

LAWSUIT

Administrative Court Hannover
Eintrachtweg 19
30173 Hannover Germany

October 13, 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, Germany

- Plaintiffs -

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

Against

Protestant-Lutheran Regional Church Hannover, Germany

represented by regional Bishop Dr. Margot Käßmann,
Rot Reihe 2, 30169 Hannover

- 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 Protestant Regional Church in Hannover 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 call itself “Christian.” It may very well continue to call
itself Protestant or Lutheran 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 (i.e. via the Catholic Church before the Reformation)

threaten the people with a punishing God

call for intolerance

condone animal torture,

dupe its adherents into believing that faith alone is enough (Luther: Sin boldly, but believe even more boldly. Jesus, however, taught the opposite: “Sin henceforth no more.”)

but it should not call itself “Christian.”

Millions of people all over the world have dropped out of the institutional church corporations. Many of them sincerely endeavor to live as Jesus of Nazareth taught and exemplified through His life. They have realized that what the institutional church corporations, among these also the Protestant establishment churches, teach and do, 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 Protestant-Lutheran Church with the claim that baptism is a procedure that cannot be revoked.

The former Protestant-Lutheran regional Bishop and chairman of the Lutheran World Federation Johannes Hanselmann stated in a letter on September 6, 1985: I would like to just give you the following to think about, that one cannot join and leave the Church, into which one was integrated through holy baptism, as one does with an association, when one has found something else where that perhaps appeals to one more. One cannot simply give notice to God canceling the covenant that he made with us in holy baptism.” (Letter to A. Emtmann from Sept. 6, 1985)

This is an attempt to appropriate “God” for the Church. But this forced appropriation has nothing to do with the will of God.

Jesus said, and originally, this was also written in the Bibles of the churches: “Teach first, and then baptize.” The Church, however, introduced the compulsory baptism of infants and until today considers this kind of membership recruitment necessary. 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, for example, in protestant homes for children, is utterly un-Christian and a mockery of Jesus, the Christ.

This also holds true for the protestant teaching which is valid even today and according to which there allegedly is no freedom of will regarding matters of faith.

The refusal of the Church to give up its claim on those who have left it and to release them from its appropriating shackles by erasing their names from baptismal records has prompted free Christians who follow the Christ of the Sermon on the Mount worldwide – among them the plaintiffs – to concern themselves with Protestant-Lutheran doctrine even more intensely. The astounding fullness of facts that has come to light as a result of this proves that the Protestant-Lutheran regional churches make a mockery of the distinction “Christian,” not only with its compulsory baptism, but with all of its doctrine and all of its history.

For this reason, the plaintiffs called on the regional bishops, church presidents and chairpersons of all member churches of the EKD (Protestant Church in Germany) to no longer call themselves “Christian” and that they pledge this in writing to the plaintiffs by October 11, 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 Protestant institution. But all the church men and women tossed His words to the wind and found Him not worthy of an answer. And the bishops, church presidents and chairpersons of member churches 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 Protestant Lutheran Regional Church in Hannover.

The plaintiffs gave the reasons for their demand in writing on September 11, 2009, having written the following:

Hear, you regional bishops!

The game is over!

Stop calling yourselves “Christian”!

For centuries, the church corporation, which you head, has led people around by the nose and taken them for fools, by pretending to be a Christian church and by also letting itself be dearly paid for this.

But it is becoming more and more apparent that what developed since Luther splitt off from the Roman-Catholic Church corporation is no more Christian than the Catholic one. Luther’s teachings have nothing in common with Jesus of Nazareth. The institution you head has been verbally using the name of Jesus, the Christ – as if it had rightfully come into His inheritance. But in reality, through your doctrine – and even more through your deeds – you have continuously mocked and ridiculed Him, and still do so today. Whether it is the justification of military intervention, the blessing of cruelty to the animal world or the unspeakable doctrine of an “eternal hell,” whether it is the denial of free will in matters of faith or Luther’s call to sin boldly, for faith alone is enough – daily, you nail Jesus, the Christ, to the cross again, because you teach and do the opposite of what He wanted. And then you worship Him, who has resurrected, on Good Friday as a dead man on the cross like a trophy that you had run down.

What does the institution you represent practice other than spiritual legacy hunting, counterfeiting and fraudulent labeling 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 stained with blood and crimes. And otherwise, at least today, you would act as the Nazarene lived, as an example for us all.

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

Jesus said that what is important is to do His teachings "in order to inherit eternal life." A lawyer who questioned Him about this spoke of the commandment of love for God and neighbor, and Jesus answered Him: "**Do** this, and you will live." (Lk. 10:25-28) However, the Protestant Church turned this message into its opposite, by teaching: "Faith alone is enough." But Jesus, the Christ, also said: "Everyone then who hears these words of mine and does them will be like a wise man." (Mt. 7:24)

Jesus taught: "First teach and then baptize." With this, He leaves to each person his free will. You, on the other hand, catch babies, inoculate them with guilt complexes from the earliest age, threaten with the punishments of hell and eternal damnation, thus extorting obedience and church taxes. Many mental illnesses, such as church-induced neuroses are the consequences. Any other organization would have long since been banned as a totalitarian organization on grounds of being in contempt of the constitution and in violation of human rights.

