QUOTING:]

The year that is drawing toward its close, has been filled with the blessings of fruitful fields and healthful skies. To these bounties, which are so constantly enjoyed that we are prone to forget the source from which they come, others have been added, which are of so extraordinary a nature, that they cannot fail to penetrate and soften even the heart which is habitually insensible to the ever watchful providence of Almighty God. In the midst of a civil war of unequalled magnitude and severity, which has sometimes seemed to foreign States to invite and provoke their aggression, peace has been preserved with all nations, order has been maintained, the laws have been respected and obeyed, and harmony has prevailed everywhere except in the theatre of military conflict; while that theatre has been greatly contracted by the advancing armies and navies of the Union. Needful diversions of wealth and of strength from the fields of peaceful industry to the national defence, have not arrested the plough, the shuttle or the ship; the axe has enlarged the borders of our settlements, and the mines, as well of iron and coal as of the precious metals, have yielded even more abundantly than heretofore. Population has steadily increased, notwithstanding the waste that has been made in the camp, the siege and the battle-field; and the country, rejoicing in the consciousness of augmented strength and vigor, is permitted to expect continuance of years with large increase of freedom. No human counsel hath devised nor hath any mortal hand worked out these great things. They are the gracious gifts of the Most High God, who, while dealing with us in anger for our sins, hath nevertheless remembered mercy. It has seemed to me fit and proper that they should be solemnly, reverently, and gratefully acknowledged as with one heart and one voice by the whole American People. I do therefore invite my fellow citizens in every part of the United States, and also those who are at sea and those who are sojourning in foreign lands, to set apart and observe the last Thursday of November next, as a day of Thanksgiving and Praise to our beneficent Father who dwelleth in the Heavens. And I recommend to them that while offering up the ascriptions justly due to Him for such singular deliverances and blessings, they do also, with humble penitence for our national perverseness and disobedience, commend to His tender care all those who have become widows, orphans, mourners, or sufferers in the lamentable civil strife in which we are unavoidably engaged, and fervently implore the interposition of the Almighty Hand to heal the wounds of the nation and to restore it as soon as may be consistent with the Divine purposes to the full enjoyment of peace, harmony, tranquillity, and Union.

[END QUOTING]



**U.S. SUPREME COURT
ASSOCIATE JUSTICE
DAVID J. BREWER'S SPEECH
AT HARVARD COLLEGE**

UNITED STATES—
CHRISTIAN NATION
1905

[QUOTING:]

We classify nations in various ways, as, for instance, by their form of government. One is a kingdom, another an empire, and still another a republic. Also by race. Great Britain is an Anglo-Saxon nation, France a Gaelic, Germany a Teutonic, Russia a Slav. And still again by religion. One is a Mohammedan nation, others are heathen, and still others are Christian nations...

This Republic is classified among the Christian nations of the world. It was so formally declared by the Supreme Court of the United States. In the case of *Holy Trinity Church v. United States*, 147 U.S. 471, that Court, after mentioning various circumstances, added, "these and many other matters which might be noticed, add a volume of unofficial declarations to the mass of organic utterances that this is a Christian Nation."

It is not exaggeration to say that Christianity in some of its creeds was the principal cause of the settlement of many of the colonies, and cooperated with business hopes and purposes in the settlement of others. Beginning in this way and under these influences it is not strange that the colonial life had an emphatic Christian tone...

In several colonies and States a profession of the Christian faith was made an indispensable condition to holding office. In the frame of government for Pennsylvania, prepared by William Penn, in 1683, it was provided that "all treasurers, judges...and other officers...and all members elected to serve in provincial council and general assembly, and all that have right to elect such members, shall be such as profess faith in Jesus Christ." And in the chapter of privileges for that colony, given in 1701 by William Penn and approved by the colonial assembly, it was provided "that all persons who also profess to believe in Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the World, shall be capable...to serve this government in any capacity, both legislatively and executively."

In Delaware, by the Constitution of 1776, every office-holder was required to make and subscribe to the following declaration:

"I, A. B., do profess faith in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ His Only Son, and in the Holy Ghost, one God, blessed forevermore; and I do acknowledge the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by divine inspiration."

New Hampshire, in the Constitutions of 1784 and 1792, required that Senators and Representative should be of the "Protestant religion," and this provision remained in force until 1877.

The fundamental Constitutions of the Carolinas declared:

"No man shall be permitted to be a freeman of Carolina, or to have any estate or habitation within it that doth not acknowledge a God, and that God is publicly and solemnly to be worshipped."

The Constitution of North Carolina, of 1776 provided:

"That no person shall deny the being of God or the truth of the Protestant religion, or the divine authority either of the Old or New Testaments, or who shall hold religious principles incompatible with the freedom and safety of the State, shall be capable of holding any office or place of trust or profit in the civil department within this State." And this remained in force until 1835, when it was amended by changing the word "Protestant" to "Christian," and as so amended remained in force until the Constitution of 1868. And in that Constitution, among the persons disqualified for

office were "all persons who shall deny the being of Almighty God."...

Massachusetts, in its Constitution of 1780, required from governor, lieutenant governor, councillor, senator, and representative before proceeding to execute the duties of his place or office a declaration that "I believe the Christian religion, and have a firm persuasion of its truth."

By the fundamental orders of Connecticut the Governor was directed to take an oath to "further the execution of justice according to the rule of God's word; so help me God, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ."

The Vermont Constitution of 1777 required of every member of the house of representatives that he take his oath:

"I do believe in one God, the creator and governor of the universe, the rewarder of the good and punisher of the wicked, and I do acknowledge the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be given by divine inspiration, and own and profess the Protestant religion." Similar requirement was provided by the Constitution of 1786.

In Maryland, by the Constitution of 1776, every person appointed to an office of profit or trust was not only to take an official oath of allegiance to the State, but also to "subscribe a declaration of his belief in the Christian religion." In the same State, in the Constitution of 1851, it was declared that no other test or qualification for admission to any office of trust or profit shall be required than the official oath "and a declaration shall be of his belief in a future state of rewards and punishments." As late as 1864 the same State in its Constitution had a similar provision, the change being one merely of phraseology, the provision reading, "a declaration of belief in the Christian religion, or of the existence of God, and in a future state of rewards and punishments."

