

WOLVES DECLARE THEIR SHEEP-KILLING PLANS "FORGERIES", #3

Clifton A. Emahiser's Non-Universal Teaching Ministries
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830
emahiser.christogenea.org

Please Feel Free To Copy, But Not To Edit

In this third paper, we are going to try to discern what Benjamin Franklin meant when he allegedly said, "I fully agree with General Washington ..." In order to find out, I will repeat part of two quotations by Franklin, (1) one that is highly documented, and (2) one which the converso-Edomites (calling themselves jews) claim is a forgery.

Firstly, the documented statement: From the book *A Worthy Company*, by M.E. Bradford (Brief lives of the framers of the United States Constitution), under chapter entitled "Benjamin Franklin", pages 66-76. The following is an excerpt from page 70:

"... True enough, he wished to preserve the English character of the colonies: since 'the number of purely white people in the world is proportionately very small,' and since 'the English [with the Saxons of Germany] make the principal body of white people on the face of the earth, ... why should the Palatine boors be suffered to swarm into our settlements ... why increase the sons of Africa by planting them in America, where we have a fair opportunity, by excluding all blacks and tawnys ...?...'."

Secondly, the alleged to be fraudulent statement, supposedly from Charles Cotesworth Pinckney's diary, in part:

"I fully agree with General Washington, that we must protect this young nation from an insidious influence and impenetration. That menace, gentlemen, is the Jews."

And the wolves cry, "FRAUD!, FRAUD!, FRAUD!"

According to the 403 page book *Judaism In Action* (author unknown), page 123, it is stated:

"They (the Jews) work more effectively against us, than the enemy's armies. They are a hundred times more dangerous to our liberties and the great cause we are engaged in It is much to be lamented that each state, long ago, has not hunted them down as pests to society and the greatest enemies we have to the happiness of America. (Washington, in *Maxims of George Washington*, (collected & arranged by John Frederick Schroeder, D.D.) Pub. D. Appleton & Co.

From the Internet at www.thebirdman.org I found:

"Response (1): Well, I got the *Maxims of George Washington* (actually published by D. Appleton & Co., 1894) through interlibrary loan yesterday, thanks to U.C. San Diego being willing to allow a 104 yr. old volume to travel. It makes interesting reading. I found that the above quote is almost entirely accurate – EXCEPT that the original has no mention of the Jews. Why am I not surprised?

"When Washington made this statement he was, according to Maxims speaking of speculators in the currency, not Jews. I did a teensy bit of research & discovered that

one of the great problems of our Revolution was that speculators cornered supplies of shoes, clothes & vital supplies & sold them at huge profits, while privateers would slip out of port & trade in other nations making individuals rich to the detriment of the national treasury.” [Today, Esther is a known novel, yet George used Haman to exemplify his own jewish problem.]

This objector’s negative response is interesting, as I personally remember, no sooner than WW II had ended, in every city, town and hamlet, the Edomite-jews set up Army Navy surplus stores. Funny thing, I was in the Navy at the time in the Philippines and my last pair of shoes wore out, and the Navy’s store of clothing was running desperately low. I finally found a pair of shoes two sizes too large for me at a dump on the island where our ship repair base was located. I had to wear those oversize shoes for several months! Those shoes I found had seen their best day, but the soles hadn’t worn completely through. I even thought about writing mom and dad at home to send me a pair of shoes. However, those Edomite-jewish run Army Navy surplus stores had military style clothing stacked nearly to the ceiling. This is not all, but at the U.S. Naval base near Oakland, California where thousands of Navy personnel (including myself) were waiting to be shipped overseas, one day in the barracks to which I was assigned, we were ordered to form into columns and march down to the supply depot, whereupon they issued us two large bags about 24 inches in diameter and all of five feet tall jam-full of clothing (including four pairs of shoes). When we got to the end of the line, we had to sign that we had received that clothing, and label each bag with our names and serial numbers. Then we were ordered to pile those two bags in a huge mountain of other bags, and we never saw that clothing again. So don’t try to feed me the bull that George Washington didn’t have similar kinds of Edomite-jewish criminal activities to contend with!