What did Jesus say when He threw 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 stay there and believe whatever you wish – for no belief or faith can be proved.

Continue to call yourselves Protestant or Lutheran, 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.

Right up until today, in the founder of your institution, you venerate a man who called for murder and manslaughter, and, who is a spiritual co-author of the Holocaust. You mock Jesus of Nazareth, because you teach that the salvation of the soul depends solely on faith and not on the fulfillment of God's commandments. You trample His heritage underfoot, because you justify war and military intervention right up to the present time.

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 differentiate good from evil in their hearts, as the Nazarene taught us. And who can still grasp with a clear head what the great teacher of mankind, Jesus, the Christ, meant, when He said: "The one who hears these words of mine and does them is a wise man," "Do not lay up for yourselves treasures ... where moth and rust consume!" "The one who takes up the sword will perish by the sword!," "Teach first and then baptize!"

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 the sentences listed here and to cause unending suffering, blood and tears to come over mankind – and to even let yourselves be paid for this! Despite this terrible past, the Church admits to only certain wrong attitudes of Martin Luther as if they were merely lesser offences, and it continues to celebrate and honor him as a role model and emphatically offers him up as a role model to the young people. Or it owns up to only individual faults of its anti-Semitic and

war-fevered bishops during the Third Reich and continues to undauntedly honor most of them – even though the inhuman image of God presented by these role models and their totalitarian subordinate mentality has brought unspeakable suffering over mankind. Thus, Karlheinz Deschner, one of the most eminent critical minds of our day, comes to the following conclusion after decades of study:

“After intensely studying the history of Christianity, I know of no organization in antiquity, in the Middle Ages and during the present 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....” (“Die beleidigte Kirche”, p. 42 f.)

Apparently he also meant your institution with this. Because, as already stated: Right up until today, your Church has not really disassociated itself from its founder, whom, if he were alive today, would have been watched over by the Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution. You even do the opposite: As ever before, you celebrate Martin Luther on the occasion of the 500-year anniversary of his “Reformation.”

It is enough! It is high time that the name of Jesus, the Christ, 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 kept on the cross by you!

Despite all the persecution throughout history, despite the Lutheran witch-hunt of Anabaptists and “witches,” despite the “modern” Inquisition of our days – we are again here! We have set out to rehabilitate Jesus, the Christ. We are free Christians who walk in the footprints 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 used by you and your institutional church doctrine for something totally different. Therefore:

- Continue to trample underfoot the teaching of the active faith, which Jesus brought (“The one who hears these words of mine and does them is a wise man...”). Continue to call yourselves “Protestant” or “Lutheran,” no one will contest that. But then do not call yourselves “Christian!”
- Feel free to continue to enjoy your tremendous assets, 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 salaries as bishops, 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 churches 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. (“You shall not bear false witness against your neighbor!”)
- 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 “Protestant,” or “Lutheran,” but do not call yourselves “Christian” anymore!

- Feel free to continue to be satisfied 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 condoning the bestial cruelties perpetrated against the animals today in the laboratories of animal experiments and on factory farms – 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 October 12, 2009, you do not answer us in the affirmative regarding this, we will call upon the courts to protest 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 Luther Church should no longer call itself “Christian”!

Many Protestants are convinced that Martin Luther reformed the Church and led it closer to Christendom. In reality, Luther remained a Catholic Augustinian monk his whole life, deeply caught up in the medieval thinking of the Roman Church.

There are worlds separating Jesus and Luther!

What the Vatican Church had built up over centuries as doctrines and behavior patterns in vivid contrast to Jesus of Nazareth was adopted by Luther in many aspects and included in his newly developing state church. He even added further un-christian elements, such as obedience toward authority, for instance. The effects of this can still be clearly felt in the Luther Church right up until today.

For this reason: Whoever follows Luther cannot call himself Christian!

The question is: What did Jesus teach? What did Luther teach? How does the Luther Church act today?

Denial of the Christianity of the Deed

Jesus taught: “Everyone who hears these words of mine and does them is like a wise man who built his house upon the rock...”

Martin Luther, on the other hand, was of the opinion that “Faith alone is enough.” The denial of the significance of the Christianity of the deed connected with this is a mockery of Jesus, the Christ, and of His teachings. The final consequence of this is an ethical minimalism, which makes every further spiritual development of a person

seem superfluous. In place of the active faith, which Jesus, the Christ, taught, a passive faith results, which makes people even easier to control. A look into the world shows where this leads.

