

Administrative Court Freiburg
Habsburger Straße 103
79104 Freiburg
Germany

September 21, 2009

L A W S U I T
re

- 1) Dieter Potzel
- 2) Dr. Peter Thurneysen
- 3) Matthias Holzbauer
- 4) Alfred Schulte
- 5) Dr. Gert-Joachim Hetzel
- 6) Dr. Christian Sailer

All at Max-Braun-Straße 2, 97828 Marktheidenfeld

– Plaintiffs –

Counsel for the Plaintiff:

Attorneys-at-Law:
Dr. Christian Sailer
Dr. Gert-Joachim Hetzel
Max-Braun-Straße 2, 97828 Marktheidenfeld,
Germany

Against

Archbishopric/Diocese of Freiburg, represented by
Archbishop Dr. Robert Zollitsch, Schoferstraße 2, 79098 Freiburg

– Defendant –

To Cease and Desist

In the name of, and vested with full powers by, the aforementioned plaintiffs (Attachment 1) we herewith bring against the Archbishopric/Diocese of Freiburg a

L A W S U I T

and file for adjudication of the following:

- I. The defendant is enjoined from calling itself “Christian.”
- II. The defendant bears the litigation costs.
- III. The adjudgment is provisionally enforceable in paragraph II.

G R O U N D S

I. Object of Proceedings

The plaintiffs demand:

that the defendant no longer calls itself “Christian.” It may very well continue to call itself Catholic and may continue to

recruit membership using compulsory means by way of the baptism of infants,

justify wars,

keep the wealth it acquired, to a considerable extent, through the use of violence,

threaten the people with a punishing God,

call for intolerance,

be hostile to women and

condone animal torture,

but it should not call itself “Christian.”

Millions of people all over the world have dropped of the institutional church corporations. Many of them sincerely strive to live as Jesus of Nazareth taught and exemplified through his life. They have realized that what the institutional church corporations, particularly the Catholic Church, teaches and does, has nothing in common with the teachings of Jesus, the Christ.

Many such free Christians, who, as babies, had been appropriated by this institution without being asked, have tried to free themselves of the stigma of this un-Christian organization and have demanded that their name be erased from baptismal records. This is categorically denied by the Catholic Church – as by the Protestant Lutheran Church, as well – with the claim that baptism is a procedure that cannot be revoked.

The Catholic Cardinal Antonio Maria Rouco explained in the Catholic News Service “KATH.NET” on July 13, 2004, that baptism remains in force for evermore and eternally, “being a part of our DNA.”

This statement vividly illustrates the attitude of the Catholic Church, as it is also laid down in the Catholic statements of doctrine.

Christ said, and originally, this is written in the Bibles of the churches: “Teach first, and then baptise.” The church, however, introduced the compulsory baptism of infants and upholds this practice until today. This manipulation of under-aged children, in combination with their appropriation for an institution for all eternity, along with the well-known and devastating psychological consequences like church-induced neuroses or, even worse, lifelong traumatization through criminal child molesters, is utterly un-Christian and a mockery of Jesus, the Christ.

The refusal of the church to give up its claim on those who have left it and to release them from its appropriating shackles, has prompted free Christians who follow the Christ of the Sermon on the Mount worldwide – among them the plaintiffs – to concern themselves with Catholicism even more intensely. The astounding fullness of facts that has come to light as a result of this proves that the Catholic Church makes a mockery of the quality “Christian,” not only with its compulsory baptism, but with all of its doctrine and all of its history.

For this reason, on August 19, 2009, the plaintiffs called on the 27 bishops of the Catholic diocese to no longer call themselves “Christian” and that they pledge this in writing to the plaintiffs by September 20, 2009.

During the past 30 years and through the prophetic word, the Spirit of the Christ of God has repeatedly offered the possibility of a dialogue to the leaders of the Catholic institution. All the priest-men tossed His words to the wind and found Him not worthy of answering. And the bishops this time reacted in exactly the same way, thus forcing the plaintiffs to turn to the courts. In the case at hand, the plaintiffs are going against the diocese of the head of the German Bishop's Conference.

The plaintiffs gave the reasons for their demand in writing on August 19, 2009, having written the following:

Hear, you bishops!

The game is over!

Stop calling yourselves "Christian"!

For centuries the church corporation, which you all head, has led people around by the nose and taken them for fools, in order to subjugate the people by way of religion and be able to continue to suck them dry, by having them dutifully continue to pay their church taxes.

But it is becoming more and more apparent that the institution you head may very well have been vocal in using the name of Jesus, the Christ, as if it had lawfully come into His inheritance, but in reality, you have trampled His heritage underfoot, and through your doctrine – and even more so through your deeds – you have continuously mocked and ridiculed Him, and still do so today. Daily, you nail Jesus, the Christ, to the cross again, because you do the opposite of what He wanted. And then you drag Him, who has resurrected, through the streets as a dead man on the cross in triumphal processions, like a trophy that you have run down.

What does the institution you represent practice other than spiritual legacy hunting, counterfeiting and fraudulent labelling of a spiritual nature? And, in addition, hypocrisy, because you adorn yourselves with a name you are not entitled to, since you have obviously betrayed the actual teachings and ethical-moral role model of Jesus of Nazareth. Otherwise, your institution's past would not be filled to the brim with blood and crimes. And otherwise, at least today, you would act as the Nazarene exemplified through His life.

But there can be no mention of this, as we will soon demonstrate (see documentation in attachment).

Jesus taught: “First teach and then baptize.” With this, He leaves to each person his free will. You, on the other hand, reel in babies, inoculate them with guilt complexes from the earliest age, make threats with the punishments of hell and eternal damnation, thus extorting obedience and church taxes. Many mental illnesses, such as church-induced neuroses and abnormalities like pedophilia are not seldom the consequence. Any other organization would have long since been banned as a totalitarian organization on grounds of being in contempt of the Constitution and of violating human rights.

What did Jesus say when He drove the merchants selling live sacrificial animals out of the temple in Jerusalem? “My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations! But you have made it a den of robbers!” (Mk. 11:17)

No need to fear: We do not want to drive you from your magnificent dens and palaces. Feel free to remain there and believe whatever you want – for no belief or faith can be proved. You can also continue to let yourselves be paid by those who think your ceremonies and rituals that stem from paganism are good, and who want to continue to venerate the bones of the deceased and the statues of alleged “saints.”

Call yourselves Catholic, no one will contest that!
We want only one thing: Do not call yourselves “Christian” anymore!

For one day you will come to grief. And what you, over the centuries and until today, have made of the original, pure teachings of the Nazarene causes sheer outrage in those who, in their life, take seriously Jesus, the Christ, and His teaching, the Sermon on the Mount, in order to put it into practice step by step.

