



June 2013

As It Was in the Days of Noah

Dear Friend of Radio Liberty,

“The foremost of the laws Nature decrees to me is to enjoy myself – no matter at whose expense.” Marquis de Sade

“The custom has been to call 'philosophers' those who attack revealed religion, and 'persecutors' those who battle for its defense.”

Guillaume Francois Bethier, 18th Century Jesuit Scholar

According to Rabbinical tradition, as recorded in the apocryphal Book of Jasher (1), Sodom and the other Cities of the Plain were not only cesspools of depravity, but also dismal, heartless communities overrun by violence and cankered with official corruption. The persons and property of innocent people were considered fair game for those who received the favor of the ruling class – and the rule of law was all but nonexistent.

It was customary in Sodom, according to Jewish tradition, for street gangs to prey upon travelers, and for civic officials to punish those who provided relief to the poor and hungry. (2) In the Midrash on the Genesis account found in the Book of Jasher, Eliezer, Abram’s servant who had been sent to find Lot, came upon a man who was being beaten and robbed, and who cried out for help. When Eliezer rebuked the people responsible for that crime, the gang leader replied by accusing him of being judgmental:

“Is this man thy brother, or have the people of Sodom made thee a judge this day, that thou speakest about this man?”

As Eliezer was talking with the head hoodlum, another one snuck up on Eliezer and hit him in the head with a rock. As the victim reeled from the attack, the assailant wiped away a small amount of the blood that flowed copiously from the wound – and then

demanded payment for rendering medical aid, **“for such is the custom and the law in our land.”** (3)

When Eliezer refused to pay, he was dragged before a judge named Shakra, who insisted that what had been done to him was legal and ordered him to pay. To his great credit, Eliezer refused to play along with the legal charade: **“If this then is the custom in your land give thou unto this man what I should have given him, for this has been thy decision, thou didst decree it.”** (4)

Once again, this is taken from an apocryphal account, not from the scriptural record, so while it could be considered a useful historical commentary, it’s not necessarily Gospel truth. But Eliezer’s experience has a contemporary flavor, and an eerie resonance. The amalgam of sexual depravity, official corruption, and casual violence that characterized Sodom has been recreated in post-Christian, post-constitutional America.

Echoes of Eliezer’s semi-mythical experience in Sodom could be detected in a recent episode in Seattle involving the attack on a street preacher by lesbian activists. After the “Gay Pride” marchers – loudly accusing the victim of being a hate criminal — grabbed the preacher’s signs, a spectator with a lengthy record of violent crimes jumped in and assaulted the man. There’s no evidence that the lead assailant was a homosexual activist; he was simply a man inclined toward violence against the innocent who reacted opportunistically when members of a specially protected class attacked a helpless and outnumbered victim. This is increasingly “the custom and the law of the land” in modern America. (5)

Shakra, the Sodomite judge who ruled that Eliezer owed money to the man who had attacked him, was practicing a variety of spurious jurisprudence that would have put him in good stead with contemporary American judges. The Obamacare ruling issued by U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice John Roberts would certainly have met with Shakra’s approval. The same is true of the recent 5-4 Supreme Court ruling striking down the Defense of Marriage Act, a federal measure signed by Bill Clinton in 1996 that prohibited states from recognizing so-called same-sex marriages.

From his position occupying what we might call the Shakra memorial seat on the Supreme Court, Justice Anthony Kennedy described the Defense of Marriage Act – which, whatever one thinks of its constitutionality, expressed the unexceptionable view that marriage is a covenantal relationship between a man and a woman — as an assault on fundamental human rights. In a characteristically unflinching dissent, Justice Antonin Scalia pointed out that traditional marriage is an institution that “had been unquestioned

in virtually all societies for virtually all of human history” and said that Justice Kennedy’s majority opinion had judged those who oppose the novel institution called “same-sex marriage” as “enemies of the human race.” (6)

