

ÉDITIONS GALAAD

Infamy of the State

(Reality of unconstitutional acts practiced by the
French State in violation of its constitution).

(Revised and completed version – reissue of December 24, 2024)

Booklet 3: the illegal nature of Sunday laws.

**IMPORTANT:
Free book cannot be sold.**

Kenny Ronald MARGUERITE

Table of contents

° 1 – Presentation of the booklets.....	5
– 1. Good to know:	7
– 2. Contents of the booklets:.....	8
° Folder: the illegal nature of Sunday (Sunday) laws.....	9
° 2 – Historical and legislative reality of the unconstitutional character of the Sunday laws.....	10
° 3 – Reality of the unconstitutional nature of the Bailly report, an essential support governing the French Sunday laws.....	23
° 4 – Open Letter: Case to Repeal Catholic Sunday Law That Oppress Sabbath Observers and Shabbat Observers.....	41
° 5 – Of Suffering and Ink.....	46

Thanks to my fiancée Nicole

Thank you to my fiancée Nicole who co-wrote this book, which would never have seen the light of day without her.

I'm going to tell you about my fiancée Nicole, and to do this, I would tell you that she has collaborated on all my books, including this one, giving shape to my words and by magnifying my ideas without altering them.

It is she who gives meaning to my ideas and manages to faithfully transcribe my thought by giving it a lighter tone. Thank you for the help and support she gave me throughout the writing of this theme. She was able to give coherence to my ideas.

May God bless her!

ÉDITIONS GALAAD



(Of Feather and actions)

Culture is the lever allowing men to aspire to excellence.

Do not neglect it.

Copyright©2024 ÉDITIONS GALAAD
Californie 97232 Le LAMENTIN (MARTINIQUE)
<http://kenny-ronald-marguerite.com>

All rights of reproduction, adaptation and translation, in whole or in part, reserved for all countries The author is the sole owner of the rights and is responsible for the contents of this book.

GOOD TO KNOW:

This file could not be corrected by a professional proofreader and was written by a French speaker since the urgency of the situation required that it be published as soon as possible. In doing so, you will certainly find spelling, conjugation and grammatical errors, I apologize in advance.

1 Presentation of the booklets

To begin with, it is important to note that in order to change things, so that my rights are no longer violated by unconstitutional laws, I have taken legal action. My case is still ongoing. You will find in this book a compilation of the files that I have filed, supplemented by other important elements for the themes addressed.

This book is made up of two parts, the first is the legal file that I have set up in order to defend my rights and the second presents the research on realities linked to the abuses of Mr. MACRON's governments, having had to manage the health crisis, as well as other testimonies that I provide. Please note that as a result, given the different nature of these two writings, the legal parts, taken from the files of my case, will present as the subject **"Mr. MARGUERITE"** instead of the personal pronoun **"I"**, used for the other part.

Thus, this book presents legal bases, from legislative texts that will allow all those who, like me, have suffered discrimination and financial losses due to the existence of these two illegal laws, vaccinal against covid 19 and Sunday (dominical), to defend themselves.

Thus, this book is not simply intended to present a story, but is also a "legal sword" that should help all those who have suffered, or are still suffering, harm because of these laws that I incriminate, to defend themselves.

To present to you what I have experienced, I will give you a strong image that symbolizes what the Sunday (dominical) and vaccinal laws against covid 19 have made me endure, for years and are still making me endure:

To do this, I would tell you that my story, if I could not prove that it really existed, thanks to the evidence that I provide, could easily pass for a B-series soap opera in bad taste.

And yet! It is indeed my life and the unconstitutional laws, Sunday (dominical) laws and vaccinal laws against covid 19, have come to undermine all my efforts, for my social integration. In hindsight, my feeling is to have been on a greased pole.

At the top is success, social integration, professional and personal fulfillment. Unfortunately, this mast is greased with the most viscous liquids, which are the legislative texts, unconstitutional, which carry both the vaccinal laws against covid 19 and the Sunday (dominical) laws.