Not satisfied with this objector’s explanation, I decided to find a copy of the *Maxims of George Washington* by D. Appleton & Co. for myself. Understanding that it was a very rare book, and probably quite expensive, I searched the Internet for an electronic copy. I was hoping to find an HTML, so I could copy and paste it into a word processor document for my own reference, but fortunately I did find it in a PDF file (which blocked copying). This first PDF I found was quite sensitive to adjust and read. Whereupon, I searched for a better one, and finding a third one I was able to manage it quite well. At this point I was faced with possibly reading four hundred pages to find what I wanted. I did notice that the chapter titles and subtitles had electronic links.

I was finally to able figure out exactly what George Washington said in his *Maxims* which is now posted at:

<http://emahiser.christogenea.org/george-washington-s-maxims-finance>

... Scroll down to page 125, and start reading near the bottom of the page, carried over into page 126. Here is what George Washington really said in his *Maxims*:

“Speculations In The Currency:

“This tribe of black gentry work more effectively against us, than the enemy’s arms. They are a hundred times more dangerous to our liberties, and the great cause we are engaged in.”

“It is much to be lamented, that each State, long ere this, has not hunted them down, as pests to society, and the greatest enemies we have to the happiness of

America. I would to God, that some one of the most atrocious in each State, was hung upon a gallows, five times as high as the one prepared by Haman. who can build his greatness upon his country's ruin." [Note reference to the Persian Haman.]

It all boils down to what Washington meant by "black gentry". I believe he meant "evil moneyed aristocracy (upper class jews)." As negroes were penniless indentured slaves, "black" can't apply to them, nor can it apply to Whites. Actually, the expression "black gentry" is an oxymoron. Inasmuch as "black" can mean "wicked or evil", and gentry "people of good birth or breeding", it would be like saying "evil-good". Evidently, Washington was using the expression "black gentry" to identify an evil tribe of people. When Washington stated: "... I would to God, that some one of the most atrocious in each State, was hung upon a gallows, five times as high as the one prepared by Haman", he was vindicating Haman for his desire to kill all of the jews in Persia, as told in the Esther novel! Therefore, jews such as those in the Esther novel are Washington's "black gentry"! As we see, Washington was quite dismayed over this outrage!

Here is what Thomas Jefferson is documented to have said along the same topic:

"I believe that banking institutions are more dangerous to our liberties than standing armies. Already they have raised up a moneyed aristocracy that has set the government at defiance. The issuing power should be taken from the banks and restored to the people, to whom it properly belongs." (Thomas Jefferson (1743– 1826), U.S. president. Letter, May 28, 1816, to political philosopher and senator John Taylor, whose book *An Inquiry into the Principles and Policy of the Government of the United States* (1814) had argued against the harmful effects of finance capitalism.)

Here it is quite evident that George Washington's use of the expression "black gentry" is equivalent to Thomas Jefferson's "moneyed aristocracy", and both Washington and Jefferson declare them to be more dangerous than "the enemy's arms" or "standing armies"! Washington also said in his *Maxims*:

"My first wish is, to see this plague of mankind banished from the earth, and the sons and daughters of this world employed in more pleasing and innocent amusements, than in preparing implements, and exercising them, for the destruction of mankind." (On war, in a statement of 1785, as quoted in *Maxims of Washington: Political, Social, Moral and Religious* (1854) John Frederick Schroeder, p. 142.).

Crime Wave By The "Moneyed Aristocracy", or "Black Gentry" Upon England, and Then America:

From www.eidolonspeak.com/?p=246

"Modern Monetary Madness And King George III.

"Are we doomed to the whims of central banks and oblivion spending governments? Another look at history may shed some insights.

"Early American colonists fought a war of independence against the British economic tyranny espoused by King George III, his Parliament, and the Bank of England (hereinafter BoE).

