

WOLVES DECLARE THEIR SHEEP-KILLING PLANS "FORGERIES", #2

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 the first paper by this title, we investigated the wolves' false claim that the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, published in Henry Ford's *The International Jew* were all forgeries. The Kenite-Canaanite-Edomite-jews have a habit of proclaiming all evidence exposing their evil machinations to be fraudulent. I will be citing several cases in point where they cry "forgery", while still having bloody sheep's wool between their teeth! With this essay, I will cite some damning evidence by Benjamin Franklin, for which the wolves haven't, as of yet, bemoaned foul-play.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN ON "BLACKS"

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 a paragraph from page 70:

"In these long years as agent, Benjamin Franklin openly valued the status of the North American colonies *within* the British Empire and the flow of English constitutional history more than did many of his fellow Americans. An Anglophile, he was clearly a reluctant revolutionary. But never did he doubt that, in some sense, America was one country and England another. 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 ...?' Franklin was a conventional xenophobe, made all the stronger in his cultural identity by the pleasure he took from life in England and from a large circle of English friends. Soon he became the American member of the British intellectual establishment – 'Dr.' Franklin, thanks to a 1759 honorary doctor of laws degree from St. Andrews University. For many years the agent from Pennsylvania had promoted the conception of an internally independent, almost self-governing America within a British Empire – bound together by loyalty to a king and a common history, and by statutory limitation and division of powers. Yet at some point late in the 1760's, Franklin began to doubt that either reason or a common heritage and blood would in the end solve the political problems of British America. To the attention of his countrymen he offered an old Italian proverb: 'Make yourselves sheep and the wolves will eat you'."

From this vital evidence concerning Franklin, we can unequivocally comprehend that he didn't want any negros in America, slave or free! Not only that, but he didn't desire any "tawnys".

From the 1996 *Webster's New Universal Unabridged Dictionary* we read:

“tawny (tô-ne) *adj.* **-ni-er, ni-est** *n.* –*adj.* **1.** of a dark yellowish-brown color. –*n.* **2.** a shade of brown tinged with yellow; dull yellowish brown. [1350-1400; ME <AF *taune* <MF *tané* ptp. of *taner* to ΤΑΝ] –**taw’ni-ly**, *adv.* –**taw’ni-ness**, *n.*”

From www.stormfront.org/forum/t172395/

“‘The Number of purely white People in the World is proportionably very small. All Africa is black or tawny. Asia chiefly tawny.’ Then Franklin speaks of people who ‘... are generally of what we call a swarthy Complexion ...’ followed by ‘... excluding all blacks and tawnys, of increasing the lovely white and red ...’ meaning White people with rosy cheeks. And further saying, ‘... I could wish their Numbers were increased’ ... Benjamin Franklin. *Papers of Franklin*, reprinted in *White Over Black*, Winthrop D. Jordan (University of North Carolina Press) 1968, p. 254.”

[If you haven’t yet surmised it, the Kenite-Canaanite-Edomite-jews are included among the “tawnys”.]

“Why increase the sons of Africa, by planting them in America, where we have so fair an opportunity, by excluding all blacks and tawnys, of increasing the lovely white and red? But perhaps I am partial to the complexion of my country, for such kind of partiality is natural to mankind.” – Benjamin Franklin, 1753, *Observations Concerning the Increase of Mankind*, reprinted in *A New Dictionary of Quotations*, ed. H.L. Mencken (New York: Alfred A. Knopf) 1942, p. 842.

The 1996 *Webster's New Universal Unabridged Dictionary* on “Anglophile”:

“Anglo-phile (ang’gle fil’, -fil), *n.* a person who is friendly to or admires England or English customs, institutions, etc. Also, **Anglo-phil** (ang’gle fil). [1865-70; ANGLLO + PHILE] – **An’glo-phil-ism**. *n.*”

The important thing to grasp here is the mind-set of Benjamin Franklin. Today he would be considered politically incorrect! Yet, he is the man who originally wrote the first draft of our United States Constitution! From the *Cyclopædia of Universal History* by John Clark Ridpath, vol. 3, p, 926 we read:

“ ... No such venerable and dignified body of men had ever before assembled on the American continent. There were Hutchinson of Massachusetts, Hopkins of Road Island, Franklin of Pennsylvania, and others scarcely less distinguished ... The convention next took up the important question of uniting the colonies in a common government. On the 10th of July, [1754] Benjamin Franklin laid before the commissioners the draft of a federal constitution. His vast comprehensive mind had realized the true condition and wants of the country; the critical situation of the colonies demanded a central government. How else could revenues be raised, an army be organized, and the common welfare be provided for? ...”