Anti-Semitism

Jesus was a Jew – and He taught us the love for God, our Father, who loves all His children equally.

Martin Luther, on the other hand, was an awful anti-Semite, upon whom, 400 years later, the anti-Semites Hitler and Streicher still based them. Luther insulted Jews as “living devils,” as the “pestilence and all misfortune,” as a “thoroughly evil, thoroughly poisonous, thoroughly bedeviled thing.” He urged the authorities to burn the Jew’s synagogues and to forbid their worship services, to destroy their homes and take their prayer books and all their money away from them. He wanted them placed under house arrest and obligated to perform forced labor. The following quote about the Jews demonstrates the enormity of his hatred for the Jews: “You are not worthy of looking at the outside of the Bible, much less of reading it. You should read only the bible that is found under the sow's tail, and eat and drink the letters that drop from there.” (H.-J. Böhm, *The Teachings of Martin Luther - A Myth Breaks Apart*], p. 208).

The Luther Church vigorously helped when the authorities put Luther’s demand into practice during the 20th century. Already in 1933, numerous Lutheran pastors were members of the National Socialist German Workers Party. A facility of the Luther Church at times even operated its own concentration camp, bearing the address: “Regional Association for Inner Mission, Department Concentration Camp Kuhlen” (Ernst Klee, “Die SA Jesu Christi,” p. 62) In 1938, the Thuringian regional Bishop Martin Sasse still extolled Luther as a trailblazer for the Crystal Night and republished Luther’s book “About the Jews and their Lies.” Baptized Jews were excluded by the thousands from the Protestant regional Churches, which then contributed to them being exposed to certain death.

Warmongering

Jesus was a pacifist. He taught love of enemy and in a situation of self-defense warned Peter: “The one who takes up the sword will perish by the sword.”

Martin Luther, on the other hand, incited his fellowmen to war and civil war. Against the Turks, they should “raise their fist in joy and with confidence beat, murder, rob and do harm as much as they can, as long as there is still a sign of life.” And he called for civil war against the rebellious peasants, “Stab, beat, throttle here, whoever can. If you remain dead in the process, happy you, you can never attain a more blessed death. For you die obedient to the divine word and command.”

The Luther Church justifies until today, just as the Catholic Church, war and violence and presumes to decide whether they are “just” or the alleged “lesser evil.” During the First and Second World Wars, the Lutheran military chaplains and regional bishops urged the soldiers into battle right up to the bitter end. Lutheran deacons were called the “Storm Troopers of Jesus Christ.”

Obsessive Belief in Witches

Jesus respected women as having equal rights and prevented the Pharisees from

carrying out a death sentence against a woman.

Martin Luther, on the other hand, profusely poured oil into the fire of the witch hunts. “You shall not let the sorceresses live ... It is a just law that they are killed. They cause much harm ... They can also cast a spell on a child ... just kill them.”

Witch hunts raged in the territory of the Lutheran Church just as strongly as in Catholic regions. The territorial lords, who, thanks to Luther, also held the office of the head of the Church, usually raked in all the assets of those who had been tortured and murdered.

Intolerance Instead of Love for Neighbor

Jesus respected each person and was tolerant toward those of different faiths. For Him, it was not the prayer book that counted, but the deed, which is expressed, for instance, in the parable of the Good Samaritan, a helpful outsider.

Martin Luther, on the other hand, had those of other faiths persecuted with inquisitorial zeal, for example, the Anabaptists, defaming them as “messengers of the devil,” who “preach vain poison and lies.” Luther sent the hangman after anyone who dared to preach in Lutheran territory without being ordained by the Lutheran Church. “... the authorities should hand over such scoundrels to the proper master, who is called Master Hans (= the hangman).”

During the Nazi time, the Lutheran Church participated decisively in seeing to it that Jehovah’s Witnesses (back then: “Bible researchers”) were persecuted; hundreds died in concentration camps. Even today, the Lutheran Church persecutes religious minorities via its own modern Inquisitors, called “sect commissioners,” with the help of the mass media, through smear campaigns that result in loss of civil rights, social exclusion and, in part, the ruination of occupational livelihood.

Financial Privileges at the Expense of the Poor

Jesus led a modest life. He warned of accumulating the treasures of earth, which “moths and rust consume.”

Martin Luther, on the other hand, provided financial security for his church, by placing it under the state. Right up to the present time, the Lutheran Church, just like the Catholic Church, enjoys considerable financial privileges at state expense. In addition to church taxes and to considerable state subsidies for church social facilities, it has itself subsidized by the state to the tune of circa 7 billion Euro annually: in tax exemptions, for educating theologians, for denominational religion classes, for the salaries of regional bishops and heads of church councils, military chaplains and much more. The state then lacks money in other areas.