"The BoE, a "private" institution established in 1694, was set up to supply money to rebuild the British Navy after the battle of Beachy Head, as the Crown and its Parliament had run dry of public funds. Incorporated into the BoE Royal Charter from the start, the bank assumed special privileges for converting a portion of the sovereign

debt into shares of The Governor and Company of the BoE,' including the issuance of £1.2M in BoE banknotes with only a fraction backed by gold. Such fractional reserve banking, easy payday loans had become all the rage in Amsterdam and Stockholm, financing brisk economic activity on the European continent and beyond – and the British figured that they too could help drive their own revolution in financing public credit and tradable government debt: facilitating the swap of short-term debt (unfunded deficits) with long-term debt (funded or tax revenue-secured loans) [1], and inventing a central bank with monopoly powers to dominate and propel that market. The leap of faith was to believe that such long-term debt would retain stable value, given the ever-growing deficits and national debts that exceeded tax revenues and gold reserves. Within two years, as bank gold reserves shrunk to less than 5% of outstanding banknotes, there was a run on the BoE, with investors demanding gold specie payments for their banknotes. The BoE had sustained its first insolvency, but with sovereign backing, had power to suspend redemption of banknotes until the bank was recapitalized by an injection of gold from shareholders [2,3]. A resumption of specie payments and fractional reserve banknote issuance continued with the BoE's charter extension in 1697.

“Charter renewals for the BoE over the next century were motivated by the need for increased fiscal and wartime financing following spikes in sovereign deficits, and with each renewal, the value of the BoE's monopoly franchise as a banking enterprise increased [1-4]. In 1697, the BoE garnered partial monopoly central banking and government-backed note-issuance status, and its shares were declared personal property not subject to profit taxation. In 1708 the BoE provided new funding to the sovereign, in part to bankroll the War of Spanish Succession, in exchange for monopoly of joint-stock banking and joint-stock note issuance. In 1742 the BoE provided an interest-free loan to the sovereign in the wake of the War of the Austrian Succession, in exchange for its monopoly on paper currency, or the issuance of circulating non-interest bearing promissory notes. Such cheap loans continued in exchange for reaffirmation of monopoly banking charter extensions in 1764 and 1781, to cover deficits from the Seven Years' War and the American Revolutionary War”

We will now examine the incident where the governor of New Amsterdam, Peter Stuyvesant, attempted to prevent the Edomite-jews from entering his Dutch settlement. The Edomite-jews haven't as yet declared it to be a forgery, but they sure as hell have twisted the event entirely out-of-shape! We will pick up the story in *Heritage, Civilization and the Jews*, by Abba Eban, p. 264, (which was also made into an extended so-called “miniseries” for television).

“... Since 1647 the director-general of the New Amsterdam colony had been Peter Stuyvesant (c. 1610-1672). Autocratic and intolerant, Stuyvesant was so disliked by the New Netherland colonists that, when the British fleet arrived in 1664, they chose to surrender to English rule rather than rally round the director-general and the West India Company that he represented. Stuyvesant, who had lost his leg in battle with the Portuguese papists in the Caribbean, had brooked no dissenters in his colony, and he was certainly not about to extend any welcome to the Jews, who had arrived short of funds, unable even to pay the captain of the *Saint Catherine* for their passage. On

September 22, 1654, Stuyvesant wrote to his superiors in Amsterdam, asking them to allow him to expel the Jews.

“The Jews who have arrived would nearly all like to remain here, but learning that they (with their customary usury and deceitful trading with the Christians) were very repugnant to the inferior magistrates, as also to the people having the most affection for you; the Deaconry also fearing that owing to their present indigence they might become a charge in the coming winter, we have, for the benefit of this weak newly developing place and land in general, deemed it useful to require them in a friendly way to depart; praying also most seriously in this connection, for ourselves also for the general community of your worships, that the deceitful race – such hateful enemies and blasphemers of the name of Christ – not be allowed further to infect and trouble this new colony [to the detraction of your worships and the dissatisfaction of your worships’ most affectionate subjects]’. [Note, Eban neglected to quote all of Stuyvesant’s letter.]