Mississippi, by the Constitution of 1817, provided that "no person who denies the being of God or a future state of rewards and punishments shall hold any office in the civil department of the State."

Another significant matter is the recognition of Sunday. That day is the Christian Sabbath, a day peculiar to that faith, and known to no other. It would be impossible within the limits of a lecture to point out all the ways in which that day is recognized. The following illustrations must suffice: By the *U.S. Constitution* the President is required to approve all bills passed by Congress. If he disapproves he returns it with his veto. And then specifically it is provided that if not returned by him within 10 days, "Sundays excepted," after it shall have been presented to him it becomes a law. Similar provisions are found in the Constitutions of most of the States, and in 36 out of 45 is the same expression, "Sundays excepted..."

By decisions in many States a contract made on Sunday is invalid and cannot be enforced. By the general course of decision no judicial proceedings can be held on Sunday. All legislative bodies, whether municipal, State, or National, abstain from work on that day. Indeed, the vast volume of official action, legislative and judicial, recognizes Sunday as a day separate and apart from the others, a day devoted not to the ordinary pursuits of life...

While the word "God" is not infrequently used in both in the singular and plural to denote any supreme being or beings, yet when used alone and in the singular number it generally refers to that Supreme Being spoken of in the *Old and New Testaments*. In that sense the word is used in constitution, statute, and instrument. In many State Constitutions we find in the preamble a declaration like this: "Grateful to Almighty God." In some he who denied the being of God was disqualified from holding office. It is again and again declared in constitution and statute that official oaths shall close with an appeal, "So help me, God." When, upon inauguration, the President-elect each 4 years consecrates himself to the great responsibilities of Chief

Executive of the Republic, his vow of consecration in the presence of the vast throng filling the Capitol Grounds will end with the solemn words, "So help me, God." In all our courts, witnesses in that manner vouch for the truthfulness of their testimony. The common commencement of wills is "In the name of God, Amen." Every foreigner attests his renunciation of allegiance to his former sovereign and his acceptance of citizenship in this Republic by an appeal to God.

These various declarations in charters, constitutions, and statutes indicate the general thought and purpose. If it be said that similar declarations are not found in all the charters or in all the constitutions, it will be borne in mind that the omission oftentimes was because they were deemed unnecessary, as shown by the quotation just made from the opinion of the Supreme Court of Louisiana, as well as those hereafter taken from the opinions of other courts. And further, it is of still more significance that there are no contrary declarations. In no charter or constitution is there anything to even suggest that any other than the Christian is the religion of this country. In none of them is Mohammed or Confucious or Buddha in any manner noticed. In none of them is Judaism recognized other than by way of toleration of its special creed. While the separation of church and state is often affirmed, there is nowhere a repudiation of Christianity as one of the institutions as well as benedictions of society.

In short, there is no charter or constitution that is either infidel, agnostic or anti-Christian. Wherever there is a declaration in favor of any religion it is of the multitude of expressions in its favor, the avowed separation between church and state is a most satisfactory testimonial that it is the religion of this country, for a peculiar thought of Christianity is of a personal relation between man and his Maker, uncontrolled by and independent of human government.

If we consult the decisions of the courts, although the formal question has seldom been presented because of a general recognition of its truth, yet in the *People v. Ruggles*, 8 John. 290, 294, 295, Chancellor Kent, the great commentator of American law, speaking as chief justice of the Supreme Court of New York, said:

"The People of this State, in common with the people of this country, profess the general doctrines of Christianity, as the rule of faith and practice." And in the famous case of *Vidal v. Girard's Executors*, 2 How. 127, 198, the Supreme Court of the United States, while sustaining the will of Mr. Girard, with its provisions for the creation of a college into which no minister should be permitted to enter, observed:

"It is also said, and truly, that the Christian religion is part of the common law of Pennsylvania."

The South Carolina Supreme Court, in *State v. Chandler*, 2 Harrington, 555, citing many cases, said:

"It appears to have been long perfectly settled by the common law that blasphemy against the Deity in general, or a malicious and wanton attack against the Christian religion individually, for the purpose of exposing its doctrines to contempt and ridicule, is indictable and punishable as a temporal offense..."

The Pennsylvania Supreme Court, in *Updegraph v. The Commonwealth*, 11 Sergeant and Rawle, 400, made this declaration:

"Christianity, general Christianity, is, and always has been, a part of the common law of Pennsylvania; for this Christianity was one of the considerations of the royal charter, and the very basis of its great founder, William Penn; not Christianity founded on any particular religious tenets, not Christianity with an established church, and tithes, and spiritual courts; but Christianity with liberty of conscience to all men..."

In Arkansas, *Shover v. The State*, 10 English, 263, the Supreme Court said:

"Sunday or the Sabbath is properly and emphatically called the Lord's Day, and is one amongst the first and most sacred institutions of the Christian religion. This system of religion is recognized as constituting as part and parcel of the common law, and as such all of

the institutions growing out of it, or, in any way, connected with it, in case they shall not be found to interfere with the rights, and can rightfully claim the protection of the lawmaking power of the State..."

If now we pass from the domain of official action and recognition to that of individual acceptance, we enter a field of boundless extent, and I can only point out a few of the prominent facts:

The *Bible* is the Christian's book. No other book has so wide a circulation, or is so universally found in the households of the land. During their century of existence the English and American *Bible* societies have published and circulated 150 million copies, and this represents but a fraction of its circulation. And then think of the multitude of volumes published in expostulation, explanation and illustration of that book, or some portion of it.

You will have noticed that I have presented no doubtful facts. Nothing has been stated which is debatable. The quotations from charters are in the archives of the several States; the laws are on the statute books; judicial opinions are taken from the official reports; statistics from the census publications. In short, no evidence has been presented which is open to question.