It is enough! For, yes, they still exist, the followers of Jesus, the Christ, who have not let their brains become clouded by litanies and pious sayings, who can still add two and two together, and can distinguish good from evil in their hearts, as the Nazarene taught us. And they can still grasp with a clear head what the great teacher of mankind, Jesus, the Christ, meant, when He said: “Do not lay up for yourselves treasures ... where moths and rust consume!” “The one who takes up the sword will

perish by the sword!” “Teach first and then baptize!” “... whoever causes one of these little ones who believe in me to sin, it would be better for him to have a great millstone fastened around his neck and to be drowned in the depth of the sea.” “Call no man on earth father, for you have one Father, who is in heaven.”

Are these sentences so difficult to understand? And yet, in the name of Jesus, the Christ – of all names – your institution has managed to violate each and every one of these few sentences listed here and to cause unending suffering, oceans of tears and blood, to come over mankind – and to even let itself be paid for this! Until today, the church has not yet truly dissociated itself from this criminal past. Even though, after decades of study, Karlheinz Deschner, one of the most eminent critical minds of our day, comes to the following conclusion:

“After intensely studying the history of Christianity, I know of no organization of the world, in antiquity, in the Middle Ages and during modern times, including and especially the 20th century, that at the same time is so long, so continuously and so terribly burdened with crime as is the Christian Church, particularly the Roman-Catholic Church.” (“Die beleidigte Kirche”, p. 42 f.)

It is enough! The time has come for the name of Jesus, the Christ, to finally be rehabilitated – the greatest prophet of all time, who became our Redeemer on the cross, who resurrected and comes again in the spirit, but is still being held on the cross by you!

Despite all the persecution throughout history, despite the Inquisition and eradication of all “heretical movements,” despite the “modern” Inquisition of our days – we are again here! We have taken up the rehabilitation of Jesus, the Christ. We are free Christians who walk in the footsteps of the freedom-thinker, Jesus of Nazareth. We are those who do not think His Sermon on the Mount is a utopia, but the sole realistic chance still remaining for mankind today. And **because** Jesus, the Christ, is a concern of our heart, **because** He is our heavenly friend and our divine brother, the Redeemer of all men and souls, we will no longer accept that His name be constantly misused by you and your institutional church doctrine for something totally different. Therefore:

- Feel free to continue to enjoy your assets of billions, hoarding your stocks and bonds, your shares in funds and the property of your church-

corporation, while more than a billion people go hungry – but then, please do not call yourselves “Christian” anymore!

- Let yourselves continue to be fattened every year with the taxpayers’ billions, with state subsidies for anything and everything, including your bishops’ salaries, while millions of people are unemployed and pinched by poverty, as long as the taxpayers tolerate this and the lemmings who are servile to you in the government permit this – but then, do not call yourselves “Christian” anymore!

- Feel free to keep on spreading the “welfare fairytale” that the German social welfare system would collapse if it weren’t for the church, even though all public social facilities operated by the church are financed nearly 100% by the state and their respective users. But then, do not call yourselves “Christian” – for this would mean to keep the eighth commandment.

- Keep on justifying wars and military intervention, and perhaps even making new soldier widows believe that it is the will of God “to defend Germany in the Hindu Kush,” but do not call yourselves “Christian”!

- Keep on inoculating the faithful with the belief that there is an “eternal hell” and a “punishing God,” thus plunging them into mental and spiritual despair and alienating them from our heavenly Father, who is only love – but then, call yourselves “Catholic,” not “Christian” anymore!

- Feel free to continue to claim in your collections of dogmas that “no one outside of the Catholic Church, neither pagan nor Jew, nor unbeliever will take part in eternal life, but will rather fall victim to the eternal fire, ...which is prepared for the devil and his angels ... ” (Neuner-Roos, Margin Note 381, German edition). This is how you deal with people and this is your Catholic posture of threat, but it is not Christian.

- Keep on discriminating against women as long as they acquiesce – but do not call yourselves “Christian” anymore!

- Continue to cover up for the child abusers among the ranks of your clergy, moving them from one parish to the next, for so long, until finally whole villages and towns will leave the church, because they are

fed up and no longer want to look on while this happens – but please, do not call yourselves “Christian” anymore!

- Feel free to continue to be satisfied with the fact that – without ethics, without morals, without decency, without style and without manners – many people, as members of your church, are up to no good in society – but do not allow them to call themselves “Christian”!
- Keep on trampling underfoot the teachings of the faith of the deed, which Jesus, the Christ, brought us (“Everyone who hears these words of mine and does them will be like a wise man ... ”); keep on proclaiming your pagan structure of dogmas, your sacraments and rituals. Keep on calling yourselves “Catholic,” no one will contest you on that. But then, do not call yourselves “Christian”!
- Keep on condoning the bestial cruelties against the animals that are being perpetrated in the laboratories of animal experiments and on factory farms today – but then, do not call yourselves “Christian” anymore. For Jesus of Nazareth was a friend of the animals.

It is more than enough! We do not contest you on your faith! But we call on you to no longer use the designation “Christian.” If by September 20, 2009, you do not answer us by consenting to this, we will go to court in protest of this presumptuous abuse of Christ’s name, in order to rehabilitate Christ.

Since this is a matter of public interest, we will take the liberty of informing the public.

Herewith, we submit the presentation of facts of this notice as a matter concerning the current proceedings, as well as the attached documentation of the notice, which contains the following:

Documentation

The Catholic Church should no longer call itself “Christian”!

What would Jesus of Nazareth say if He were to come again to the Earth today and see what the church has made of His life's works?

The Vatican – The Greatest Warmonger

Jesus, the Christ, taught love of enemy and non-violence. “The one who takes up the sword will perish by the sword.”

As absolute monarch of the church-state, the pope in Rome, however, has often waged war himself and participated in civil wars. Over and over again, the popes have incited and supported wars, yes, they have incited whole nations to wage war against one another – for instance, the Byzantines against the Ostrogoths, the Franconians against the Lombards, the Normans against the Hohenstaufen dynasty and vice versa.

During the 17th century, the Vatican fueled the Thirty Years War in Germany, and in 1914, the Vatican ambassador in Vienna incited the Habsburgs against the Serbs in the First World War.

Shortly before the Second World War, Pope Pius XII let Hitler know that he would “withhold every damnation of Germany if it would wage war against Poland.” (Deschner, Ein Jahrhundert Heilsgeschichte, vol. 2, p. 41). Catholic army chaplains on both sides of the front always sent soldiers into battle with “God’s blessing.” The Vatican supported all fascistic and right-winged dictators in Europe and Latin America. After the Second World War, the Catholic Cardinal Josef Frings was the first to urge the rearmament of the Republic of Germany.