Starting from nothing, I fought to reach the top of the mast, by willpower and by the grace of God, and I was able to touch the rewards so much expected, but lo and behold, the perfidious grease of these insidious laws made me slip and I find myself again at the foot of the mast.

From then on, my condition is much worse than before because I have been soiled by this pernicious grease that are these unconstitutional laws, which have stained my clothing. This is exactly the image that comes to mind when I think of everything that has happened and which makes me dizzy. Incredible!

I ask that justice be done, because until now, neither the President of the Republic, nor the ministers concerned, nor the high authorities established on public finances have seen fit to put in place what I am asking for and which is none other than to live in dignity and no longer be kept in precariousness by laws and administrations, which have exceeded their rights and prerogatives.

I come to you, through this book, so that we do not regress and that my story is not this exception, which demonstrates that the blood of those who established our Nation, France, has not flowed in vain. My goal is that those who have suffered under the iniquitous yoke of the Sunday (dominical) and vaccinal laws against covid 19, can be compensated.

Thus, in view of what has been presented in this book, I ask that justice be done to me, as well as to all those who like me, have suffered, under the rule of the vaccinal laws against covid 19, which themselves are unfounded, because they contravene the "Declaration of Helsinki" and by extension European law.

The same goes for those who have suffered and are still suffering because of the Sunday (dominical) laws, which are nevertheless unconstitutional. I ask that we can be compensated for the losses and abuses suffered, but at what price!

Unfortunately, this compensation will never be able to provide an answer and compensate for the pain of the families of those who, under the pain, have killed themselves because of the loss of their jobs.

Thus, it is not only the covid 19 virus that kills, but also unfair and unfounded laws established in complete illegality that have led or are still leading some to the grave prematurely.

For my part, I am alive, but the tears shed for our constitution (French) have been in vain.

To continue, I would like to tell you that it is important for me that you understand that these situations that I have been confronted with, I did not want them because, before coming to defend my case before the courts, I believed in the integrity of the Secular Republic that is France. and for which courageous men and women shed their blood and gave their lives, as early as 1789, during the French Revolution.

This, just like for the maroon negroes (*Black Slaves Who Rebelled and Fought Against Slavery*), in search of freedom, who rose up against the colonists.

Just before I could experience the unthinkable, I had faith in our secular republic that is France and in the fact that our constitution assured us, as citizens, that no powerful iniquitous person would come to mistreat a French citizen.

Yes, my naivety was very great, I admit it!

Unfortunately, considering my history, what was decreed at the beginning of the constitution (French), liberty, legality, fraternity seems to me, today, to be nothing more than a myth, a utopia. Indeed, what I suffered while the highest French authorities were aware of it and that nothing concrete has been put in place, is in my opinion, unworthy of a country such as France.

How can a strong nation, a Republic where human rights are the banner, allow a citizen who starts from nothing, and who does not want to remain a burden for his Nation, fights like a Lion in order to ensure a better future for his children and himself and who, having reached a status that makes him a Frenchman with an average income of **3 500 euros**, to be forced to receive as an income, for several months, **less than the minimum subsistence**, because of laws that flout Marianne, therefore our Nation (France) and to be lowered by those who, coming from the people, have sworn to serve the citizens. We will see it!

To you, who are reading me, can you imagine what I am going through? Often the best way to understand a person who is suffering because of a stone in their shoes is to wear them for a while.

Can you, even for a moment, put on my clogs. I am just a simple Frenchman, I do not have a prestigious name or wealthy parent, I was only naive enough to believe in the values of the Republic (French), in this inestimable heritage that is our constitution that was bequeathed to us, at the cost of the blood, of men and women of great value?

I want you to know that despite the vicissitudes that have largely been my lot, in recent years, I continue to believe in, freedom, legality, fraternity and justice.

I will tell you my story, and I will tell you that I am coming out of this misadventure, sore.