I could easily enter upon another line of examination. I could point out the general trend of public opinion, the disclosures of purposes and beliefs to be found in letters, papers, books, and unofficial declarations. I could show how largely our laws and customs are based upon the laws of Moses and the teachings of Christ; how constantly the *Bible* is appealed to as the guide of life and the authority in questions of morals; how the Christian doctrines are accepted as the great comfort in times of sorrow and affliction, and fill with the light of hope the services for the dead. On every hilltop towers the steeple of some Christian church, while from the marble witnesses in God's acre comes the universal but silent testimony to the common faith in the Christian doctrine of the resurrection and the life hereafter.

But I must not weary you. I could go on indefinitely, pointing out further illustrations both official and unofficial, public and private; such as the annual Thanksgiving proclamations, with their following days of worship and fasting; announcements of days of fasting and prayer, the universal celebrations of Christmas; the gathering of millions of our children in Sunday Schools, and the countless volumes of Christian literature, both prose and poetry. But I have said enough to show that Christianity came to this country with the first colonists; has been powerfully identified with its rapid development, colonial and national, and today exists as a mighty factor in the life of the Republic. This is a Christian nation, and we can all rejoice...

[END QUOTING]

Part II

THE UNITED STATES FALL FROM GRACE: THE TALMUD

The Talmud Unmasked—The Secret Rabbinical Teachings Concerning Christians was first printed in 1892 in Russia, in Latin. It was later translated into English by Father I.B. Pranaitis in 1939. It went out of print but was republished by the Christian Defense League in 1972 [P. O. Box 449, Arabi, LA 70032],

[QUOTING:]

The *Talmud* gets its name from the word LAMUD—"taught", and means "The Teaching". By metonymy it is taken to mean the book which contains the Teaching, which teaching is called Talmud, that is, the doctrinal book which alone fully expounds and explains all the knowledge and teaching of the Jewish people.

As to the origin of the *Talmud*, the Rabbis regard Moses as its first author. They hold that, besides the

written law which Moses received from God on Mount Sinai on tables of stone, which is called *Torah Schebiktab*, he also received interpretations of it, or the oral law, which is called *Torah Shebeal Peh*. They say that this is the reason why Moses remained so long on the mountain, as God could have given him the written law in one day.

Moses is said to have transmitted this oral law to Joshua; Joshua in turn to the seventy Elders; these Elders to the Prophets, and the Prophets to the Great Synagogue. It is held that it was later transmitted successively to certain Rabbis until it was no longer possible to retain it orally.

Whatever may be said about this story of the Rabbis, it is sufficiently known to us that before the birth of Christ, schools existed in Palestine in which sacred literature was taught. The commentaries of the Doctors of the law were noted down on charts and lists as an aid to memory, and these, when collected together, formed the beginnings of the Jewish Talmud.

The *Talmud* teaches that Jesus Christ was illegitimate and was conceived during menstruation; that he had the soul of Esau; that he was a fool, a conjurer, a seducer; that he was crucified, buried in hell and set up as an idol ever since by his followers.

The following is narrated in the Tract *Kallah*, 1 b (18b): "Once when the Elders were seated at the Gate, two young men passed by, one of whom had his head covered, the other with his head bare. Rabbi Eliezer remarked that the one in his bare head was illegitimate, a *mamzer*. Rabbi Jehoschua said that he was conceived during menstruation, *ben niddah*. Rabbi Akibah, however, said that he was both. Whereupon the others asked Rabbi Akibah why he dared to contradict his colleagues. He answered that he could prove what he said. He went therefore to the boy's mother whom he saw sitting in the market place selling vegetables and said to her: 'My daughter, if you will answer truthfully what I am going to ask you, I promise that you will be saved in the next life.' She demanded that he would swear to keep his promise, and Rabbi Akibah did so—but with his lips only, for in his heart he invalidated his oath. Then he said: 'Tell me, what kind of son is this of yours?' To which she replied: 'The day I was married I was having menstruation, and because of this my husband left me. But an evil spirit came and slept with me and from this intercourse my son was born to me.' Thus it was proved that this young man was not only illegitimate but also conceived during the menstruation of his mother. And when his questioners heard this they declared: 'Great indeed was Rabbi Akibah when he corrected his Elders!' And they exclaimed: 'Blessed be the Lord God of Israel who revealed his secret to Rabbi Akibah the son of Joseph!'"

Still quoting from *The Talmud Unmasked*:

In the preceding chapter we saw what the Jews think of the Founder of the Christian religion, and how much they despise his name. This being so, it would not be expected that they would have any better opinion about those who follow Jesus the Nazarene. In fact, nothing more abominable can be imagined than what they have to say about Christians. They say that they are idolaters, the worst kind of people, much worse than the Turks, murderers, fornicators, impure animals, like dirt, unworthy to be called men, beasts in human form, worthy of the name of beasts, cows asses, pigs, dogs, worse than dogs; that they propagate after the manner of beasts, that they have a diabolic origin, that their souls come from the devil and return to the devil in hell after death; and that even the body of a dead Christian is nothing different from that of an animal.

The teaching of the Jews is that God created two natures, one good and the other evil, or one nature with two sides, one clean and the other unclean. From the unclean side, called *Keliphah*—rind, or scabby crust—the souls of Christians are said to have come.

In *Zohar* (I, 131a) it says:

"Idoltrous people, however, since they exist, befool the world, because their souls come out of the unclean side."

Jews are required to avoid all contact with Christians for four reasons: (1) Because they are not worthy to share in the Jewish way of life; (2) Because they are unclean; (3) Because they are idolaters; (4) Because they are murderers.

A Jew, by the fact that he belongs to the chosen people and is circumcized, possesses so great a dignity that no one, not even an angel, can share equally with him. In fact, he is considered almost the equal of God. "He who strikes an Israelite" says Rabbi Chanina "acts as if he slaps the face of God's Divine Majesty."

A Jew is always considered good, in spite of certain sins which he may commit; nor can his sins contaminate him, any more than dirt contaminates the kernel in a nut, but only soils its shell. A Jew alone is looked upon as a man; the whole world is his and all things should serve him, especially "animals which have the form of men."

Thus it is plain that they regard all contact with Christians as contaminating, and as detracting from their dignity. They are therefore required to keep as far away as possible from all who live and act as Christians do.