Catholic clergy were decisively involved in the genocide committed by Croatian fascists on orthodox Serbs from 1941-1943, in the bloody “cleansings” in Argentina from 1976-1983 and in the genocide committed by the Hutus on the Tutsis in Ruanda in 1994.

Leading Jesuits even justified the deployment of nuclear weapons, and thus, they accepted hazarding the consequences of the annihilation of entire nations.

During the Golf War in 1991, Pope John Paul II said: “We are no pacifists.” And in 1995, he called for a “just war” in Bosnia. And as Cardinal Ratzinger, a few months before his election, the present pope rejected pacifism as “unchristian.” And so, he rejects Christ!

Until today, the Vatican justifies the death penalty in its Catechism.

Intolerance Instead of Love for Neighbor

Jesus called upon all people to practice brotherhood and respected their free will.

But the Church has always shed blood while bloodily persecuting dissidents. From the Marchionites to the Cathars and Bogomils all the way to the Waldensers and Anabaptists, it eradicated all movements that were connected to original Christianity. With its agitating slogans, it is answerable for the pogroms against the Jews; it initiated the Inquisition and inflamed the witch-hunts. It spread its church doctrine with fire and sword, and thus, has the genocide of the Central and South American Indians and the plunder of a whole continent on its conscience. Even today, the Vatican persecutes religious minorities.

The Riches of the Church Is Blood Money

Jesus lived simply and taught that people should “not lay up treasures ... where moths and rust consume.”

The church has laid up immense wealth over many centuries, by plundering the population, by mercilessly having the church tithe collected, by enriching itself on the victims of the Inquisition and the burning of witches, by falsifying documents, practicing legacy hunting and ensuring for itself tax exemptions and state subsidies, which, until today, continue to be held valid in many countries. What the church does as “good deeds” in the world is not financed by its enormous assets, but by donations of the faithful and subsidies from the state.

In Germany, these subsidies amount to at least **14 billion Euros** a year in direct subsidies and tax exemption – not counting church taxes and state subsidies for public welfare facilities run by the church. The salaries of the bishops including their “royal” household expenses, as well, are paid by the state, in this case, by the respective German states.

Pope and Church – Proclaimers of Evil

Jesus taught the God of love, who loves all His children equally and undertakes everything to have them with Him again. He did not teach an eternal hell. Nor did He teach to baptize infants, saying, instead: “Teach first and then baptize.”

However, the church introduced the compulsory baptism of infants, and upholds this until today. An infant has no possibility to defend itself against this. This is against Jesus of Nazareth; it is a manipulation, a mental restriction imposed on defenseless children by way of the parents, as ordained by the church.

But, as if that weren't enough: Until today, the church spreads the pagan idea of a punishing God, who punishes with eternal damnation all those people who do not follow the caste of priests. With this, until today, they terrify countless people, undermine their mental health and alienate them from God. This is a sin against the Holy Spirit.

From all these mental burdens that the church inflicts upon people, many mental illnesses develop, among others, the so-called church-induced neuroses. Since so many people are affected by this, we can understand the state our world is in.

The Guilt Complex – The Product of a Church that Is Against Sexuality

The church loads enormous guilt complexes onto people, by threatening them over and over again with guilt and eternal damnation. Then it has the nerve to claim that via its priests, it can forgive these sins, which, however, they are not capable of, at all. (The Bible was deliberately manipulated here. In reality, people should forgive each other their sins – it is still correct in the Lord's Prayer: "... as we forgive those who trespass against us.")

The implication is: "You are all sinners and will probably go to hell, unless you subjugate yourselves to our ceremonies" – this is psychological blackmail. If the state or an association were to do this, someone would immediately intervene, saying: This is psychological terrorism.

The church's hostility toward sexuality also leads to considerable problems in society, above all with priests. Enforced celibacy has no biblical foundation at all; and so, it is a purely ecclesiastical tradition and, what's more, an unnatural condition, an expression of the church's hostility toward sexuality. It is often accompanied by pedophilia and the terrible crimes that result from this.

Children and Youth Become Slaves of Pedophilic Priests

Despite all assurances and showcase speeches, sexual crimes among the ranks of the clergy are still not being rigorously cleared up. Over and

over again, children and youth become slaves of pedophilic priests. For decades, pedophilic priests were covered for and transferred from one parish to the next. This, too, is a sin against the Holy Spirit, because it not only leaves young people emotionally traumatized, but also alienates them from God. The countless institutionalized children who were mistreated, abused and forced into labor in Catholic facilities have received no compensation until this very day.

The False “Holy Father” in Rome

Jesus was a simple, modest person, who honored God in all things.

At all times, His alleged followers surrounded themselves with all imaginable pomp, for which the people had to bleed. They cultivate a personality-cult and have themselves venerated as “Holy Father,” even though Jesus said: “Call no man on earth father, for you have one Father, who is in heaven.” In the Lord’s Prayer, we simply address this father as “Father,” and yet, we are supposed to address His alleged representative on Earth with “Your Holiness.” Is the chief priest of the Roman Church, attired in pagan robes, perhaps more than God?

Jesus Did Not Want a Caste of Priests

Jesus appointed no priests and established no church. He gave people an understanding of the inner religion of the heart, for: “The Kingdom of God is within, in you!”

However, the church turned these positive beginnings of Early Christianity into the outright opposite of what Jesus wanted: a hierarchically structured church of priests with rituals, vessels, robes and customs, which all verifiably stem from paganism. The church bound, and still binds, people to external pagan rituals such as the veneration of saints, pilgrimages, the ritual celebration of Mass, holy water, sacramental ceremonies, thus holding them captive in an externalized religion.

The Church that Is Hostile to Women and Children

Jesus always spoke up for women and their right to equality.

However, since it emerged, the church has oppressed women and labelled them second class. During the persecution of witches, it had

them tortured with choice torture methods and cruelly killed. Illegitimate children of priests were turned into church slaves. Until today, women do not have equal rights in the church. Children, resulting from liaisons with priests, are alienated from their fathers and palmed off with meagre child support payments.

The Betrayal of Animals

Jesus loved the animals. When He fasted in the desert, they approached Him and made friends with Him. The first Christians lived primarily as vegetarians and, aside from soldiers, excluded hunters, as well, from their communities.

Right up until today, the church denies animals a soul and justifies the billionfold maltreatment and torment of animals in animal testing, factory farming and hunting. The indifference, yes, the disdain, for nature and the animals, which is based on church doctrine, plays a considerable part in today's boundless, brutal exploitation of nature all over the Earth. Ultimately, the climate disaster also has its roots in this.

