



American Resistance Party

How long will you wear the chains of your Masters?

Contact: Edward C. Noonan
Tel: 530-777-3474
Email: ednoonan7@gmail.com
Email: americanresistanceparty@mail.com
<http://www.americanresistanceparty.org>

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
ACTION ALERT**

LORETTA LYNCH Violates Common Law & the Constitution

May 10, 2016 – **Statement of EDWARD C NOONAN, 2016 Presidential Candidate:**

Loretta Lynch the *de facto* Attorney General Loretta Lynch (serving under the illegal alien Soetoro - aka BHO) this week announced legal action on Monday, to force NC accept to [Soetoro's bathroom-bill-decree](#) which allows transgender-persons to use women's public bathrooms.

The [American Resistance Party](#) declares that this threat from the Justice Department is unconstitutional. It violates COMMON LAW that our Constitution demands:

U.S. Constitution - Amendment 7 - Trial by Jury in Civil Cases. Ratified 12/15/1791.

*In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, **than according to the rules of the common law.***

It is stipulated that parts of the common law, has been taken from various sources throughout history. It comes from merchant law, commercial law, civil law, Roman law, and even human reason. But English Common Law first commenced as “God’s Law” from the reign of **Richard the First, A. D. 1189**. 2 Bl. Com. 31.

And then a few years later, Common Law was solidified by the MAGNA CARTA in 1215. And then in 1297 at the Confirmation of Edward the Magna Carta was referred to by saying:

*“...shall allow the said charters in pleas before them and judgments in all their points; that is to say, the **Great Charter of Liberties as common law...**”*

And they continued by declaring COMMON LAW WAS TO BE RELIGIOUS LAW:

“III. And we will that the same charters shall be sent under our seal to cathedral churches throughout our realm, and there remain, and shall be read before the people twice in the year.

English Common Law, later became GOD’S LAW in America. The United States Supreme Court (1824) has ruled:

There is no dissonance in these declarations. There is a universal language pervading them all, having one meaning. They affirm and reaffirm that this is a religious nation. These are not individual sayings, declarations of private persons. They are organic utterances. They speak the voice of the entire people. While because of a general recognition of this truth the question has seldom been presented to the courts, yet we find that in **Udegraph v. Comm., 11 Serg. & R. 394, 400, it was decided that, "Christianity, general Christianity, is, and always has been, a part of the common law of Pennsylvania; * * * not Christianity with an established church and tithes and spiritual courts, but Christianity with liberty of conscience to all men."**

And in **People v. Ruggles, 8 Johns. 290, 294, 295**, Chancellor KENT, the great commentator on American law, speaking as chief justice of the supreme court of New York, said:

"The people of this state, in common with the people of this country, profess the general doctrines of Christianity as the rule of their faith and practice; and to scandalize the author of those doctrines in not only, in a religious point of view, extremely impious, but, even in respect to the obligations due to society, is a gross violation of decency and good order. * * * The free, equal, and undisturbed enjoyment of religious opinion, whatever it may be, and free and decent discussions on any religious [143 U.S. 457, 471] subject, is granted and secured; but to revile, with malicious and blasphemous contempt, the religion professed by almost the whole community is an abuse of that right. Nor are we bound by any expressions in the constitution, as some have strangely supposed, either not to punish at all, or to punish indiscriminately the like attacks upon the religion of Mahomet or of the Grand Lama; and for this plain reason that the case assumes that we are a Christian people, and the morality of the country is deeply ingrafted upon Christianity, and not upon the doctrines or worship of those impostors."

And in the famous case of **Vidal v. Girard's Ex'rs, 2 How. 127, 198**, this court, while sustaining the will of Mr. Girard, with its provisions for the creation of a college into which no minister should be permitted to enter, observed:

"it is also said, and truly, that the Christian religion is a part of the common law of Pennsylvania."
Holy Trinity Church vs. United States (1892)

It is clear that there Ms. Lynch seems to be ignorant as to what is "COMMON LAW" of America is. Our Founding Fathers knew that CHRISTIANITY was part of the law of the land from our early beginnings in England...

King v. Williams (1797), 26 Howell's State Trials 653, was the celebrated case of the indictment of the publisher of Paine's "Age of Reason" for blasphemy in publishing the work. It was tried before Lord KENYON. **He charged the jury that Christianity was part of the law of the land.** In the opinion of the Court, Mr. Justice ASHHURST, (p. 714,) said:

CHRISTIANITY AND THE COMMON LAW.

"All offences of the kind are not only offences to God, but crimes against the law of the land, and are punishable as such, inasmuch as they tend to destroy those obligations **whereby civil society is bound together; and it is upon this ground that the Christian religion constitutes part of the law of England."**

Sir JAMES MANSFIELD, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, observed in *Drury v. Defontaine (1808)*, i Taunt. 130, 135, that it was said by Lord COKE **that the Christian religion is part of the common law.** The citation from Coke in connection with this statement is 2 Inst. 220, where, in referring to a Saxon law of King Ethelstan, (the latter part of which is, *Die autem dominico nemo mercaturum facito ; id quod si quis egerit, et ipsa merce, et triginta praeterea solidis inulctatur;*) Lord COKE observes: "Here note by the way that no merchandising should be on the Lord's day."

In 1819, in *King v. Carlile*, 3 B. & Al. 161, on an information the same as the indictment in **King v. Williams, it was declared that, independent of statute, blasphemous libel was an offence at common law.**

The [American Resistance Party](#) declares that Ms. Lynch has no Common Law (God's Law) authority to rule that transgenderism is a Constitutional or "a right from God."

###

If you'd like more information about this topic, or to schedule an interview with Mr. Edward C. Noonan, Founder and National Committee Chairman: [American Resistance Party](#), please call 530-777-3474 or email at: ednoonan7@gmail.com Forward this email to 10 of your friends for a "free gift." (bcc us for proof of your referral.)

Permission to reprint in whole or in part is gladly granted, provided full credit is given.