Gruesome Image of God

Jesus taught that God is a God of love, who gave us free will as His children.

Martin Luther, on the other hand, expressly denied that man has free will; he said that the salvation of his soul is predetermined: According to this, God has predetermined that the one serve the good, and that the other, however, fall victim to evil and land in eternal damnation. He said that a person could do nothing to change this on his own. For Luther, God is, literally, also a “cruel,” an arbitrary, an unpredictable and punishing God, whose “wrath” should be feared. Yes, He is even supposed to be so cruel that He can be appeased only through the “blood sacrifice”

of His Son.

This doctrine has considerably affected the mental health of its church members until today. Countless Lutherans still suffer from ecclesiogene (church-induced) neuroses: They can't deal with the concept that the heavenly Father, of all figures, is supposedly so cruel and frightening. In many a region strongly influenced by Lutheranism, for example, the German states of Thuringia and Saxony, an increased tendency toward suicide was recorded, which gradually decreased only during the course of the time of the German Democratic Republic. That man allegedly has no free will (which in the Lutheran Church is still considered necessary for the salvation of one's soul) is basically an unconstitutional doctrine – because how should politics function, for instance, if the majority of adulthood and the self-responsibility of the citizens are denied right from the start? How should social coexistence function when, according to Luther, reason is a “harlot of the devil”?

Church – Proclaimer 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 the baptism of babies, saying, instead: “Teach first and then baptize.”

However, the Church introduced the forced baptism of babies, and upholds this until today. A baby has no possibility to defend itself against this. This is against Jesus of Nazareth; it is 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 all those people with eternal damnation who do not follow the caste of priests. With this, they terrify countless people, undermine their mental health and alienate them from God, until today. This is a sin against the Holy Spirit.

From all these mental burdens inflicted on the people by the Church, many psychological illnesses develop, among others, the already mentioned church-induced neuroses. Since so many people are affected by this, we can understand the state our world is in.

Totalitarian Political Thought

Jesus was a spiritual revolutionary, a freedom thinker, who urged people not to orient themselves to institutions or traditions, but to seek God in their own inner being. This is why he was crucified by the caste of priests at that time. Regarding the authorities, He taught: Give to Caesar what is Caesar's and to God what is due to God.”

Martin Luther, on the other hand, made subordination to authority absolute. He saved his own skin by seeking protection from the territorial lords and by founding a new state church with their help.

This ideology of the Luther Church had fatal consequences in German history – not only in the bloody suppression of the peasant's rebellion, but also in the Prussian form of state absolutism, which the National Socialist (Nazi) state with its blind obedience was able to easily built on.

Pagan Domination by Priests

Jesus did not appoint any priests. Nor did He initiate any sacraments or carry out any

rituals; instead He brought us a religion of the heart, an inner religion. **Martin Luther** did indeed reduce several excesses of Catholicism; however he also took over important elements of the Catholic cult religion, which, ultimately, consisted of things borrowed from pre-Christian paganism for instance, the ministry, which is similar to the priesthood, a ritual communion, the baptism of babies and more. All this existed in pagan religions from ancient Egypt, to Babylon, to the ancient mystery cults of Greece and Rome – but not with the first Christians.

Hostility Toward Nature and the Betrayal of Animals

Jesus came into the world among the animals, and over and over again used parables that gave people an understanding of the beauty of nature. 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 excluded hunters, as well as soldiers, from their communities. Martin Luther and the Luther Church, on the other hand, continued the Vatican Church's hostility toward nature. Right up to the present time, we wait in vain for clear statements against animal testing, factory farming, genetic engineering, abuse of the power of atoms and much more.

Until today, the Church justifies the billion-fold maltreatment and torment of animals in animal testing, factory farming and hunting. The indifference basically laid out by church doctrine, the disdain for nature and the animals, plays a considerable part in the present 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 labels itself “Christian,” as it always has.
This is a scandal that we no longer want to accept.

Down with this fraudulent labeling of the Church!

We are free Christians who champion the Christ of the Sermon on the Mount. We feel connected to Christ and committed to Him, who lived among us as Jesus of Nazareth. No one has to make of 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.

Surely there are people outside the Church who try to live as Christians. But what did Jesus of Nazareth say? “No one puts new wine into old wineskins.” However, the Church, which Jesus never founded, whether Catholic or Lutheran, is an ancient “wineskin.” It is another domain of theologians and priests, the self-named alleged intermediaries for God, who, until now, have turned nearly all the good beginnings of the largest world religion into their opposite – including the vision of Jesus of Nazareth.

Just imagine that one of our ancestors developed a unique product of the highest quality and marketed it. At first, this product enjoyed great respect among the consumers and was highly prized. 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 time use. How would we react?

Would we simply look on – or would we try to point out the product piracy and fraudulent labeling to our fellowman and warn them?