You who read me, you remain on this day my last hope.

I would like to tell you, to you who read me, that I am convinced that my story and especially the facts that I present in this book will mark the spirits. At least, I believe it. May this book, that we took pleasure in writing and offering you, be the glimmer of hope that will open up better tomorrows.

1 Good to know:

To continue, I would tell you that this is an excerpt from a larger digital book, which contains 236 pages, entitled “Infamy of the State (Reality of unconstitutional acts practiced by the French State in violation of its constitution).”

If you would like more details, when I refer to a chapter, you can find it in the full version of the book. Finally, I would like to point out that this full version has been split into 4 booklets, including this one.

The purpose of these booklets is to be in a more manageable and transportable format, providing you with better reading comfort.

They will also allow you to more easily choose the theme that suits you.

However, they are all available to you in digital version, booklets and full version book. I invite you to download them from my site:

<https://www.kenny-ronald-marguerite.com/infamy-of-the-state>

You can share them with your loved ones or talk about them around you.

2 Contents of the booklets:

◦ **booklet 1: Of faith, suffering and action.**

- STATEMENT OF FACTS.
- DISCUSSION.
- New evidence on the responsibility of the civil servant Mr. Vincent GUILGAULT, as head of the FIP accounting department other categories, in the alleged external illegality.
- New evidence on the responsibility of the civil servant Mr. Rodolph SAUVONNET, as Regional Director of Public Finances of Martinique, in the alleged external illegality.
- New evidence on the responsibility of the civil servant Mr. Jérôme FOURNEL, as Director General of Public Finances, in the alleged external illegality.
- Presentation of the loss of opportunity and loss of earnings that the covid 19 vaccination laws generated against Mr. MARGUERITE.
- New evidence on the alleged internal illegality of the decrees relating to the solidarity fund.
- Presentation of the reality of Mr. MARGUERITE's rights discriminated against by the administrative court of Martinique in the context of his case.
- Brief career synopsis, philosophy of life and discriminatory oppression.
- Of Suffering and Ink.

◦ **booklet 2: the illegal nature of the vaccinal laws against covid 19.**

- On the alleged internal illegality of the vaccinal laws against covid 19.
- The reality of the legislative activation of the already programmed obsolescence of the vaccine laws against covid 19.
- Reality of the unconstitutional nature of the vaccinal laws against covid 19, which contravene the right of Mr. MARGUERITE, as a Frenchman, not to be vaccinated against Covid 19 because of his faith.
- Of Suffering and Ink.

◦ **booklet 3: the illegal nature of Sunday laws.**

- Historical and legislative reality of the unconstitutional character of the Sunday laws.
- Reality of the unconstitutional nature of the Bailly report, an essential support governing the French Sunday laws.
- Open Letter: Case to Repeal Catholic Sunday Law That Oppress Sabbath Observers and Shabbat Observers.
- Of Suffering and Ink.

◦ **booklet 4: various realities to take into account.**

- Bases presenting the responsibility incumbent on the French State for the harm suffered by Mr. MARGUERITE.
- Bases presenting the responsibility incumbent on the French State in the establishment of incomplete laws in the management of the discipline of civil servants who are at fault and in the damages they have caused to Mr. MARGUERITE.
- The reality of material and psychological damages and loss of opportunity generated by unconstitutional laws established in French legislation and the possibilities of financial compensation envisaged.
- The reality of the “mirror to larks” of the “vaccinal pass” instituted by the French government under cover of covid 19.
- The titanic fight between the clay pot and the iron pot, David and Goliath version.
- Of Suffering and Ink.

Folder: the illegal nature of Sunday laws.

“The sectarian blindness of the greatest number gives birth to a selfishness which leads the most upright men to act ruthlessly, like a pack of bloodthirsty wolves. The legacy that such men leave to their descendants, children and disciples, is nothing but ignominy and perpetuation of the pains of their victims through the centuries”. [Quote from Kenny R. MARGUERITE].