It’s important to recognize that the Defense of Marriage Act – which was signed into law by that paladin of martial fidelity Bill Clinton – improperly federalized a matter that was reserved to the states under the Constitution. This is because the DOMA was *designed* to fail: Creating a patently unconstitutional national marriage policy meant that there would be an inevitable legal challenge and a Supreme Court ruling that would lead to the redefinition of an institution that was not created by government. And within hours of the Supreme Court’s DOMA ruling, Barack Obama ordered Attorney General Holder and other cabinet members to capitalize on that development by overhauling personnel regulations regarding marital and spousal benefits. Significantly, the most visible changes will come at the Pentagon: Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel has promised that he will “immediately” change the military’s policies regarding housing, education, and other benefits for same-sex couples. (7)

What all of this means, of course, is that the federal government – in alliance with the entertainment industry, the establishment media, and academia — will be using its formidable and growing power to impose an elemental change on the rest of American society. It bears repeating that the federal government has no legitimate role regarding marriage and family policy. Marriage, as the American Founders understood, was created before the State; it exists independent of the State, and does not require the State’s permission. It was the proto-totalitarian Jacobin revolution in France that redefined marriage as a civil institution, and families as a government-regulated social construct. Unfortunately, that evil doctrine (called “*parens patriae*,” or the fatherhood of the state) took root in the United States no longer than the early 19th century, and quickly flourished in both the legal system and what would become the government-run public education system.

As we read in the book of Genesis, and saw in the account above, human life was regarded as disposable in ancient Sodom. However, it’s difficult to believe that even Sodom was guilty of the kind of focused depravity and concentrated viciousness that has led to the destruction of more than 50 million pre-born children in the United States since the Supreme Court placed its imprimatur on child-killing in 1973.

Those who regard the accounts of Sodom’s evil to be implausible should consider the spectacle that erupted at the Texas State Legislature in Austin when newly minted feminist “superhero” Wendy Davis conducted a filibuster of what was described as an

extreme anti-abortion bill. Most news accounts of the episode retailed imagery of desperate women being driven into back alleys to abort unwanted children, and condemned proponents of the bill for supposedly exercising a proprietary claim on the lives of women. The Democratic State Senator herself was touted as the scourge of a heartless Patriarchy who boldly faced down would-be theocrats seeking to reverse decades of “progress” for women.

Lost in this tightly scripted melodrama were the details of the bill Davis was opposing. The Wall Street Journal – hardly a voice of the Religious Right — points out that the bill, which was widely described as the nation’s most radical anti-abortion measure, would have banned abortions after 20 weeks of pregnancy except in cases of severe fetal abnormalities or the need to protect the life or health of the mother, an exception that could permit a woman to procure an abortion to end any pregnancy she found psychologically burdensome. It would also impose regulations on abortion clinics that would be intended to prevent abuses like those found in the unlicensed abortion facility run by convicted murderer Kermit Gosnell in Philadelphia.

That bill—which would not have recognized the right to life of the developing child — was actually designed to be compatible with both the Roe decision and what we’re told is the public consensus regarding abortion. What “Feminist Superhero” Wendy Davis was defending, in essence, was the supposed right to commit undisguised infanticide. This might help explain the unfettered hostility of the “pro-choice” activists who confronted pro-life advocates in Texas following Davis’s filibuster: As pro-lifers sang “Amazing Grace,” their antagonists attempted to drown them out by chanting “Hail Satan!” This revolting display prompted an official protest from the Church of Satan, which apparently didn’t want to endure the disrepute of being associated with unabashed supporters of child-killing. (8)

Satanists attempted to shout down pro-lifers in Texas. The IRS has been doing much the same thing. For two years prior to the 2012 election, the leaders of a non-profit group called Pro-Life Revolution tried to obtain tax-exempt status. During one March 2012 conversation with IRS agent Sherry Wan, the pro-life group’s president, Anita Joseph, was told that the group would have to be “neutral” on its defining issue in order to qualify for a tax exemption.