We have nothing against it when the Luther Church wants to call itself “Protestant,” Lutheran,” or “unified.” It can call itself whatever it wants, but please not “Christian.”

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

Sources:

Hans-Jürgen Böhm, Die Lehre M. Luthers - ein Mythos zerbricht

Hans-Jürgen Böhm, Prof. Dr. Martin Luther – ein Massenmörder und Christenverfolger?

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, Passion der Grausamkeit;

Hubertus Mynarek, Die neue Inquisition;

Matthias Holzbauer, Der Steinadler und sein Schwefelgeruch;

Matthias Holzbauer, Verfolgte Gottsucher;

Matthias Holzbauer und Gert Hetzel, Des Satans alte Kleider;

Carsten Frerk, Finanzen und Vermögen der Kirche

Wer sitzt auf dem Stuhl Petri?, Band 1-3, Verlag Das Wort;

Wynfrith Noll, Wenn Frommsein krank macht;

Ernst Klee, „Die SA Jesu Christi“

Die Bekenntnisschriften der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche, herausgegeben im

Gedenkjahr der Augsburgerischen Konfession 1930, Göttingen, 1982

Dieter Potzel, Die Evangelische Kirche und der Holocaust, Der Theologe Nr.4, Wertheim, 1999

We repeat once more: The plaintiffs do not contest the protestant beliefs of the Protestant Church or the name Protestant or Lutheran. Nor do they contest the designation “reformed” or “united” that they use for some of their religious orientations. 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 the Protestant Churches 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 Protestant or Lutheran Church is a brazen labeling fraud. Through this devious misrepresentation, countless people have been and are being duped. They were deceived regarding the true doctrines and motives of the Protestant Church, which pretends to have reformed Catholicism 500 years ago in the name of Christ, but which has merely falsified the Christian teachings in a somewhat different way and kept for itself much that is anti-Christian. 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 Protestant

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 a labeling 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 Protestant Church has existed for a long time and the Catholic Church couldn't wipe it out back then – therefore it must be from God, then one would have to answer: If anything like the many machinations of the two mainstream churches 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, by the caste of priests and by the church authorities in both mainstream churches and many of them were also killed. These are their works – right up to this day.

The bishops and leaders of the Protestant or Lutheran Churches have no right to act for or in the name of Jesus, the Christ. They have been elected by people and are answerable to them. This has nothing to do with Jesus Christ. Bishops and pastors are neither installed by Christ (“call no man Rabbi,” “you are all brothers and sisters”), nor do they 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 Protestantism'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 Protestant 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 Protestant Institutions. 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 Protestantism.

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 of an institution of the character of the Protestant Churches 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 the Confessions of Faith of the Protestant-Lutheran Church of 1580, which are valid until today.

Here is a selection of valid doctrinal statements of the Protestant-Lutheran Church as written in the textbook “The Confessions of Faith of the Protestant-Lutheran Church,” published in the commemorative year 1930, 9th Edition, Göttingen, Germany 1982)

“Respecting baptism it is taught, that it is necessary; that grace is offered through it and that children ought to be baptized, who through such baptism are presented to God and become acceptable to him” (Augsburg Confession, IX.1; 9 Edition, Göttingen 1982)

“We confess that Baptism is necessary to salvation, and that children are to be baptized, and that the baptism of children is not in vain, but is necessary and effectual to salvation... It clearly follows, therefore, that infants are to be baptized, because with Baptism salvation [the universal grace and treasure of the Gospel] is offered, according to Christ's command, Matt. 28:19: *Baptize all nations*. ... That God, however, approves of the baptism of little children is shown by this, namely, that God gives the Holy Ghost to many who have been baptized in childhood. For there have been many holy men in the Church who have not been baptized otherwise.” (Defense of the Augsburg Confession, Art. 9;2.3)

“The Anabaptists [whose teachings are rejected by the Evangelical Church]...have such doctrines which are to be tolerated and allowed neither in the Church, nor in the commonwealth, nor in domestic life... [namely] That children are not to be baptized until they have attained the use of reason and can confess their faith themselves. [And] That the children of Christians, since they have been born of Christian and believing parents, are holy and the children of God even without and before Baptism.” (Formula of Concord, XII, 9,12,13)

“Baptism is our sole comfort and access to all divine goods ... The baptist shall speak: “Go out you unclean spirit and make room for the Holy Spirit.” (Martin Luther, Small Catechism; compare: “Was ist lutherisch? Under www.velkd.de: “According to Luther, baptism tears the “devil from the throat” of the person baptized. p. 42)

“...so also I can boast that Baptism is no human trifle, but instituted by God Himself, moreover, that it is most solemnly and strictly commanded that we must be baptized or we cannot be saved...For to be baptized in the name of God is to be baptized not by men, but by God Himself. Therefore, although it is performed by human hands, it is nevertheless truly God's own work. From this fact every one may himself readily infer that it is a far higher work than any work performed by a man or a saint. For what work greater than the work of God can we do?” (Martin Luther, Large Catechism, Chapter on Holy Baptism 6,10)

“Therefore state it most simply thus, that the power, work, profit, fruit, and end of Baptism is this, namely, to save...But to be saved, we know, is nothing else than to be delivered from sin, death, and the devil, and to enter into the kingdom of Christ, and to live with Him forever. Here you see again how highly and precious we should esteem Baptism, because in it we obtain such an unspeakable treasure...” (Martin Luther, Large Catechism, Chapter on Holy Baptism 24-26; Ibid.)