“The grudging reply to this vicious communication from Stuyvesant came in a letter dated April 26, 1655, after the Jews of Amsterdam had addressed their own petition to the company on behalf of their brethren in the New World:

“We would have liked to effectuate and fulfill your wishes and request that the new territories should no more be allowed to be infected by people of the Jewish nation, for we foresee therefrom the same difficulties which you fear, but after having further weighed and considered the matter, we observe that this would be somewhat unreasonable and unfair, especially because of the considerable loss sustained by this nation, with others, in the taking of Brazil, as also because of the large amount of capital which they still have invested in the shares of this company. Therefore after many deliberations we have finally decided [and resolved to apostille (annotate) upon a certain petition presented by said Portuguese Jews] that these people may travel and trade to and in New Netherland and live and remain there, provided the poor among them shall not become a burden to the company or to the community, but be supported by their own nation. You will now govern yourself accordingly.’” [Again, Eban neglected to quote all of the West India Company’s reply.]

From www.pbs.org/wnet/heritage

“Stuyvesant replied that Jewish settlers should not be granted the same liberties enjoyed by Jews in Holland, lest members of other persecuted minority groups, such as Roman Catholics, be attracted to the colony. Dutch West India Company officials, sharing his fears, responded with the following ruling.

“The consent given to the Jews to go to New Netherland and there to enjoy the same liberty that is granted them in this country was extended with respect to civil and political liberties, without the said Jews becoming thereby entitled to a license to exercise and carry on their religion in synagogues or gatherings.’

“A year later, Stuyvesant sent the following wry report to the company on his compliance with the company’s policies.

“June 10, 1656 – Considering the Jewish nation with regard to trade, they are not hindered, but trade with the same privilege and freedom as other inhabitants. Also, they have many times requested of us the free and public exercise of their abominable religion, but this cannot yet be accorded to them. What they may be able to obtain from your Honors time will tell.”

From www.thebirdman.org – “RESPONSE (1) – What is so surprising about this quote, if true? The religious bigotry of the Old World was exactly the sort of thing that the new nation of America – the New World was founded (after Peter Stuyvesant) to rid itself of.

“RESPONSE (2) – Concerning Peter Stuyvesant, a Dutchman, he was a person that reflected the bigoted attitudes of his time. He was a rabid anti-Semite that caused great suffering to the Jews. In 1654 the Portugese recaptured Holland’s Brazilian colony and a group of 23 Jewish refugees sought asylum in New Amsterdam (to become New York) where Stuyvesant was the governor. Stuyvesant wanted them expelled because he thought of them as Christ-killers and thieves but was stopped doing so by the Dutch West Indies Company because it had a number of Jewish shareholders and that company was vital to the health of the colony. [*Hurrah for Stuyvesant!*]

“However, even though the Jews gained a temporary reprieve, the company thought Stuyvesant’s original wish desirable in any case and it was required that the refugees ‘not become a burden to the company or to the community’. [*Hurrah for Stuyvesant!*]

“Stuyvesant adopted a strategy of making life for the Jews so miserable that they might leave of their own accord anyway. He issued edicts prohibiting Jews from owning property, employing Christians, travelling without property, praying in public or joining Citizen’s guards. [*Hurrah for Stuyvesant!*]

“The arrogance of Stuyvesant is expressed in what he said to some Long Island citizens that wanted a part in government: ‘We derive our authority from God and the West India Company, not from the pleasure of a few ignorant subjects’. Presumably this [*is*] exactly the type of leader the ignorant anti-Semites that post this material would want. – David S. Maddison”

I would like to conclude this paper with one last morsel of what I believe to be blasphemy on the part of the multi-racial-jews! Abba Eban in his *Heritage, Civilization and the Jews*, page 268, compares the supposed words of an Edomite-jew by the name of Moses Seixas to something Washington was to have agreed with at Newport, Rhode Island nine years after the war’s end.

Moses Seixas was to have said orally in part: “... behold a Government erected by the majesty of the people, a Government which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance ...”

Washington was to have replied orally in part, “For happily the government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance ...” Question: Whose words are these, Seixas’ or Washington’s? Yet, Yahweh Himself is a racial bigot!

Inasmuch as both Seixas and Washington were said to have spoken orally, this is strictly hearsay evidence! Eban stated, “... Seixas went on to say ...” Had there been any written record with witnesses, we can be damn sure that Eban would have written such evidence with emphases! If “Seixas went on to say”, he surely didn’t “went on to write”, did he? Or could it be just another Anne Frank ball-point pen novel?