Out of the mind of this “Anglophile”, Benjamin Franklin, came the first draft for a federal constitution. Therefore, we don’t have to guess what the intents of our founding fathers were! Had we lived up to the provisions of the final draft of the United States Constitution, we would not be in the turmoil we are experiencing today economically, politically, religiously, and more importantly, racially!

Today the provisions of our U.S. Constitution are being corrupted beyond measure by falsely interpreting the Preamble, where the “who” is identified as “to ourselves and our Posterity” This is paramount, as there were twenty-five men who

signed the Constitution of the United States, and all twenty-five were White, Caucasian, European-Americans! Therefore, the entire United States Constitution hangs on the phrase “to ourselves and our Posterity”, and I am sure that I need not explain the term “posterity”, meaning (“1. Future generations taken collectively. 2. All of one’s descendants ...”, 1968 *The Reader’s Digest Great Encyclopedic Dictionary*) Ibid. The term “race”: “... 3. A nation; the German *race*. 4. A genealogical or family stock; clan: the *race* of MacGregor. 5. Pedigree; lineage: a noble *race*”

Secondly, **NO** Federal, State, County, City, Township, or Institution therein has the authority to infringe upon our First Amendment Rights, especially where it states: “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof” If the Congress is not allowed to do this, neither is any other man or institution.

Now some might argue that the 13th & 15th Amendments give the authority to enforce racial integration, but I would point out to you that these are void *ab initio* without a constitutional covenant to strike out the phrase “to ourselves and our Posterity ...” in the Preamble. Until the phrase “to ourselves and our Posterity ...” is struck out of the Preamble, any court decision to the contrary is null and void.

As one can clearly see, our forefathers who wrote the United States Constitution were exclusively racially oriented, and they were much wiser than I, and studied the same Scripture that I study, and their conclusions on race as the United States Constitution reveals is the same as mine. Charles Thomson, the Secretary of the Continental Congress of the United States of America, 1774-1789, translated the Greek Septuagint into English, of which I have a copy in my library! Therefore, to outlaw the Bible in any institution within the United States is contrary to our Preamble, written by our White, Caucasian European-American forefathers.

As recorded in the diary of Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, delegate from South Carolina: A Warning Issued by Franklin at the Constitutional Convention, 1787 Philadelphia. The wolves claim that what Franklin is alleged to have said about the Jews is a forgery! Yet we know for a fact that Franklin stated, “... 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 ...?” While the evidence of Charles Cotesworth Pinckney can no longer be found, the following alleged statement is not out-of-context, and Franklin might very well have said it:

“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. In whatever country Jews have settled in any great number, they have lowered its moral tone, depreciated its commercial integrity, have segregated themselves and have not been assimilated, have sneered at and tried to undermine the Christian religion upon which that nation was founded by objecting to its restrictions, have built up a state within a state, and when opposed have tried to strangle that country to death financially, as in the case of Spain and Portugal. For over 1,700 years, the Jews have been bewailing their sad fate in that they have been exiled from their homeland, as they call Palestine. But Gentlemen, did the world give it to them in fee simple, they would at once find some reason for not returning. Why? Because they are vampires, and vampires do not live on

vampires. They cannot live only amongst themselves. They must subsist on Christians and other people not of their race. If you do not exclude them from these United States in the Constitution, in less than 200 years they will have swarmed here in such great numbers that they will dominate and devour the land, and change our form of government, for which we Americans have shed our blood, given our lives, our substance, and jeopardized our liberty. If you do not exclude them, in less than 200 years our descendants will be working in the fields to furnish them substance, while they will be in the counting houses rubbing their hands. I warn you, gentlemen, if you do not exclude the Jews for all time, your children will curse you in your graves. Jews, gentlemen, are Asiatics, let them be born where they will or how many generations they are away from Asia, they will never be otherwise. Their ideas do not conform to an American's, and will not even though they live among us ten generations. A leopard cannot change its spots. Jews are Asiatics, are a menace to this country if permitted entrance, and should be excluded by this Constitutional Convention."