Despite all these clear contradictions, the church still denotes itself "Christian," as it always has.

This is a scandal that we no longer want to accept.

Down with this fraudulent labelling of the church!

We are free Christians who stand up for the Christ of the Sermon on the Mount. We feel linked and committed to Christ who lived among us as Jesus of Nazareth. No one has to make the original teachings of the Nazarene the guideline for his life. But whoever calls himself "Christian" should not constantly do the opposite of what Jesus, the great freedom-teacher, wanted and taught.

Just imagine that one of our ancestors developed a unique product of the highest quality and marketed it. At first, this product enjoyed a great reputation among the consumers and was highly prized. But then came a product pirate who produced an inferior product under our ancestor's name. It only bears the same name, but it is worthless and even harmful to people after short term use. How would we react?

Would we simply look on – or would we try to point out to our fellow-man the deceit, the product piracy and fraudulent labelling and warn them?

A source bibliography is attached to the documentation, from which all presented facts and those following can be substantiated:

Sources:

Karlheinz Deschner, Kriminalgeschichte des Christentums (bisher neun Bände)
Karlheinz Deschner, Ein Jahrhundert Heilsgeschichte, auch:
Die Politik der Päpste im 20. Jahrhundert
Karlheinz Deschner, Opus Diaboli
Horst Herrmann, Kirchenfürsten
Horst Herrmann, Passion der Grausamkeit
J.R. Grigulevic, Ketzer-Hexen-Inquisitoren
Hubertus Mynarek, Die neue Inquisition
Hubertus Mynarek, Herren und Knechte der Kirche
Matthias Holzbauer, Der Steinadler und sein Schwefelgeruch
Matthias Holzbauer, Verfolgte Gottsucher
Matthias Holzbauer und Gert Hetzel, Des Satans alte Kleider
Peter de Rosa, Gottes erste Diener
Curzio Maltese, Scheinheilige Geschäfte – die Finanzen des Vatikans
Carsten Frerk, Finanzen und Vermögen der Kirche
Vladimir Dedijer, Jasenovac – das jugoslawische Auschwitz und der Vatikan
Wer sitzt auf dem Stuhl Petri?, Band 1-3, Verlag DAS WORT
Wynfrith Noll, Wenn Frommsein krank macht
Ernst Klee, „Die SA Jesu Christi“
Neuner und Roos, Der Glaube der Kirche
Carl Anders Skriver, Der Verrat der Kirchen an den Tieren
Elinor Burket und Frank Bruni, Das Buch der Schande – Kinder und sexueller Missbrauch in der katholischen Kirche

We repeat once more: The plaintiffs do not contest the Catholicism of the Catholic Church or the name Catholic. The point is that it should not call itself “Christian” anymore.

The plaintiffs perhaps wouldn't even have had any reason to concern themselves more closely with the un-Christian teachings and doings of Catholicism if they hadn't been forced to do so through the outrageous appropriation of their person based on baptism and the categorical refusal of the church to release compulsorily baptized infants from their clutches.

The designation of “Christian” in connection with the Catholic Church is a brazen labelling fraud. Through this devious misrepresentation, countless people have been and are duped regarding the real doctrines and motives of Catholicism. This also applies to the unsuspecting parents of the plaintiffs, who entrusted their children to the church, trusting in an education based on

the Spirit of Jesus, the Christ. The plaintiffs and all those who do the will of God are fighting against the fact that the name of Christ is being misused for this fraudulent appropriation and for the refusal to revoke it.

In the economic sphere of life, which, by right of its ultra wealth in the billions, the Catholic corporation is a part of, a firm, for instance, would not be permitted to sell an alcoholic beverage under the label “good for health,” or “alcohol free.” One would take a course of action against this as labelling fraud and, because of the danger to people, it would even be a case for the district attorney.

And if someone were to say that the Catholic Church has existed for a long time and therefore must be from God, then one would have to answer: If anything like the many machinations of the church exists for so long, it must be from Satan, because all those who strove for a true Christianity – be it the prophets, enlightened men and women, Original Christian communities and not lastly, Jesus, the Christ – were debased, defamed, discriminated against, harmed through character assassination and many of them were also killed. These are their works – right up to this day.

The bishops of the Catholic Church have no right to act for or in the name of Jesus, the Christ. They have been installed by the pope and are duty-bound to obey him. The pope, in turn, is installed by the bishops. The pope has nothing to do with Jesus Christ, for he is neither installed by Christ (“call no man Rabbi” – “for there is only one Father, who is in heaven”), nor does he do the will of God or of His Son, Christ.

The plaintiffs, on the other hand, and all those who do the will of God, are the legitimate followers of Jesus, because He so defined it in His testament, the New Testament, according to the following: “The one who does the will of My Father in heaven is My brother, My sister.”

The plaintiffs are the messengers of God on Earth and strive on Earth for the sovereign principle:

In all that you do, practice loyalty and integrity to the end of your days and depart not one finger-width from the ways of God.

This is why they denounce Catholicism’s estrangement from the teachings of Jesus, the Christ, and, above all, the abuse of His name.

For Original Christians or true Christians, the principle “Link and be” holds true. For the Catholic Church, “Divide, bind and rule” is in force.

The plaintiffs are the Board of Directors of the Community of Faith Universal Life of All Cultures Worldwide, and thus, speak for millions of Original Christians all over the world. They represent a recognized religious community and are thus equal to the Boards of Directors of the Catholic Institution. However, in relation to Jesus Christ, there is a difference: The plaintiffs and all those who do the will of God, are the rightful representatives of Jesus, because they have not trampled underfoot the teachings of God and of His Son Christ over the millennia. As the rightful followers of Jesus, they are called to protect His name from the abuse and mockery practiced by Catholicism.

Each of the plaintiffs is also personally and directly involved, because, against his will, he was appropriated by an institution, not just life-long but eternally, by way of a baptism that took place against his will and for which the church expressly refers to Jesus Christ. This is in stark contradiction to the teachings of Jesus and constitutes a brazen abuse of the name of the One for whose rehabilitation the plaintiffs have come forth in this incarnation: Jesus Christ.

The disgrace of being caught against their will in the registries and sphere of influence and power of an institution of the character of the Catholic Church is something the plaintiffs and all those who do the will of God will not put up with – neither for themselves nor, in particular, for Jesus, the Christ, whose name is also being misused for such purposes.

More About Compulsory Baptism:

The defendant gains its members through a compulsory act, namely, the baptism of infants without a will of their own, as written in Canon 96 of the Code of Canon Law (C.I.C.):

“By Baptism one is incorporated into the Church of Christ ...” As a rule, baptism takes place during infancy. Catholic parents live in the belief that the newborn infant is burdened with the stigma of original sin from which it can be freed only through baptism.