From what has been shown thus far, it is clear that, according to the teaching of the *Talmud*, Christians are idolaters and hateful to Jews. As a consequence, every Jew who wishes to please God has a duty to observe all the precepts which were given to the Fathers of their race when they lived in the Holy Land concerning the idolatrous gentiles, both those who lived amongst them and those in nearby countries.

A Jew is therefore required, (1) To avoid Christians; (2) To do all he can to exterminate them.

Wherever it is possible a Jew should kill Christians, and do so without mercy.

A Jew is commanded to harm Christians wherever he can, both indirectly by not helping them in any way, and also directly by wrecking their plans and projects; neither must he save a Christian who is in danger of death.

In numerous places ignominious names are given by the Jews to Christian things. It will not be out of place to list a few of these names which they give to things and persons which are held holy and dear by Christians, as follows:

Jesus is ignominiously called *Jeschu*—which means, *May his name and memory be blotted out*. His proper name in Hebrew is *Jeschua*, which means Salvation.

Mary, the mother of Jesus, is called *Charia*—dung, excrement (German *Dreck*). In Hebrew her proper name is *Miriam*.

Christian saints, the word for which in Hebrew is *Kedoschim*, are called *Kededchim* (*cinaedos*)—feminine men (Fairies). Women saints are called *Kedeschoth*, Whores.

Sunday is called the *day of calamity*.

Feast of Christmas is called *Nital*, denoting extermination.

Since the *Goim* minister to Jews like beasts of burden, they belong to a Jew together with his life and all his faculties:

"The life of a *Goi* and all his physical powers belong to a Jew." (A. Rohl. *Die Polem*. p. 20)

It is an axiom of the Rabbis that a Jew may take anything that belongs to Christians for any reason whatsoever, even by fraud; nor can such be called robbery since it is merely taking what belongs to him.

In *Abhodah Zarah* (26b, *Tosephoth*) it says:

"Even the best of the *Goim* should be killed."

A Jew who kills a Christian commits no sin, but offers an acceptable sacrifice to God. In *Sepher Or Israel* (177b) it says:

"Take the life of the *Kliphoth* and kill them, and you will please God the same as one who offers incense

to Him.”

Jews must never cease to exterminate the *Goyim*; they must never leave them in peace and never submit to them. In *Hilkhoth Akum* (X,1) it says:

“Do not eat with idolaters, nor permit them to worship their idols; for it is written: *Make no covenant with them, nor show mercy unto them* (*Deuter. ch. 7, 2*). Either turn them away from their idols or kill them.”

In this work I have quoted from only a very few of the Talmudic books which refer to the Christians. For the sake of brevity, and to spare your sensitive soul, I omitted many others which could have been included. These texts, however, which I have quoted from should be sufficient to demonstrate how false are the statements of the Jews when they claim that there is nothing in the *Talmud* which teaches hatred and enmity for Christians.

If it revolted you, Christian reader, to study the horrible blasphemies in this book, do not vent your anger on me. I did not state in the beginning that I was going to narrate something pleasant, but merely to show you what the *Talmud* really teaches about Christians, and I do not think I could have done so in a more suitable way.

I realize, however, that, since the truth does not please everyone, there are many who will become my enemies for thus having borne witness to the truth. And I have been reminded of this, both by the laws of the *Talmud* itself which threatens death to “traitors,” and more so, by the warnings of those who have had experience of the actions which Jews take against those who make known things which are not favorable to them.

[As predicted by his friends during that time, Rev. Pranaitis was “liquidated” by the Cheka during the Bolshevik revolution in Russia.]

[END QUOTING]

Here is what Mohammed had to say in the *Koran* concerning Jews:

“Whoever is a friend of a Jew, belongs to them, becomes one of them, God cannot tolerate this mean people. The Jews have wandered away from divine religion. They are usurpers. You must not relent in your work which must show up Jewish deceit.”

MARTIN LUTHER ON JEWS 16th Century

Martin Luther, in *Table Talk of Martin Luther*, said:

“But the Jews are so hardened that they listen to nothing; though overcome by testimonies they yield not an inch. It is a pernicious race, oppressing all men by their usury and rapine. If they give a prince or magistrate a thousand florins, they exhort twenty thousand from the subjects in payment. We must ever keep on guard against them.”

And then, in another writing, Luther states:

[QUOTING:]

They are the real liars and bloodhounds, who have not only perverted and falsified the entire Scriptures from beginning to end and without ceasing with their interpretations. And all of the anxious sighing, longing and hoping of their hearts is directed to the time when some day they would like to deal with us heathen as they dealt with the heathen in Persia at the time of Esther... Oh how they love that book *Esther*, which so nicely agrees with their blood-thirsty, revengeful and murderous desire and hope!

The sun never did shine on a more bloodthirsty and revengeful people as they, who imagine to be the people of God, and who desire to and think they must murder and crush the heathen. And the foremost undertaking which they expect of their Messiah is that he should

slay and murder the whole world with the sword. As they at first demonstrated against us Christians and would like to do now, if they only could; have also tried it often and have been repeatedly struck on their snouts...

Their breath stinks for the gold and silver of the heathen; since no people under the sun always have been, still are, and always will remain more avaricious than they, as can be noticed in their cursed usury. They also find comfort with this: ‘When Messiah comes, He shall take all the gold and silver in the world and distribute it among the Jews.’ Thus, whenever they can direct Scripture to their insatiable avarice, they wickedly do so.

Therefore know, my dear Christians, that next to the Devil, you have no more bitter, more poisonous, more vehement an enemy than a real Jew who earnestly desires to be a Jew. There may be some among them who believe what the cow or the goose believes. But all of them are surrounded with their blood and circumcision. In history, therefore, they are often accused of poisoning wells, stealing children and mutilating them; as in Trent, Weiszensee and the like. Of course they deny this. Be it so or not, however, I know full well that the ready will is not lacking with them if they could only transform it into deeds, in secret or openly.