Here again the wolves are crying "forgery" while having bloody sheep's wool between their teeth! Even if Franklin didn't state the above, every word is applicable to the descendants of Cain. Even if the above is a forgery, it all came true, and our forefathers did exclude everyone who were **not** White, Caucasian European-Americans, by stating in the Preamble, "to ourselves and our Posterity". The bottom line is: both our Constitution and Bible are racially exclusive in every respect! What are the chances, then, that Charles Cotesworth Pinckney had, at one time, an entry of Benjamin Franklin's statement above recorded in his diary? From the 1980 edition of *Collier's Encyclopedia*, vol. 19, p. 51, we learn the following about Pinckney:

"PINCKNEY, CHARLES COTESWORTH: (1746-1825), American statesman and twice Federalist candidate for president. Born in Charleston, S.C., on Feb. 25, 1746, he was the son of Charles and Eliza (Lucas) Pinckney. The young Pinckney was educated in England at the Westminster School, Christ Church College, Oxford, and the Middle Temple where he studied law. He also studied military science at the royal academy in Caen, France. In 1769 Pinckney returned to Charleston where he was admitted to the bar and set up an immediately successful law practice. He was also elected a member of the provincial assembly.

"In 1775, with the outbreak of the Revolution, Pinckney became a member of South Carolina's first provincial congress, entered the militia as a captain, and rose to the rank of colonel. In 1778 he won a seat in the lower house of the South Carolina legislature and in the following year was elected to the state senate and was chosen its president. Captured by the British in the fall of Charleston in 1780, Pinckney was kept prisoner until exchanged in 1782. He rejoined the Continental army and in November of the following year, just before receiving his discharge, was commissioned a brigadier general.

"After independence, Pinckney returned to his law practice and to politics, and attended the Constitutional Convention of 1787 as an influential representative from South Carolina. In the state convention held in 1788, he helped secure South Carolina's ratification of the Constitution. Pres. George Washington offered him several high posts, among them the secretaryships of state and war, which he declined. In 1796, however, he accepted the appointment of minister to France"

With a man of such extensive training, education and responsibility, it is apparent that Pinckney would take many notes of all the proposals made by the various delegates. No doubt, by the end of his life, his hand-written notes and records from all his many legal activities would have required much space to store all that he had accumulated. Considering the nature of the alleged Franklin statement, it is reasonable it would have been kept separate in his personal diary. Over a period of time, records like these are misplaced, thrown away, or accidentally destroyed. But members of the family will remember some of the more outstanding records, and repeat them by word-of-mouth for many generations. Of course, there is always the remote possibility that Pinckney's diary will reappear.

But this is not the end of our investigation. At this juncture, I decided to research to see if Franklin had any personal dealings with an Edomite-jew, and I found that he did, in the 1894, 9th edition of *The Encyclopedia Britannica*, vol. 9, p. 626-627 states, "... a Jew printer named Keimer." I next did a search on the Internet, and typed in "Benjamin Franklin, Jew printer Keimer", whereupon several sites popped up. Funny thing: *Britannica* admitted Keimer was a Jew, but not a single website so much as hinted that fact. After this, I decided to check out the 11th edition of *The Encyclopedia Britannica*, vol. 11, p. 24, and found that the 11th edition omitted the term "Jew", but after the name Samuel Keimer there was given a footnote. First, I will quote the passage and follow with the footnote:

"... But Benjamin's management of [his brother's] paper, and particularly his free-thinking, displeased the authorities; the relations of the two brothers gradually grew unfriendly, possibly, as Benjamin thought, because of his brother's jealousy of his superior ability; and Benjamin determined to quit his brother's employ and to leave New England. He made his way first to New York City, and then (October 1723) to Philadelphia, where he got employment with a printer named Samuel Keimer.¹"

Footnote: [¹ Keimer and his sister had come the year before from London, where he had learned his trade; both were ardent members of the fanatic band of 'French prophets.' He proposed founding a new sect with the help of Franklin, who after leaving his shop ridiculed him for his long square beard and for keeping the seventh day. Keimer settled in the Barbadoes about 1730; and in 1731 began to publish at Bridgetown the semi-weekly *Barbadoes Gazette*. Selections from it called *Caribbean* (1741) and *A Brand Plucked from the Burning, Exemplified in the Unparalleled Case of Samuel Keimer* (1718) are from his pen. He [Keimer] died about 1738.]

If there was a question in one's mind whether or not Samuel Keimer was an Edomite-jew, that question should now be resolved! The fact that Samuel Keimer was an Edomite-jew reveals how the jews try to cover their tracks, causing all of their nefarious influence to be erased from history in elementary, high-school, colleges, and the public at large. Evidence like this accounts for a lot of subterfuge.

Here was Benjamin Franklin working for an Edomite-jewish printer. It is apparent that Benjamin was setting type for jewish periodicals, brochures, and maybe even books. This would allow Benjamin to gain a lot knowledge of what was going on in jewish circles. No doubt, this gave Ben a lot of insight into jewish history. Benjamin was a genius, and when he read something, he would not forget it. Eventually, Benjamin's increased activities required much travel. His several crossings of the Atlantic, and his

diplomatic assignments in Europe, allowed him to understand the political, monetary and religious climates there. His widely circulated *Poor Richard's Almanack*, alone kept him informed of the political, monetary and religious climates throughout the thirteen colonies. We can be quite sure he had firsthand knowledge of many Jewish activities! The bottom line is: Franklin had every reason to say what Pinckney allegedly recorded him as saying!

From www.librarycompany.org/BFWriter/entre.htm

"The Printer as Entrepreneur

"Every step of Benjamin Franklin's way to wealth as printer in Philadelphia was taken at the expense of one or the other of his two great rivals, first his employer Samuel Keimer, whose business he undermined and then supplanted, and then Andrew Bradford, a far more formidable rival, who had been the only printer in Pennsylvania, before Keimer's arrival. Bradford and his father William in New York together had enjoyed a monopoly on all the offices and functions necessary for success as a colonial printer: newspaper and almanac publisher, postmaster, government printer, job printer, stationer, wholesale paper merchant, book publisher, retail and wholesale bookseller. One after another of these monopolies Franklin either broke or usurped, but in every instance, he expanded or improved upon what the Bradfords had done, and made all these parts work together in a dynamic business system. He became the most purely entrepreneurial of all colonial printers."

Benjamin Franklin, *Autobiography [his own typesetting]*:

"Keimer's Credit and Business declining daily, he was at last forc'd to sell his Printing-House There remain'd now no Competitor with me at Philadelphia, but the old one, Bradford, who was rich and easy, did a little Printing now and then by straggling Hands, but was not very anxious about the Business. However, as he kept the Post Office, it was imagin'd he had better Opportunities of obtaining News, his Paper was thought a better Distributer of Advertisements than mine, and therefore had many more, which was a profitable thing to him and a Disadvantage to me ... In 1737 the Postmaster General, being dissatisfied [with Bradford] respecting some Negligence in rendering, and Inexactitude of his Accounts, took from him the Commission and offer'd it to me. I accepted it readily ... for tho' the Salary was small, it facilitated the Correspondence that improv'd my Newspaper, increas'd the Number demanded, as well as the Advertisements to be inserted, so that it came to afford me a very considerable Income. My old Competitor's Newspaper declin'd proportionably. B. Franklin, Printer"

Since we know for sure that Benjamin spoke of excluding all blacks and tawnys, he may also have said what was allegedly found written in Pinckney's diary. It is now the reader's responsibility to evaluate all of this!