In today’s Catechism of the Catholic Church it literally reads as follows:

“Born with a fallen human nature and tainted by original sin, children also have need of the new birth in Baptism to be freed from the power of darkness and brought into the realm of the freedom of the children of God, to which all men are called.⁵⁰ ... The Church and the parents would

deny a child the priceless grace of becoming a child of God were they not to confer Baptism shortly after birth.” (Catechism, No. 1250)

And in the Codex of Canon Law we can read in Canon 867, §1:

“Parents are obliged to see that their infants are baptized within the first few weeks. As soon as possible after the birth, indeed even before it, they are to approach the parish priest to ask for the sacrament for their child, and to be themselves duly prepared for it.”

In case the child is in danger of dying, baptism has to take place even against the will of the parents. Can. 868, §2 C.I.C. states the following to this:

“An infant of catholic parents, indeed even of non-catholic parents, may in danger of death be baptized even if the parents are opposed to it.”

Most Catholic parents defer to this statement and have their children baptized as early as possible, mostly just a few weeks after birth. According to prevailing opinion, their right to bring up the child is sufficient justification for this decision, even though, according to Catholic doctrine, baptism indissolubly binds the baptized child to it. The Catholic Catechism states the following to this:

“Having become a member of the Church, the person baptized belongs no longer to himself, but to him who died and rose for us.⁷⁵ From now on, he is called to be subject to others, to serve them in the communion of the Church, and to "obey and submit" to the Church's leaders,⁷⁶ holding them in respect and affection.” (Catechism, No. 1269).

The integration of the baptized child into the Catholic Church is irrevocable (compare here von Campenhausen, Hdb., Staatskirchenrecht der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, 2nd Edition, Berlin 1994, pg. 759 f.), which is why the church refuses to strike from baptismal records the names of those who have dropped out.

II. Legitimization of the Plaintiffs

1. Despite church persecution of all early Christian movements, which based themselves directly on Jesus of Nazareth and rejected the ecclesiastical distortion of His teachings, from the Marchionites, through the Cathars and Bogomils to the Waldensers and the Anabaptists, an original Christian movement has again emerged during our time. Its teachings do not consist of

dogmas, ceremonies and hierarchies, as the churches proclaim and practice. Its core is the Sermon on the Mount. It is a faith that leads to the application of the Sermon on the Mount and of the Ten Commandments in daily life – according to the principles of equality, of freedom, of unity, of brotherliness and the justice that results from these.

Meanwhile, the Original Christianity of today has become a worldwide movement. It has no firm membership rosters; solely for legal purposes, legal entities have been formed in the individual countries, which bear the name of the community, organize events and disseminate the writings. The authority responsible for the total community of faith is the Association Universal Life of All Cultures Worldwide e.V.”, based in Germany. The plaintiffs 1), 3), 4), 5) and 6) are members of the Board of Directors of this association and are thus, notably, the representatives of the Original Christians.

2. In the name of freedom of those Christians, who follow the freedom teachings of Jesus of Nazareth, the plaintiffs turn against the above described compulsory recruitment of people as members of the Roman-Catholic organization. Presently, the plaintiffs experience the fact that the defendant even refuses to delete from church registries the names of those who have dropped out. Using public records, the church organization digs its claws into the souls of former members, which is another reason for the plaintiffs to denounce the un-Christian attitude of the defendant.

This appropriation takes place not only through the one-time coercive act of the baptism of an infant, but subsequently continues to be in effect throughout the whole life of the person, for, according to the view of the defendant, dropping out of church can end only the external membership in the church (Art. 2, §3 of the Bavarian Church Tax Law). The qualification for tendering a resignation is based on the Reich Law concerning the religious education of children from July 15, 1921 (Reich Law Gazette, pg. 939, 1263), which grants a child the right to decide on its own church affiliation upon completing its 14th year (§ 5, phrase 1). In Bavaria, based on Art. 137, §1 of the Constitution of Bavaria, instead of 14 years of age, it is 18 years of age.

To carry out the given opportunity to drop out would require a massive effort, which, at the outset, keeps many young people from seriously contemplating such a step: Over many years of religion classes, supplemented by special instructions for first communion and confirmation, they were taught to regard leaving the church as a “mortal sin.”

Already neglecting the so-called Sunday obligation is seen as a “grave sin.” (See Catechism, No. 2181).

This applies all the more to a final alienation from the Catholic Church by officially leaving it. In a statement of the German Diocese Bishops, it says:

“So if a Catholic declares his resignation from the church – regardless of the reason – this constitutes a grave transgression toward the church congregation.” (Erklärung der Diözesanbischöfe on December 1969, quoted from von Campenhausen, *Ibid.*, pg. 7619)

The statement of the bishops, which refers to a “grave transgression” connects with the definition of a mortal sin as a “grave matter” (Catechism, No. 1857: “Mortal sin is sin whose object is grave matter...”).

According to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, this leads to “eternal death in hell,” as the Catholic Catechism expressly defines the case of grave sin.

Compulsory baptism and retaining members who were acquired forcefully by threatening them with the eternal torments of hell contradicts the spirit of freedom of Jesus, the Christ, who said: “First teach and then baptize.” Aside from this, compulsory baptism contradicts the freedom of religion according to Article 4 of the Basic Constitutional Law of Germany, and according to Article 9, of the European Commission on Human Rights, which includes freedom of choice of religion, and which is exceedingly aggravated, that is to say, disqualified, by the mechanism of infant baptism and later threat of punishment of sin in the case of a resignation from the church. And, in the final analysis, the spiritual rape of infants that goes with compulsory baptism contradicts the “dignity of man” in Article 1, par. 1 of German Constitutional Law.

The fact that until now no offence was taken and those affected let themselves be fobbed off by saying that it was the parents who were acting for the underage child to be baptized, can simply be traced back to the fact that one has become accustomed to this system – reminiscent of the Middle Ages – and the terrible message of threat, within the framework of a long tradition. In reality, it is a tradition that goes against human rights, and which free Christians are now rising against, just as free citizens rose against slavery and racial segregation, in their time.

III. No Church Internal Matter

1. Pretentiousness of Name

The defendant claims of itself “to be one with Christ” (Catechism of the Catholic Church, No. 795) and to be “the body of Christ” as a church (Catechism, No. 805). The head of the defendant claims to be the “Vicar of Christ” (Catechism, No. 882).

Incidentally, it is known to the courts that the defendant designates itself as “Christian” and refers to Jesus of Nazareth, which is why there is a general reference to the “Christian Church” by the public.