A person who does not know the Devil, might wonder why they are so at enmity with the Christians above all others; for which they have no reason, since we only do good to them. They live among us in our homes, under our protection, use land and highways, market and streets. Princes and government sit by, snore and have their maws open, let the Jews take from their purse and chest, steal and rob whatever they will. That is, they permit themselves and their subjects to be abused and sucked dry and reduced to beggars with their own money, through the usury of the Jews. For the Jews, as foreigners, certainly should have nothing from us; and what they have certainly must be ours. They do not work, do not earn anything from us, neither do we donate or give it to them. Yet they have our money and goods and are lords in our land where they are supposed to be in exile!

If a thief steals ten gulden he must hang; if he robs people on the highway, his head is gone. But a Jew, when he steals ten tons of gold through his usury is dearer than God himself!

Do not their *Talmud* and rabbis write that it is no sin to kill if a Jew kills a heathen, but it is a sin if he kills a brother in Israel? It is no sin if he does not keep his oath to a heathen. Therefore, to steal and rob (as they do with their moneylending) from a heathen, is a divine service... And they are the masters of the world and we are their servants—yea, their cattle!

I maintain that in three fables of Aesop there is more wisdom to be found than in all the books of the Talmudists and rabbis and more than ever could come into the hearts of the Jews...

Should someone think I am saying too much—I am saying much too little! For I see in writings how they curse us Goyim and wish us all evil in their schools and prayers. They rob us of our money through usury, and wherever they are able, they play us all manner of mean tricks... No heathen has done such things and none would do so except the Devil himself and those whom he possesses—as he possesses the Jews.

Burgensis, who was a very learned rabbi among them and by the grace of God became a Christian (which seldom occurs), is much moved that in their schools they so horribly curse us Christians (as Lyra also writes) and from that draws the conclusion that they must not be the people of God.

Now behold what a nice, thick, fat lie it is when they complain about being captives among us! Jerusalem was destroyed more than 1400 years ago and during that time we Christians have been tortured and persecuted by the Jews in all the world. On top of that, we do not know to this day what Devil brought them into our country. We did not fetch them from Jerusalem!... Yes, we have and hold them captive, as I

would like to keep my rheumatism, and all other diseases and misfortunes, who must wait as a poor servant, with money and property and everything I have! I wish they were in Jerusalem with the other Jews and whomsoever they would like to have with them.

Now what are we going to do with these rejected, condemned Jewish people?... Let us apply the ordinary wisdom of other nations like France, Spain, Bohemia, et al., who made them give an account of what they had stolen through usury, and divided it evenly; but expelled them from their country. For as heard before, God’s wrath is so great over them that through soft mercy they only become more wicked, through hard treatment, however, only a little better. Therefore, away with them!

How much more unbearable it is that we should permit the entire Christendom and all of us to be bought with our own money, be slandered and cursed by the Jews, who on top of all that be made rich and our lords, who laugh us to scorn and are tickled by their audacity!

What a joyful affair that would be for the Devil and his angels, and cause them to laugh through their snouts like a sow grinning at her little pigs, but deserving real wrath before God.

Maybe mild-hearted and gentle Christians will believe that I am too rigorous and drastic against the poor, afflicted Jews, believing that I ridicule them and treat them with much sarcasm. By my word, I am far too weak to be able to ridicule such a satanic brood. I would fain do so, but they are far greater adepts at mockery than I and possess a god who is master in this art. It is the Evil One himself.

Even with no further evidence than the *Old Testament*, I would maintain, and no person on earth could alter my opinion, that the Jews as they are today are veritably a mixture of all the depraved and malevolent knaves of the whole world over, who have then been dispersed in all countries, similarly to the Tartars, Gypsies and such folk.

[END QUOTING]

CONGRESS VIOLATES 1ST AMENDMENT JEWS NOACHIDE LAW PASSED

Moving forward in time to the 1990s, on March 20, 1991, Congress passed the joint resolution which is now known as Public Law 102-14. With the passage of this law, Congress has made a law that creates a national religion based on the Zionist *Talmud* and “Jewish” *Torah*. In clear violation of the *1st Amendment* to the *Constitution*, while the American public was in deep slumber, this resolution was signed into law. This law is carefully *cloaked* under the false title of “Education Day”, with statements built in such as: “Whereas these ethical values and principles have been the bedrock of society from the dawn of civilization, when they were known as the Seven Noachide Laws.” Please keep in mind that conclusions such as these, even false conclusions such as these, when adopted into law become fact. You must read carefully to see what they have done. Following Public Law 102-14 are the actual Noachide Laws—you be the judge.

[QUOTING:]

105 STAT. 44 PUBLIC LAW 102-14—
MAR. 20, 1991
Public Law 102-14
102nd Congress
Joint Resolution

Mar. 20, 1991

To designate March 26, 1991, as “Education Day, USA”

[H.J. Res. 104]

Whereas Congress recognizes the historical tradi-

tion of ethical values and principles which are the basis of civilized society and upon which our great Nation was founded;

Whereas these ethical values and principles have been the bedrock of society from the dawn of civilization, when they were known as the Seven Noachide Laws;

Whereas without these ethical values and principles the edifice of civilization stands in serious peril of returning to chaos;

Whereas society is profoundly concerned with the recent weakening of these principles that has resulted in crises that beleaguer and threaten the fabric of civilized society;

Whereas the justified preoccupation with these crises must not let the citizens of this Nation lose sight of their responsibility to transmit these historical ethical values from our distinguished past to the generations of the future;

Whereas the Lubavitch movement has fostered and promoted these ethical values and principles throughout the world;

Whereas Rabbi Manachem Mendel Schneerson, leader of the Lubavich movement is universally respected and revered and his eighty-ninth birthday falls on March 26, 1991;

Whereas in tribute to this great spiritual leader, "the rebbe", this, his ninetieth year will be seen as one of "education and giving", the year in which we turn to education and charity to return the world to the moral and ethical values contained in the Seven Noachide Laws; and

Whereas this will be reflected in an international scroll of honor signed by the President of the United States and other heads of state: Now, therefore, be it Resolved that the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That March 26, 1991, the start of the ninetieth year of Rabbi Menachem Schneerson, leader of the worldwide Lubavitch movement, is designated as "Education day, U.S.A.". The President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Approved March 20, 1991.