2 Historical and legislative reality of the unconstitutional character of the Sunday laws

To begin, I would say to you that to understand the religious and therefore unconstitutional character of the Sunday laws which establish in France that weekly rest must be given on Sunday for all French people, we have to take a step back in history to fully understand these realities.

When I speak of history, I am in fact speaking of that of antiquity, because there we find the the grind (*foundation*) of the Sunday laws. This tells us:

“From the Emperor Constantine to A. Helpidius: All judges, all citizens and all occupations must rest on the honourable day of the sun [...]”. [Extract from: “Code de Justinien III. 12, de feriis, 3.” (translated into English from the original text)].

This decree was promulgated by the Emperor Constantine at the beginning of modern Christianity. It was established because the Romans' main faith base revolved around the stars, particularly the “Sun god”. History teaches us that this day has found its continuity through the centuries:

Indeed, in English-speaking countries it is still called “Sunday”, which etymologically consists of two words:

“Sun” and “day”. In Germany, it is the same: the name “Sonntag” consists of two words:

“Sonne”, which means “Sun” and “Tag” which means “day”. Sunday and Sonntag, in their literal roots, mean “day of the Sun”. For French speakers this day became “le dimanche”.

Although this term “day of the Sun”, was not retained later by the Catholic Church to qualify Sunday as a sacred day of rest, its origin is pagan.

It is this agreement of the Christians, with the installation of this day of rest within the Roman empire, which makes it possible to establish Sunday like being the “day of the sun”.

The weekly Sunday rest, as we know it today, derives from this and finds its durability there. This is how the Catholic Church subsequently at the Council of Laodicea instituted Sunday as the “Lord's Day”.

Here is an excerpt from that text: **“Christians should not judaize by resting on the Sabbath, but should work on that day, honouring the Lord's Day [Sunday] by resting”**. [Extract from: “Canon 29 du concile de Laodicée (Date approximative l'an 363).” (translated into English from the original text)].

We can also add this: **“We observe Sunday instead of Saturday because the Catholic Church, at the Council of Laodicea [363], transferred its sanctification from Saturday to Sunday”**. [Excerpt from: “The Convert's Catechism of Catholic Doctrine, 3^e édition, p. 50” (translated into English from the original text)].

Here we find that the Catholic Church has instituted that Christians should no longer Judaize (*worship God*) on the Sabbath (*Saturday*), but henceforth do so on Sunday.

In addition, the Council of Laodicea forbade working on Sundays, while it required working on the Sabbath day (*Saturday*).

Moreover, In order that Sunday might appear to have been established by the Lord, the Catholic Church instituted the “**dies dominica**” which is derived from the Latin root “**dies Dominicus**” meaning “**day of the Lord**”.

In this century, the fact of working on Sunday while resting on Saturday may seem an aberration, but it has not always been so, because it was the Catholic Church which once decreed that the French should be unemployed on Sunday and work on Saturday.

In doing so, the predominance of Catholic dogma is omnipresent in the tenor of the laws prohibiting work on Sundays.

These laws are not recent, indeed, the first dominical law was instituted in the year 363 of our era. *We have seen it !*

On the basis of these bases, the Catholic Church will continue through the centuries to enact other texts intended that the Sunday which it has decreed to be the “*day of the Lord*”, can be revered. The following introduces us to one of these texts:

“Sanctify Sundays [...] Every Christian should avoid imposing unnecessarily on others what would prevent him from keeping the Lord’s Day [...]

Despite economic constraints, the public authorities will ensure that citizens have time for rest and divine worship [...] [Excerpt from: *catechism of the Catholic Church; II. The Day of the Lord; the Libreria Editrice Vaticana (translated into English from the original text)*].

Throughout the centuries this Sunday law, the paternity of which belongs to the Roman people and the “*motherhood*” to the Catholic Church, has been able to make its way, to ultimately give birth to the following text:

“Article 1. It is forbidden for the same employee or worker to spend more than six days a week in an industrial or commercial establishment or in any of its premises, regardless of whether such activity is of a public, private, lay or religious nature, even if its purpose is either professional or charitable.