2. Affecting the Outside World

As such, the Catholic Church has an influence on the public. A part of the self-image of the church is that it has a “mission to the public,” even a “guardian function” that it exercises to enforce the “Christian faith” (see Schlaich, “Der Öffentlichkeitsauftrag der Kirchen”, in: Handbuch des Staatskirchenrechts, Volume 2, 2nd Edition, 1995, Pp. 131 ff, 157). The defendant exercises its “mission to the public,” above all, through written position papers.

In the new constitution of the state of Brandenburg from August 20, 1992, this mission to the public is even expressly recognized in Article 38. Incidentally, it is introduced in contracts between church and state, for example, in the Lower Saxony agreement (1955) and in the agreements of Schleswig-Holstein (1957), Hesse (1960) and Rhineland-Palatinate (1962) (see Schlaich, *Ibid.*, pp. 131). The constitution of the free state of Saxony (1992) refers to the “significance of the churches ... for the consolidation of a religious and moral basis of human life” in Article 109.

Insofar as the Catholic Church considers itself authorized to “follow and assess public life from the standpoint of religion” (Jeand’heur/Koriath, *Grundzüge des Staatskirchenrechts*, 1999, Margin Note 64), as a corporation under public law, it acts as a sovereignty toward the outside world (see Schlaich, *Ibid.*, pp. 161). When its actions touch upon the rights of third parties, then the state courts are responsible (see Koriath in Maunz-Dürig, Margin Note 52, to Article 140). This applies to church pronouncements

about third parties, as well as to the utilization of state services by the churches, through which third parties are placed at a disadvantage.

IV. The Defendant's Violation of the Freedom of Religious Development

Such disadvantages may involve basic rights impairments that are within the scope of protection of the freedom of religious development according to Article 4 of the Basic Constitutional Law of Germany.

1. The Effects of Basic Rights on Third Parties

In court rulings and in the literature there is agreement that basic rights encroachments can take place not only finally and solely through command and coercion, but can also take place virtually directly (see, for example, Cremer, *Ibid.*, pp. 150, Pieroth/Schlink, *Grundrechte*, 22nd Edition, 2006, Margin Note 238 ff). Such de facto impairments can not only take place directly through the state, for example, through state warnings against certain products or state subsidies of certain activities, but also through those natural or legal persons who receive preferential treatment from the state, thus gaining an advantage in competition with other contestants. That in this area, positions on basic rights can also play a role as the basis for the right of defense has meanwhile become indisputable. Basic rights apply in non-governmental areas (whether between exclusively private parties or between private bodies and public corporate bodies) in the form of an "indirect effect between third parties." (Pieroth/Schlink, *Ibid.*, Margin Note 181; Cremer, *Ibid.*, pp. 456 ff). The consequence of this is that it comes to a "constellation of multipolar impairments" (Cremer, *Ibid.*, pp. 161; Wolfgang Roth, *Faktische Eingriffe in Freiheit und Eigentum*, 1994, pp. 298ff). The defense of basic rights and the right to have the impairments reviewed in terms of their legality, is, in such cases, not only directed against the state, which made the impairment possible, but also against the private or public detractor, itself. Depending on whether the impairment took place privately or under public law, the protection of basic rights takes place before the civil courts or before the administrative courts. In any case, it is a matter for the non-governmental review of de facto encroachments against basic rights.

In the process, the significance of the "indirect effect between third parties" is seen, above all, in the fact that "it helps safeguard freedom and equality even under the conditions of a modern, highly complex industrial society. This presupposes, namely ... a state of virtual symmetry, in which every citizen

has an equal chance to follow and carry through his own interests. Today, this virtual symmetry is not only often removed or compromised through governmental authority, but also through the exercise of private, economic and social power.” (Pieroth/Schlink, *Ibid.* Margin Note 183).

2. The Threat to Freedom by the Excessive Power of the Church

In the relationship between large, established churches and new religious movements, such a threat lies in the fact that the churches are granted multiple privileges and high subsidies at the expense of other religious communities and their followers. A very impressive overview of these privileges and supportive measures are found in Czermak, *Religions- und Weltanschauungs-Recht*, 2007, pp. 23f:

- “The government maintains numerous Christian theological faculties as educational institutions not only for religion class teachers, but also for priests. It finances them with tax monies collected from all citizens and lavishly endows them” (§17, I-4) ... “Primarily in Bavaria, the so-called “Concordat Chair” (originally) should serve Christian influence of students in the Educational Science Faculties, despite the fact that according to Bavarian Constitutional Courts (1975), public elementary schools may, at most, have a culturally Christian accent, but may not be of Christian faith, despite the misleading appellation of a ‘Christian Community School.’” (§ 17, I-5).
- “... The government finances all military, prison and police chaplains. The military chaplaincy (§ 7, II-1,2) is also supplemented with classes in social studies, (§ 17, II-2d) which are taught per government regulation by military chaplains on the basis of Christian faith.”
- “... Some states, particularly Bavaria, operate a firmly Christian school politics (§13, III, IV). Even the symbol of the cross, the epitome of Christian faith, is used by governmental and local authorities, not only to equip schools and hospitals and thus, areas of social and public significance, but even courtrooms and municipal halls, including Parliament – places of exclusively secular public authority.” (§10, V-3).
- “The government also pays the salaries of bishops, canons and other clergy in other denominations and faiths using tax monies. (§15, III, 1 b). It promotes church conventions generously, and even seminaries for priests

are supported with general tax monies, despite a scarcity of public funds.”
(Margin Note 47)

- “The practical extent of governmental churches subsidies is largely unknown in terms of its dimensions ... As part of the financing of churches, including direct non-cash subsidies (like the waiver of government income), they are even more significant than the revenues obtained through the church tax. Subsidies of the social services run by the church are not factored into the following. The magnitude is as follows: Financing (figures obtained from 1999-2001) of religion classes (€1,342 billion); state theological faculties and other church educational centers (€600 million – lowest estimate), military chaplaincy (€27 million), police and prison chaplaincy, salaries of bishops and other clergy members, church conventions, church building repairs, building grants of all types (including seminaries for priests), reduced fee privileges, monument maintenance services, adult education (particularly academies), youth work, radio broadcasting (free broadcasting of third party programs), court fines, job creation means, congregations abroad (culture, developmental aid, missions), etc. In summary, Frerk reaches the conclusion that for the year 2000, direct governmental subsidies amounted to €8,3 billion, and in addition, waived governmental income amounted to €10 billion. Part of this waiver includes the full deductibility of church taxes from the income tax at a rate of not less than €2.6 billion annually, and, in 2004, €3.75 billion. This sum however is not favorable to the churches, but to church taxpayers, who are, in turn, subsidized by all other taxpayers.”
- “Notwithstanding its still unredeemed commitment to dissolving all historical governmental services still in effect in 1919, including the contractual rights of new states, the government entered into a fullness of open-ended commitments requiring large sums of money.” (§15, III, 3 E).
- “Contrary to scientific conclusions, many religious minorities are vilified with blanket generalities as ‘sects,’ they are pilloried by governmental agencies and discriminated. In comparison, even the somewhat sobering final report of the pertinent Enquête-Kommission of the German Parliament (1998) paid no attention to special church movements like Opus Dei, whose totalitarian character and great influence has been thoroughly researched.” (Margin Note 51). “Since the 1970s, the so-called sects, as one tended to call all smaller or, above all, unfamiliar religious communities, have been the center of public interest. One likes to talk (often inappropriately) about religions or sects that appeal to the young, and about new religious movements. In reports and films, also based on