Legislative History—H.J. Res. 104:

Congressional Record, Vol. 137 (1991)

[Considered and passed House on March 5.]

[Considered and passed Senate on March 7.]

[Both passed by a voice vote.]

WHAT ARE NOACHIDE LAWS AND HOW DO THEY EFFECT US?

From the *Judaica Encyclopedia*:

[QUOTING:]

NOACHIDE LAWS, The seven laws considered by rabbinic tradition as the minimal moral duties enjoined by the *Bible* on all men (*Sanh.* 56-60; *Yad, Melakhim*, 8:10, 10:12 [*Babylonian Talmud*]). Jews are obligated to observe the whole *Torah*, while every non-Jew is a "son of the covenant of Noah" (see *Gen.* 9), and he who accepts its obligations is a *ger-toshav* ("resident-stranger" or even "semi-convert") (See *Av. Zar.* 64b; *Maim, Yad, Melakhim* 8:10.) *Maimonides* equates the righteous man (Ihasid) of the [gentile] nations who has a share in the world to come even without becoming a Jew with the gentile who keeps these laws. Such a man is entitled to full material support from the Jewish community (see *ET*, 6 (1954), col. 289 s.v. *ger toshav*) and to the highest earthly honors (*Sefer Hasidim* [1957], 358). The seven Noachide laws as traditionally enumerated are: the prohibitions of idolatry, blasphemy, bloodshed, sexual sins, theft, and eating from a living animal, as

well as the injunction to establish a legal system (*Tosef., Av. Zar.* 8:4; *Sanh.* 56a). Except for the last, all are negative, and the last itself is usually interpreted as commanding the enforcement of the others (*Maim. Yad, Melakhim*, 9:1). They are derived exegetically from divine demands addressed to Adam (*Gen.* 2:16) and Noah (see *Gen. R.* 34; *Sanh.* 59b), i.e., the progenitors of all mankind, and are thus regarded as universal. The prohibition of idolatry provides that, to ensure social stability and personal salvation, the non-Jew does not have to "know God" but must adjure false gods (that's a good trick if you can do it) (*Meg.* 13a; *Kid.* 40a; *Maim. Yad, Melakhim*, 10:2ff). This law refers only to actual idolatrous acts, and not to theoretical principles and, unlike Jews, Noachides are not required to suffer martyrdom rather than break this law (*Sanh.* 74a; *TJ, Shev.* 4:2). "They are, however, required to choose martyrdom rather than shed human Jewish [for "other" is classified as something else—not 'human'] blood" (*Pes.* 25b and *Rashi*).

In view of the strict monotheism of Islam, Muslims were considered as Noachides (cf. *ET*, loc. cit., col. 291, n. 17), whereas the status of Christians was a matter of debate. Since the later Middle Ages, however, Christianity too has come to be regarded as Noachides, on the ground that *shittuf* ("associationism"—this was the Jewish interpretation of Trinitarianism) is not forbidden to non-Jews (see *YD* 151). Under the prohibitions of blasphemy, murder, and theft Noachides are subject to greater legal restrictions than Jews because non-Jewish society is held to be more prone to these sins (*Rashi to Sanh.* 57a). The prohibition of theft covers many types of acts, e.g., military conquests (*ibid.*, 59a) and dishonesty in economic life (*ibid.*, 57a; *Yad, Melakhim*, 9:9). A number of other Noachide prescriptions are listed in the sources (see *Sanh.* 57b; *Mid. Ps.* 21; *Yad, Melakhim*, 10:6), e.g., prohibitions of sorcery, castration, mixed seeds, blemished sacrifices, injunctions to practice charity, procreate, and to honor the *Torah* (*Hul.* 92a). These are best understood as subheadings of "the seven laws". Noachides may also freely choose to practice certain other Jewish commandments (*Yad, Melakhim*, 10:9-10). Jews are obligated to try to establish the Noachide Code wherever they can (*ibid.*, 8:10). *Maimonides* held that Noachides must not only accept "the seven laws" on their own merit, but they must accept them as divinely revealed. This follows from the thesis that all ethics are not ultimately "natural", but require a theological framework, (see Schwarzschild, in: *JQR*, 52 (1962), 302; Fauer, in: *Tarbiz*, 38 (1968), 43-53). The Noachide covenant plays an important part in both Jewish history and historiography. Modern Jewish thinkers like Moses Mendelssohn and Herman Cohen emphasized the Noachide conception as the common rational, ethical ground of Israel and mankind (see H. Cohen, *Religion der Vernunft* (1929), 135-48, 381-8), and see Noah as the symbol of the unity and perpetuity of mankind (*ibid.*, 293). Views differ as to whether the ultimate stage of humanity will comprise both Judaism and Noachidism, or whether Noachidism is only the penultimate level before the universalization of all of the *Torah* (see *TJ, Av. Zar.* 2:1). Aime Palliere, at the suggestion of his teacher Rabbi E. Benamozegh, adopted the Noachide Laws and never formally converted to Judaism.

IN JEWISH LAW. While in the amoraic period the above-mentioned list of seven precepts is clearly accepted as the frame-work of the Noachide Laws, a variety of tannaitic sources indicate lack of complete agreement as to the number of such laws, as well as to the four possible additional prohibitions against (1) drinking the blood of a living animal; (2) emasculation; (3) sorcery; and (4) all magical practices listed in *Deuteronomy* 18:10-11. The *Talmud* records a position which would add prohibitions against cross-breeding of animals of different species, and grafting trees of different kinds (*Sanh.* 56b). Non-rabbinic sources of the tannaitic period indicate even greater divergence.

The *Book of Jubilees* (7:20ff.) records a substantially different list of six commandments given by Noah to his sons: (1) to observe righteousness; (2) to cover the shame of their flesh; (3) to bless their creator; (4) to honor parents; (5) to love their neighbor; and (6) To guard against fornication, uncleanness, and all iniquity (see I. Finkelstein, bibl.). *Act* (15:20) refers to four commandments addressed to non-Jews, "...that they abstain from pollutions of idols, from fornication, from things strangled, and from blood." This latter list is the only one that bears any systematic relationship to the set of religious laws which the *Pentateuch* makes obligatory upon resident aliens (the *ger hagar* and *ezrah*).