During the covertly recorded conversation, which has been made public by the legal advocacy group Alliance Defending Freedom, Wan told Joseph that the group would “have to know your boundaries and that it could not invoke religious belief in opposition to abortion.” Referring to the group’s outreach efforts against abortion, Wan insisted: “I

don't believe you need the right to do this." ADF attorney Erik Stanley describes the IRS official's actions as unconstitutional, pointing out that the agency "is a tax collector; it shouldn't be allowed to be the speech and belief police." (9)

Even casual students of the Bible are aware that Sodom and Gomorrah are notorious as havens for homosexuality and other forms of sexual derangement and depravity. (10) However, relatively little attention is paid to the explicit definition of the "sin of Sodom" as pride, indolence, materialism, and indifference to the weak, poor, and vulnerable. (11) The epistle to the Romans describes how the worship of the "creature rather than the Creator" conduces to the kind of depravity for which the cities of the plain were notorious. (12) There is a sense in which the contemporary "Gay Rights" movement – which, it is important to understand, is a controlled collectivist movement deployed on behalf of those seeking to build the Total State – is an opportunistic infection in a society that has become obsessively materialistic and focused on the worship of the creature, and the acquisition of creature comforts.

Since its creation by the ancient tyrant Nimrod, the State has been an idol, and politics has been a ritual in which people are encouraged to pretend that the state has the moral authority to enrich some people at the expense of others. The modern totalitarian state is a particularly jealous false god, ruthlessly subverting and destroying every institution and social covenant that commands loyalty that is not subject to political control. The most ancient enemy of the State, as G.K. Chesterton observed, is the family. This is why adherents of the religion of satanism work tirelessly to undermine and destroy the family.

Tragically, too many State-focused conservatives have been willing to fight their battles on terms favorable to the enemy, rather than rejecting Nimrod's idol and all of its works and pomps.

I believe William Grigg is correct. When the United States was established, it was a Christian nation, but the United States is not a Christian nation today. What happened? A small group of evil men (the Brotherhood of Darkness) purchased the major media, took control of the U.S. Supreme Court, centralized power in Washington, D.C., infiltrated Christianity, bought the major banks, established the major corporations, and convinced the American people the United States is a Democracy.

What is the Brotherhood of Darkness? It is a loosely knit subversive organization that is using the financial and military power of the United States to establish a world government, a world financial system, a world religion, and destroy Christianity.

How can we counter them? We must continue our effort to educate the American people. How did the BOD seize control of the U.S. Supreme Court?

President Roosevelt was a 32nd degree Freemason, and Masons worship a different god. President Roosevelt appointed 6 Freemasons to the U.S. Supreme Court.

President Truman was a 33rd degree Freemason. He appointed 4 Freemasons to the U.S. Supreme Court.

President Eisenhower wasn't a Freemason, but he was a member of a subversive organization that was created (in part) by Freemasons. He was a member of the CFR, and he appointed 2 Freemasons to the U.S. Supreme Court.

What was the result? The Freemasons controlled the U.S. Supreme Court from 1941 to 1969 with majorities of 5-4 to 6-3, and during that period they removed God and prayer from public schools and public institutions. What happened? The U.S. Supreme Court decisions undermined the moral foundation of our nation, and led to the tragic situation that exists today.

If that is true, why hasn't someone told the American people? The BOD controls the media, and they suppressed the information.

Thurgood Marshall was the last Freemason on the U.S. Supreme Court, but the BOD selects the judges, and controls the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

What can you do? Access your Search Engine, and type in "Masons on U.S. Supreme Court." If you do, you will discover my information is correct. What can you do? You can give your friends and neighbors a copy of this letter, and ask them to read it.

The situation in the Middle East is deteriorating. Almost 100,000 civilians have been killed in Syria, and if the U.S.-backed terrorists win the civil war, they (the terrorists) will attack Israel.

A similar situation exists in Egypt. Why did the U.S. initially back the Muslim Brotherhood's candidate in that country?

I believe God is going to punish the United States because the U.S. is funding the effort to destroy Christianity.

I am going to close this letter by quoting the third president of the United States. His words are inscribed on his monument in Washington, D.C., Thomas Jefferson wrote:

"God who gave us life gave us liberty. Can the liberties of a nation be secure when we have removed a conviction that these liberties are the gift of God? Indeed I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just, that his justice cannot sleep forever."

Barbara and I appreciate your loyal support and your faithful prayers.

Yours in Christ,

Stanley Monteith