contrived stories, the general impression was successfully awakened that a large number of these groups work with inhuman methods of psycho-terrorism, systematically mistreating children for the purpose of indoctrination, hindering those willing to resign with threats, practicing financial or sexual exploitation and much more, thus posing a threat to society. Alone the unverified and unwarranted claim that someone belongs to a ‘sect,’ could lead to the obliteration of their means of subsistence, and governmental agencies and church ‘sect commissioners’ fueled public opinion through public warnings ... The sect commissioners of the mainstream churches, predominantly the protestant church, took up their influential activities, at the time when the numbers of those leaving the church skyrocketed and the churches, because of their own inner erosion, regarded the ‘sects’ as their competition. They managed, through intense public activity, to convey their view of the problem to the media, politics, training facilities and even the courts.” (Margin Note 206).

All of this led to the impairment of the freedom of religious development (Article 4 of Basic Constitutional Law) of religious minorities, also of the Free Christians for the Christ of the Sermon on the Mount of All Cultures Worldwide and their followers, that is, the plaintiffs. That they are severely handicapped in contrast to the Catholic Churches and their members, is apparent in view of the governmental support described above. Even in a pluralistic government of basic law, the Catholic Church became a power factor in politics and society, and a leader of opinion in terms of the treatment of religious minorities, which, meanwhile, are disdained with the blanket label of “sect” after years of campaigning by the church sect commissioners. While the government supports with taxpayers monies the church pomp and development of power in public events, as, for example, church conventions, the followers of a religious minority have difficulty to get even a permit for a small information stand. While the government grants unlimited tax privileges to the Catholic Church, religious minorities have to keep themselves above water with financial contributions, and have difficulties to get their religious efforts recognized as non-profit, at all.

3. Further Grounds for the Plaintiff's Right of Action

Whether the encroachment on the right to religious development is lawful or unlawful, that is, whether it is not only an encroachment on basic rights but a violation of basic rights, depends – as with any basic rights encroachment – on its legitimation. When, at the expense of other religious communities and their followers, the Catholic Church is granted privileges or subsidies because

it is presumed to be Christian, but in reality is not, then this legitimation is lacking. The state bestowal of church privileges, involving unequal treatment at the expense of other religious communities, is carried out without the originally applicable factual grounds, and is thus, a violation of the principle of equal treatment according to Art. 3 of Basic Constitutional Law. The illegality, however, is not only to be attributed to the state, but also to the church, if it obtains these privileges by fraud, using false information, in that it expressly claims or tacitly implies it is Christian, when, in reality, it is not.

This is like a businessman who is given authorization to act on behalf of the government, and, as such, violates the basic rights of third parties; or a businessman who receives state furtherance support and, in using this support, prejudices the commercial prospects of competing companies. This infringement does not only take place through a specific measure carried out by the recipient of the governmental authorization or support, but already through the act of authorization or furtherance (Cremer, *Freiheitsgrundrechte*, 2003, p. 164, 166). If the recipient of the authorization or support obtains these by fraud, then not only is the act of authorization or furtherance unlawful, but also the sovereign actions toward third parties – of the one authorized, or the utilization of support under civil law by the one receiving furtherance – because one of the prerequisites that makes possible his sovereign action or his action under private law, respectively, is lacking. The right of defense of the third party concerned is not only directed against the state, which granted the authorization or support, but is also directly against the recipient of the authorization or furtherance support.

And if there is specific danger that such governmental authorizations or furtherance support jeopardizing basic rights are obtained by fraud over and over again, then, according to Art. 19, par. 4 of the Basic Constitutional Law, and in connection with § 40 of the Rules of the Administrative Courts, this opens up the opportunity to argue for preventive legal protection by way of a lawsuit to cease and desist (see Kopp/Schenke, *VwGO*, 13. edition, Prelim. § 40, Margin Note 34).

4. Fraudulent Labelling Leads to a Violation of the Law

4.1 By using the name “Christian,” the Catholic Church not only procures for itself the possibility to pass “Christian” judgment on society and politics, and on people of different faith or on atheists, but also the possibility to receive what government and society in the so-called Christian western world grant only to the church: especially high governmental subsidies, an exceptional

social reputation, special institutionalized rights of participation in governmental and public spheres, as, for instance, broadcasting corporations under public law, advisory committees on ethics, in hearings on the law, state receptions and the like. The basis for legitimizing all this is the appellation “Christian” and the reference to Jesus of Nazareth. The church acts as the representative “of Christianity” which, in the so-called Christian western world, is still considered to be particularly worthy of support. If the defendant were not a “Christian” religious community, it would not receive anything remotely close to the amount of present governmental support by way of financial benefits, tax exemptions and political and social privileges. The assumption that it is a “Christian church” is a self-evident prerequisite for the fact that the defendant obtained and obtains the political and social benefits which provide it with its present religious and ideological predominance in Germany.

4.2 As presented at the beginning of the grounds for the lawsuit, the Catholic Church, however, wrongfully calls itself “Christian,” and wrongfully makes references to Jesus of Nazareth.

What “Christian” is and whether someone can make references to Jesus of Nazareth is a statement which contains factual as well as judgmental elements. The starting point is the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth.

Certainly, there are behavior patterns and teachings of religious communities of which one can argue whether they still correspond to the teachings of the Nazarene or not. In such cases, it would be a matter of judgment within a justifiable margin of assessment. A judgment, however, only becomes a claim to fact when it lies “outside of a justifiable margin of assessment” (Wenzel, *Das Recht der Wort- und Bildberichterstattung*, 5. edition, chapter 4, Margin Note 79).

This is the case here: The above-described behavior patterns and doctrines of the defendant obviously have nothing to do with the teachings of the Nazarene anymore, but stand instead in diametrical opposition to them. For this reason, the claim of the church that it is “Christian” and rightfully makes reference to Jesus of Nazareth, is an untrue claim to fact.