“...whoever rejects Baptism rejects the Word of God, faith, and Christ, who directs us thither and binds us to Baptism.” (Martin Luther, Large Catechism, Chapter on Holy Baptism 31; Ibid.)

“Therefore our Baptism abides forever...” (Martin Luther, Large Catechism, Chapter on Holy Baptism 77; Ibid.)

In the most recent Protestant confessional document from the year 1973, this teaching on baptism is also confirmed. There it states:

“Baptism is administered in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit with water. In Baptism Jesus Christ irrevocably [irrevocably, emphasis added by us] receives man, fallen prey to sin and death, (Leuenberg Agreement 14a, 1973.)
(<http://www.leuenberg.net/daten/Image/Konkordie-en.pdf>)

Most protestant parents defer to these statements and have their children baptized as early as possible, usually a few weeks after birth. According to prevailing opinion, their right to bring up the child is sufficient for this, even though according to Protestant doctrine, baptism binds the baptized baby indissolubly and irrevocably.

And so, the integration of the baptized baby into the Protestant Church is irrevocable. (Compare here also: Campenhausen, Handbuch der Staatskirchenrechts der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, 2. Edition, Berlin 1994, p. 759f) which is why the Church refuses to erase those who have left the Church from the baptism records.

And concerning the subliminal pressure that weighs on the parents, and also continues to be effective, the until today highly honored reformer of the Protestant Church, Philipp Melanchthon, demanded the execution of all parents, or people, who did not want to have their children baptized as babies. In his report for the University of Wittenberg, the reformer Melanchthon formulated as follows:

“Baptism of children, original sin ... since these articles are also important, because there is not much point in throwing the children out of Christendom and putting them in an uncertain state, yes, bringing them to damnation ... since, one indeed sees and comprehends that these are coarse, false articles [by those of other faiths], in the end we conclude that in this case the obstinate ones should also be killed.”

(Melanchthon's report: "Ob christliche Fürsten schuldig sind, der Wiedertäufer unchristliche Sekte mit leiblicher Strafe und mit dem Schwert zu wehren" [Whether Christian princes are guilty of fighting against the Anabaptists unchristian sect with physical punishment and with the sword], 1536; Tomos (= symbol of the Jena Edition of the Luther Writings from the 16th C.) 8, p. 383 ff)

It is true that such demands for execution made by the Protestant reformers concerning those of other faiths cannot be carried out anymore in our legal system. However, until today church co-workers who, for instance, do not want to have their babies baptized yet, must endure sanctions. This is shown by the example of an Protestant youth deacon in Würzburg in 1989, who because of his decision to "postpone the baptism" of his small child was no longer allowed to be active in the work with the young people of his Church. He had merely wished that his daughter be old enough to be able to consciously experience the church act carried out on her. (Letter to the editor in: Evangelisches Sonntagsblatt [Sunday Paper] No. 30, July 23, 1989 referring to an article in No. 26/1989)

And the founding father of the Protestant Church, the reformer Martin Luther, even demanded the death penalty for people who did not want to subject themselves to the order of the Church. And this was even when in Luther's viewpoint they taught correctly. Martin Luther wrote:

“... even if they wanted to teach the pure Gospel, indeed, even if they were like angels and Gabriel from heaven ... If he wants to preach, then he must prove the calling or order [of the Church]... If he does not want to, then the authorities should hand over such scoundrels to the proper master, who is called Master Hans (= the hangman).”
(The 82nd Psalm through D. M. L., written and interpreted Anno 1530, Tomos 5, pp. 74 b ff.)

The Truth Comes to Light

And when in recent weeks several of the plaintiffs wrote two public letters in the name of the Original Christians to the head of the EKD Council, Bishop Dr. Wolfgang Huber, they waited in vain for the bishop's answer. Finally, the “sect commissioner” of the EKD, Pastor Matthias Pölmann, wrote: “The public letters reflect a fanaticism that evolves into a massive aggressiveness against the Church.” (Materialdienst of the EZW. No. 10/2009, s.388-390)

But this assessment is only a reflection of Martin Luther or a projection of Martin Luther's behavior toward others. And it is once more evidence of the spirit of Luther that drives it.