NATURE AND PURPOSE. There are indications that even during the Talmudic period itself there was divergence of opinion as to whether the Noachide Laws constituted a formulation of natural law or were intended solely to govern the behavior of the non-Jewish residents living under Jewish jurisdiction. The natural law position is expressed most clearly by the assertion, as to five of the seven laws, that they would have been made mandatory even had they not been revealed (*Yoma* 67b; *Sifra Aharei Mot*, 13:10). Similarly, the rabbinic insistence that six of the seven Noachide Laws were actually revealed to Adam partakes of a clearly universalistic thrust (*Gen. R.* 16:6, 24:5). The seventh law, against the eating of flesh torn from a living animal, could have been revealed at the earliest to Noah, since prior to the flood the eating of flesh was prohibited altogether. The very fact that these laws were denominated as the "seven laws of the sons of Noah" constitutes further indication of this trend since the term "sons of Noah" is, in rabbinic usage, a technical term including all human beings except those whom Jewish law defines as being Jews. Nor was there a lack of technical terminology available specifically to describe the resident alien. On the other hand, the entire context of the Talmudic discussion of the Noachide Laws is that of actual enforcement by rabbinic courts. To that end, not only is the punishment for each crime enumerated, but standards of procedure and evidence are discussed as well (*Sanh.* 56a-59a). This presumption of the jurisdiction of Jewish courts is most comprehensible if the laws themselves are intended to apply to non-Jews resident in areas of Jewish sovereignty. Of a similar nature is the position of Yose that the parameters of the proscription against magical practices by Noachides is the verse in *Deuteronomy* (18-10) which begins, "There shall not be found among you..." (*Sanh.* 56b). The attempt by Finkelstein (op. cit.) to date the formulation of the seven Noachide commandments during the Hasmonean era would also suggest a rabbinic concern with the actual legal status of the non-Jew in a sovereign Jewish state. It might even be the case that the substitution by the *tanna* of the school of Manasseh of emasculation and forbidden mixtures of plants for the establishment of a judicial system and blasphemy (*Sanh.* 56b) itself reflects a concern with the regulation of the life of the resident alien already under the jurisdiction of Jewish courts. Of course, the seven commandments themselves are subject to either interpretation: e.g., the establishment of courts of justice can mean either an independent non-Jewish judiciary and legal system or can simply bring the non-Jew under the rubric of Jewish civil law and its judicial system.

THE BASIS OF AUTHORITY. A question related to the above is that of the basis of authority of these laws over the non-Jews. Talmudic texts seem constantly to alternate between two terms, reflecting contradictory assumptions as to the basis of authority, namely seven precepts "which were commanded" (*she-nitzavvu*) to the Noachides, and seven precepts "which the Noachides accepted upon themselves" (*she-kibbeul alieheim*; *BK* 38a; *TJ, Av. Zar.* 2:1; *Hul.* 92ab; *Hor.* 8b; *Sahn.* 56b). This disparity between authority based on revelation as opposed to consent reaches a climax when *Maimonides* asserts that the only proper basis for acceptance of the Noachide laws by a non-Jew is divine authority and revelation to Moses, and that "...if he

observe them due to intellectual conviction (i.e., consent) such a one is not a resident alien, nor of the righteous of the nations of the world, nor of their wise men" (*Yad, Melakhim* 8:11); the possibility that the final "ve-lo" ("nor") is a scribal error for "ella" ("but rather") while very appealing, is not borne out by any manuscript evidence. Of course, this same conflict between revelation and consent as basis of authority appears with regard to the binding authority of *Torah* over the Jew, in the form of "we will do and obey" (*Ex.* 24:7) as opposed to "He (God) suspended the mountain upon them like a cask, and said to them, 'If ye accept the *Torah*, 'tis well; if not, there shall be your burial'" (*Shab.* 88a).

NOACHIDE LAWS AND PRE-SINAITIC LAWS.

The *amoraim*, having received a clear tradition of seven Noachide Laws, had difficulty in explaining why other pre-Sinaitic laws were not included, such as procreation, circumcision, and the law of the sinew. They propounded two somewhat strained principles to explain the anomalies. The absence of circumcision and the sinew is explained through the assertion that any pre-Sinaitic law which was not repeated at Sinai was thenceforth applicable solely to Israelites (*Sahn.* 59a), whence procreation, would nevertheless not be lost (cf. *Tos. to Yev.* 62A s.v. *benei*; *Tos. to Hab.* 2b s.v. *lo*).

LIABILITY FOR VIOLATION OF THE LAWS.

While committed to the principle that "There is nothing permitted to an Israelite yet forbidden to a heathen" (*Sanh.* 59a), the seven Noachide Laws were not as extensive as the parallel prohibitions applicable to Jews, and there are indeed situations in which a non-Jew would be liable for committing an act for which a Jew would not be liable. As to the latter point, as a general rule, the Noachide is criminally liable for violation of any of his seven laws even though technical definitional limitations would prevent liability by a Jew performing the same act. Thus a non-Jew is liable for blasphemy—even if only with one of the divine attributes; murder—even of a foetus; robbery—even of less than a *perutah*; and the eating of flesh torn from a living animal—even of a quantity less than the size of an olive. In all these cases a Jew would not be liable (*Sahn.* 56a-59b; *Yad, Melakhim*, ch. 9, 10). One additional element of greater severity is that violation of any one of the seven laws subjects the Noachide to capital punishment by decapitation.

MARCHING TO ZION

As an additional reminder, referring to the *Phoenix Journal* titled, MARCHING TO ZION—THE ULTIMATE WORLD ORDER.

[QUOTING:]

THE FATAL DISCOURSE OF RABBI REICHHORN

In its issue of 10 March, 1921 (No. 214) *La Vieille France* gives the version of a funeral oration which was published in *La Russie Juive*. It is perfectly clear that the funeral oration and the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* come from the one and the same mint. Both are prophetic; and the power which made the prophecies has been able to bring about their fulfillment. This oration is so important that we again print it herein. There can no longer be any doubt as to whose is the power which is disturbing the world, creating World Unrest, and at the same time reaping all the profits. Jewry is enslaving all Christian peoples of the Earth as well as all God-loving peoples of other doctrines. There IS a Zionist World Plot and it now stands finally and completely unmasked.