Since it permanently establishes this claim to fact either expressly or tacitly, thus obtaining by fraud the above-mentioned governmental benefits, through which religious rivals suffer massive disadvantages, particularly the plaintiffs, as well, the latter can demand that this untrue claim be enjoined.

V. **The Violation of the Personal Rights of Jesus of Nazareth**

1. The Protection of One's Biographical Image

According to the rulings of the Federal Supreme Court, the protection of the universal personal rights of a person are effective beyond death, since that person's merits, which are worthy of protection, outlast the legal capacity of their subject, which expires at death. This applies particularly under observance of the system of values of Basic Law whose "protection of human dignity indicates no temporal limitation to the life of the person." (in detail Federal High Court of Justice 50, 136 ff, also 107, 391; further, Palandt, Margin Note a).

According to this judicial decision, the protection of one's biographical image is also a part of universal personal rights, so that the right of injunction to compel someone to refrain from serious distortions of this image can be given postmortem.

It is, above all, those appointed by the deceased during his lifetime who are entitled to exercise the protection of his personal rights. Beyond this, according to the rulings of the Federal High Court of Justice, also "the close relatives of the deceased come into question, who are frequently affected themselves through the revilement of a deceased member of the family" (comp. Federal High Court of Justice 50, 140, in which the Court expressly left open the circle of those authorized to assert rights).

There is also no time limit to enforce the personal rights of a deceased person. What is decisive is "that the one entitled to assert rights can substantiate sufficient legitimate interest to take legal action," which "dwindles to the extent to which the memory of the deceased fades." (Ibid. page 140).

2. In the Case of Jesus of Nazareth, the following Ensues:

2.1 Until today, a time limit in the paraphrased meaning set by the Federal High Court has not come to pass. Jesus Christ is regarded as the founder of Christianity, as the giver of His name for the "Christian western world" and all those who call themselves Christian, that is, particularly the churches and some of the political parties. So one most certainly cannot argue that in His

case, “the memory of the deceased” has faded. Thus, the protection of His biographical image persists.

2.2 The assertion of this protection also will not fail because no “close relative” in the traditional sense, that is, no biological family member, can be found. The rationale concerning the characteristics of a relative that the Federal Supreme Court refers to consists in the fact that – in determining the qualification to assert rights – it establishes the closeness to the person whose rights are to be protected and the self-interest of the person asserting the protection. Usually, this interest lies with the biological family members. However, it can also be assumed for people who have chosen the person to be protected as a role model for their whole way of life. In asserting the protection of the personal rights of Jesus of Nazareth, this is even particularly self-evident because, as is generally known, He regarded the spiritual connection as far more significant than family ties. Let us again bring to mind His reaction as His mother and brothers sought Him: “Who are my mother and my brothers? Looking about at those who were sitting around Him, He said: Behold My mother and My brothers! For whoever does the will of God, he is My brother and sister and mother.” (Mk. 3, 31 ff)

2.3 This spiritual relationship as prerequisite for the postmortem assertion of Jesus' personal rights also guarantees that this right of action is not accrued in the sense of a popular action by anyone who simply makes references to Jesus of Nazareth. What is decisive, is that it concerns someone who verifiably believes in a teaching that corresponds to the teachings of the Nazarene and who verifiably strives to apply these teachings in everyday life.

2.4 This pertains to the plaintiffs.

They follow the “Creed of the Original Christians of Universal Life” which, according to § 2 par. 2, is an element of the statute of the carrier association of the community of faith (attachment 2). It links up with all the essential points of the teachings of Jesus as they are given above in abbreviated form and excludes everything that the mainstream churches have developed in the course of millenia or centuries, respectively, in terms of dogmas and rituals that are in opposition to the teachings of Jesus. This consistency of text is available for judicial verification through a comparison of the texts of the most important tenets of Jesus of Nazareth and the text of the Original Christian creed.

The plaintiffs not only believe in the teachings of the Original Christians in Universal Life, but for many years have made it their task to live according to them and to help with the dissemination of this teaching.

For this reason, the plaintiffs and all those who do the will of God are legitimized to assert the postmortem personal rights of Jesus of Nazareth, who is their role model.

In this spirit, they resist the massive falsification of the teachings and biographical image of the great teacher of mankind, Jesus of Nazareth. The defendant has turned His divine teachings into their exact opposite. Above all, the Sermon on the Mount was so falsified, that is, made so relative, that it no longer plays a decisive role in the everyday life of the people, instead being considered an impracticable utopia. With this, the central message of Christianity was falsified. The Golden Rule, “Do to others as you would have them do to you” was virtually done away with, in favour of a war of everyone against everyone, which led to a civilization now standing at the abyss, and despairing of a God whom the church described as a punishing God. The good tidings of Jesus of Nazareth were turned into a threatening message of satanic origin.

How glaring the fraudulent labelling is, which the defendant practices with the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth, may be described in several analogous examples. What if:

- one were to claim that the Dalai Lama had called for armed resistance against all those who do not share his belief?
- one were to claim that Nelson Mandela had called upon the black population of his country to kill all whites – with the cry: “God wants this”!?
- one were to claim of Martin Luther King that he had called for the enslavement of all white Americans who do not subject themselves to his will, by having themselves and their children be forcibly baptized by voodoo-priests?
- one were to say that Willy Brandt had declared that reconciliation with other countries was a grave mistake?

If one were to allow the Catholic Church to call itself “Christian” or to make references to “Jesus Christ,” thus ignoring its deeds throughout history, would this not be like thinking only of autobahns at the mention of the name of Hitler, while suppressing his crimes? At that, the crimes of the church throughout history are even worse than those of Hitler, Franco and Mussolini

combined – criminal dictators whom the church lent a helping hand, as so often in history. And after the millionfold slaughter of war, many Nazi criminals – with the help of the Vatican – were even set up with a new identity and taken to other countries, thus withdrawing them from lawful prosecution by due process of law. True Christians prepare the way for the Christ of God and not for criminal Fascists.

These are only a few examples and analogies, to illustrate the extent of fraudulent labelling using the term “Christian,” the scandalous deceit which is being practised with the teachings of the Nazarene up until this day. All of this is a deception of the people through well-directed disinformation. This is the satanic “trick” of the adversary of God.

With the Dalai Lama, with Nelson Mandela, with Martin Luther King and with Willy Brandt such massive misrepresentations of their biographical image and their person would trigger a general outrage. With Jesus, the Christ, society tolerates it with indifference. Why?

The plaintiffs, representatives of the Original Christians of today, do not want to countenance this any longer and therefore demand that this cease and desist in the spirit of the charges at hand.

Dr. Sailer
Attorney at Law

Dr. Hetzel
Attorney at Law

The German text of this lawsuit is the work of reference for all questions regarding the meaning of the contents.