For the Protestant, or Lutheran Church, the truth is aggressive. And it is recommended that anyone who wants to learn more about how the spirit of Luther is effective through the Protestant, or, the Lutheran Church, read the book: “Des Satans alte Kleider,” (**Exhibit 2**), which describes the disparagement and discrimination of those who left the Church over more than 30 years ago. This was carried out by men commissioned by the Church. The Lutheran sect commissioner Michael Fragner writes about this book that it doesn't contain anything new. From this, it follows that, for the Lutheran Church, such indecent activities are nothing new, but apparently normal. What can one then expect from such a Lutheran in relation to decency, morals, ethics, conduct and style?

So it is not astonishing with what insensitivity the “sect commissioner of the EKD,” Matthias Pöhlmann, complains about people who tell the truth, while at the same time it is made known (ARD [German Public Television Station] news program from Oct. 7, 2009) that in precisely this institution criminals have committed thousands of severe crimes against children, which, in their effects, are even partly described by experienced experts as soul murder.

In that same week, the Bishop of the regional Protestant-Lutheran Church of Hannover, Mrs. Margot Käßmann, publicly apologized for the child abuse crimes committed by employees of the Protestant Church in the German state of Lower Saxony in homes for children during the 1950s, 60s and 70s. It is estimated that over a million children in Germany were victims of child abuse and sexual abuse during the 1950s, 60s and 70s.

The churches of both denominations have created the moral justification and pedagogical guidelines on the basis of which the educators working in the homes for children carried out their crimes. Violence committed on children in such homes is based on a long established system. It was a cunning pedagogy of punishment and improvement, continuously developed in a manner that despised humans during the turn of the century. Even 8 and 9-year olds were to be raised with the harshest physical punishments. This concept was carried out right into the 60s and 70s of the 20th century. Many punishments bordered on torture:

- “Setting child in a bathtub of ice-cold water and forcefully submerging it;
- showering it in ice-cold water and having it stand still, wet, freezing and naked – sometimes for over an hour;
- knee-bends with outstretched hands on which the Bible lies. Beating of hands with a strap as soon as the Holy Scripture falls;

- making it remain sitting in front of the plate of vomited food and via repeated blows to the head forcing it to completely eat up the vomit;
- while vomiting into the toilet bowl, pressing the youth's head down and flushing the toilet;
- fettering a youth's hands behind his back and hanging him in the cellar on a hook on the wall with a strap around the neck, so that the strap throttles him when he collapses after standing for hours."

These are only a few of the many examples cited from the book by Peter Wensierski: "Schläge im Namen des Herrn" [Blows in the Name of the Lord] (**Exhibit 3**). The scope of these occurrences also can be sensed by way of the literature list in this book, a copy of which we include (**Exhibit 4**).

The members of the Association of Former Home Children e. V. have turned to the highest representatives of both mainstream churches in Germany – to the former head of the German Bishops' Conference, Cardinal Karl Lehmann, and to the head of the Council of the EKD, Bishop Wolfgang Huber, and have not received an answer from either of them.

The evidence against the Protestant Church is damning. Why could these two high gentlemen not bring themselves to utter a word of apology? Bishop Huber is presently bringing his chairmanship of the EKD to an end and is said to be going to South Africa – but why? Are things getting too hot for him in Germany? Is it possible that something will be brought to light here that he no longer wants to face?

Doesn't the description of the cases in the homes also awaken memories of the criminal behavior of the Protestant Church toward the handicapped and children during the Nazi era?

Ernst Klee and Gunnar Petrich describe in their film "Alles Krank ist Last" [Everything Sick Is Burdensome], which was shown on ARD on July 26, 1988 as commissioned by the Hesse Broadcasting Co., that the church institutions not only delivered the handicapped, including many children, by the thousands to state officials to be murdered (i.e. from Neuendettelsau in Bavaria), but that the Protestant leaders of the institutions themselves spoke already in 1931 "less of curing the handicapped than of exterminating unworthy life." This took place at their Conference for Eugenics Experts in Treysa, Germany. And this not only referred to the most severely handicapped, but also those slightly handicapped, including thousands of children, who could play happily together as film documentaries prove today.

The leader of the department of "Health Care," Dr. Hans Harmsen, stated to the Central Committee of the Inner Mission: "We give the state the right to exterminate human life, the life of criminals and in war. Why do we refuse it the right to exterminate the most burdensome existences?"

In 1931, even though the responsible leaders of the Protestant institutions ultimately demanded "only" the forced sterilization of the handicapped, the ground work was laid for the murder of handicapped later by the National Socialists was thus prepared in the church debates – and for a large part they were likewise convinced Protestants or Catholics.

Thus far, the descriptions from the film by Ernst Klee and Gunnar Petrich.