1. Every hundred years, We, the Sages of Israel, have been accustomed to meet in Sanhedrin in order to examine our progress towards the domination of the

world which Jehovah has promised us, and our conquests over the enemy—Christianity.

2. This year, united over the tomb of our reverend Simeon-ben-Ihuda, we can state with pride that the past century has brought us very near to our goal, and that this goal will be very soon attained.

3. Gold always has been and always will be the irresistible power. Handled by expert hands it will always be the most useful lever for those who possess it, and the object of envy for those who do not. With gold we can buy the most rebellious consciences, can fix the rate of all values, the current price of all products, can subsidize all State loans, and thereafter hold the states at our mercy.

4. Already the principal banks, the exchanges of the entire world, the credits of all the governments, are in our hands.

5. The other great power is THE PRESS. By repeating without cessation certain ideas, the Press succeeds in the end in having them accepted as actualities. The Theatre renders us analogous services. Everywhere the Press and the Theatre obey our orders.

6. By the ceaseless praise of DEMOCRATIC RULE we shall divide the Christians into political parties, we shall destroy the unity of their nations, we shall sow discord everywhere. Reduced to impotence, they will bow before the LAW OF OUR BANK, always united, and always devoted to our Cause.

7. We shall force the Christian into wars by exploiting their pride and their stupidity. They will massacre each other, and clear the ground for us to put our own people into.

8. The possession of the land has always brought influence and power. In the name of social Justice and Equality we shall parcel out the great estates; we shall give the fragments to the peasants who covet them with all their powers, and who will soon be in debt to us by the expense of cultivating them. Our capital will make us their master. We in our turn shall become the great proprietors, and the possession of the land will assure the power to us.

9. Let us try to replace the circulation of gold with paper money; our chest will absorb the gold, and we shall regulate the value of the paper which will make us masters of all the positions.

10. We count among us plenty of orators capable of feigning enthusiasm and of persuading mobs. We shall spread them among the people to announce changes which should secure the happiness of the human race. By gold and by flattery we shall gain the proletariat which will charge itself with annihilating *Christian* capitalism. We shall promise workmen salaries of which they have never dared dream, but we shall also raise the price of necessities so that *our profits will be greater still.*

11. In this manner we shall prepare Revolutions which *the Christians will make themselves* and of which we shall reap the fruit.

12. By our mockeries and our attacks upon them we shall make their priests ridiculous then odious, and their religion as ridiculous and as odious as their clergy. Then we shall be masters of their souls. For our pious attachment to our own religion, to our own worship, will prove the superiority of our religion and the superiority of our souls.

13. We have already established our own men in all important positions. We must endeavor to provide the *Goyim* with lawyers and doctors; the lawyers are *au courant* with all interests; doctors, once in the house, become confessors and directors of consciences.

14. But above all let us monopolize Education. By this means we *spread ideas that are useful to us*, and shape the children's brains as suits us.

15. If one of our people should unhappily fall into the hands of justice amongst the Christians, we must rush to help him; find as many witnesses as he needs to save him from his judges, until we become judges ourselves.

16. The Monarchs of the Christian world, swol-

len with ambition and vanity, surround themselves with luxury and with numerous armies. *We shall furnish them with all the money their folly demands, and we shall keep them in leash.*

17. Let us take care not to hinder the marriage of our men with Christian girls, for through them we shall get our foot into the most closely locked circles. If our daughters marry *Goyim* they will be no less useful, for the *children of a Jewish mother are ours.* Let us foster the idea of free love, that we may destroy among Christian women attachment to the principles and practices of their religion.

18. For ages the sons of Israel, despised and persecuted, have been working to open up a path to power. They are hitting the mark. *They control the economic life of the accursed Christians; their influence preponderates over politics and over manners.*

19. At the wished for hour, fixed in advance, *we shall let loose the Revolution, which by ruining all classes of Christianity will definitely enslave the Christians to US.* Thus, will be accomplished the promise of God made to His People.

GEORGE WASHINGTON ON JEWS

In *Maxims of George Washington*, by A.A. Appleton & Co.:

"They (the Jews) work more effectively against us, than the enemy's armies. They are a hundred times more dangerous to our liberties and the great cause we are engaged in...It is much to be lamented that each state, long ago, has not hunted them down as pest to society and the greatest enemies we have to the happiness of America."

CONGRESS SHALL PASS NO LAW RESPECTING AN ESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION... (FIRST AMENDMENT)

While it is true that, "All laws which are repugnant to the *Constitution* are null and void." (*Marbury v. Madison*), and "Where rights secured by the *Constitution* are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation which would abrogate them" (*Miranda v. Arizona*)—of what effect are these legal precedents if they do not possess the teeth necessary to keep the *controllers* in line? Congress can pass one unconstitutional law after another and if no one is paying attention, and there are no lawyers amidst the countless numbers of attorneys, in as many law firms, who will come forward to challenge such obvious affronts to our *Constitution* as the Noachide Law—then perhaps we as a once free nation deserve everything we get.

As we take a long careful look backward, it becomes obvious how the anti-God elements have usurped our government to the point that God is left outside, waiting. The khazarian/"zionists" have taken such control at all levels of our society today, that while small in numbers, they seemingly hold all the cards. Yet they forget that it is God at the helm and not the anti-Christ. But God expects those believing in Him to do their part. The remaining question concerns those choices which man has yet to make. Will his choices include sovereignty and freedom under the *Constitution*, or will man move closer down that tunnel toward enslavement and darkness?

The time is long, long past when our *Constitutional* guarantees should be taken for granted. The *Constitution* does not "bestow" rights—it merely outlines what our unalienable rights as man [generic term] are. If we do not exercise our rights, surely we shall lose them.

Who among you will see that the *Constitution* lives? And who among you will stand idly by waiting for your brother to act, while he waits for you?

Think on these things for they are no idle concerns but will affect the rest of your life—if you have one past the next moment.