In the normal use of language doesn't one describe an organization in which crimes are committed for long and so continuously as a "criminal organization"? Some of its representatives must already have a millstone around their necks, for Jesus, the Christ, said, and so it reads in the Bible: "... 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.” (Mt. 18:6) But since the Lutherans involved are not “Christians,” the state helps them to wear down the millstone.

The Protestant Church has to deal with its past itself. But an organization that is encumbered with these crimes committed on children should no longer call itself Christian.

With all these events, anyone who wants to switch on his mind or his reason in assessing the facts of these cases is threatened by Martin Luther with the words: “Anyone ... who wants to be a Christian ... may he pluck out the eyes of reason...” (Martin Luther, Gesamtausgabe in 25 Bänden [Complete Works in 25 Volumes], published by Johann G. Walch, Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1880-1910, Vol. V, p. 452)

Or: Prudence “is the highest harlot that the devil has (Weimarer Ausgabe der Lutherschriften [Weimar Edition of Luther’s Writings] A 51, 126; compare 10 I, 326; 18, 164; 24, 182)

In contrast to this, it is reported in the Bible about the young Jesus: “... and all who heard him were amazed at his understanding and his answers.” (Lk. 2:47)

On the other hand, according to his own demands, Luther had no reasoning mind and that is why he acted against the Original Christians of his time. Thus, he insulted the Zwickau prophets with the words: “I clobber your spirit on the mouth.” (1520 gegen the Zwickauer Propheten; cited from Walter Nigg, Prophetische Denker [Prophetic Thinker], Rottweil 1986, p. 87)

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 and confirmation, they were taught a faith that connects leaving the church with the loss of the salvation of the soul.

So it says literally in the Protestant Confessions: “Also they teach that at the Consummation of the World, Christ will appear for judgment, and will raise up all the dead; He will give to the godly and elect eternal life and everlasting joys, but ungodly men and the devils He will condemn to be tormented without end” (Augsburg Confession, Art. 17.1.)

And according to the Protestant self-image, turning away from the Church automatically leads to unbelief and godlessness or is already an expression of this. As already mentioned, until today it applies in the Protestant-Lutheran Church “Therefore, we do not ascribe to free will and reason accomplishments in spiritual matters ...” (Defense of the Augsburg Confession, Art. 18.73)

Necessary for this is the “Holy Spirit,” whereby the church institution and its services are absolutely required. For, according to church doctrine in order to receive the “Holy Spirit,” “That we may obtain this faith, the Ministry of Teaching the Gospel and administering the Sacraments was instituted. For through the Word and Sacraments, as through instruments, the Holy Ghost is given, who works faith; where and when it pleases God, in them that hear the Gospel...” (Augsburg Confession Art. 5;)

Thus, according to Protestant-Lutheran doctrine, a person cannot have the “Holy Spirit” conveyed to him without being baptized in Church, without the pastor’s sermons and without church communion. But he needs this spirit, so that it, “works faith” in him, which is necessary (!), in order to be saved and not eternally damned.

The conclusion of this is: Disengaging oneself from this system of belief, for example, by leaving the Church, would lead to eternal disaster, namely, to “hell and eternal punishment.” This is how a person is chained to the Church.

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 the Church of Jesus Christ. It literally says the following about this in the constitution of the Protestant-Lutheran Regional Church of Hannover: “The task given by Jesus Christ to proclaim the Gospel is obligatory for the Protestant-Lutheran Regional Church of Hannover. The basis for the proclamation in the regional church is the word of God which became apparent in Jesus Christ, as it is given in the Holy Scripture of the Old and New Testaments and is testified to in the confessional documents of the Protestant-Lutheran Church.”

Incidentally, it is known to the courts that the defendant designates itself as “Christian” and refers to Jesus of Nazareth. Thus, in the creed of the Protestant or Lutheran Church, one also speaks the sentence: “I believe in the holy Christian Church.” This is why, in public, the protestant churches are also considered “Christian” churches.

2. Affecting the Outside World

As such, the Protestant-Lutheran Church also has an influence on the public. A part of the self-image of the Protestant 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.*, p. 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 Protestant 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.*, p. 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 subsidies of churches 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 chaplainry (€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 leads 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 Protestant Lutheran Church and its members, is apparent in view of the governmental support described above. Even in a pluralistic government of basic law, the Protestant 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 Protestant Church, religious minorities have to keep themselves above water with financial contributions, and have difficulty getting 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 legitimacy. When, at the expense of other religious communities and their followers, the Protestant Church is granted privileges or subsidies because it is presumed to be Christian, but in reality is not,

then this legitimacy 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 Labeling Leads to a Violation of the Law

4.1 By using the name “Christian,” the Protestant 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 Protestant 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. p. 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/Exhibit 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 millennia 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 favor 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 labeling 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 Protestant 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?

These are only a few examples and analogies, to illustrate the extent of fraudulent labeling using the term “Christian,” the scandalous deceit which is being practiced 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