The weekly day of rest shall consist of at least twenty-four consecutive hours.

Article 2. The weekly day of rest shall take place on Sunday. [...]. [Excerpt from: “*Loi du 13 juillet 1906 établissant le repos hebdomadaire en faveur des employés et ouvriers*” (translated into English from the original text)].

Before continuing, it is important to emphasize that the interest of this law is undeniable, because it is in favor of the workers and has made it possible to put an end to their exploitation.

Indeed, it prohibits employers from making their employees work more than *6 days per week*, and all workers must have *24 consecutive hours* of rest per week. It is therefore not a question here of totally incriminating it, but only of drawing attention to one of its important elements, this little sentence which follows:

“The weekly day of rest shall take place on Sunday”. It should be noted that on reading this [*French law of July 13, 1906 establishing weekly rest...*], the religious character does not appear immediately, because no allusion to an allegiance to be brought to God on Sunday is made.

In order to realize the religious connotation associated with the weekly Sunday (*dominical*) rest in France, it is necessary to refer to what *Mr. Ayrault (when he was Prime Minister)* declared during his press conference on *December 2, 2013*, following the report on the question of exceptions to Sunday rest in shops that *Mr Jean-Paul Bailly* submitted to the French government.

Here is an excerpt from his speech: “There will be no question of questioning the rule on the dominical rest [...] Sunday is not a day like any other”.

The legislator uses the term “*dominical*” to present Sunday rest. However, this is not its original meaning; it is taken from the Latin word “*dominicalis*”, which means “*of the Lord*”.

The term “*dominical*” therefore means “*that which belongs to the Lord*”. The legislator describes the dominical weekly Sunday rest, thus recognising that Sunday has a “*divine*” nature since, as we have seen, the term is derived from the Latin word *dominicalis*, which means “*of the Lord*”.

Therefore by extension allegiance is made to the dogma of Papal Rome which instituted this day.

Nevertheless, what could be more normal for a religious legislative base that has infiltrated the Republic?

With these foundations, let us now discover why the Sunday which was seen attached to this expression of the “*dominical rest on Sunday*” (which is not a pleonasm), cannot be a day like any other for the French State.

This reality alone has made the laws which established that the compulsory weekly rest of the French people must take place on this day, the Sunday, unfounded and contravene the principle of a Secular Republic.

It thus appears that these Sunday laws and the various sanctions they instituted, penalizing those who do not have an exemption to hire an employee who wishes to work on Sunday, were put in place while they are perfectly unconstitutional since they are of a religious nature and thus contravene the following text:

“[...] the Republic assures freedom of conscience. It guarantees the free exercise of worship with the only restrictions enacted hereafter being in the interests of public order [...] The Republic does not recognise, financially support or subsidise any religion”.

[Loi du 9 décembre 1905 concernant la séparation des Églises et de l'État. Version consolidée au 19 mai 2011. Titre 1^{er}: Principes. Articles 1 et 2. (translated into English from the original text)].

Let's also add this: **“France is an indivisible, secular, democratic and social Republic. It ensures equality before the law for all citizens without distinction of origin, race or religion. It respects all beliefs.”** *[Article 1er de la Constitution (Française) du 4 octobre 1958 (translated into English from the original text)].*

Here we find two of the fundamental texts, which present the reality of France as a Secular Republic, which has completely disassociated itself from religions, having no subordination to them, while leaving each citizen the choice to be able to freely live their faith without being discriminated against for this.

This law, which was voted on *December 9, 1905*, and is still in force, is the basis that establishes the freedom of the French State with regard to religions. It was voted at the time in order to emancipate the State from the yoke of the Catholic Church, which reigned supreme over religions as well as over monarchs and the State.

The sentence **“The Republic does not recognize [...] any religion”** is the guarantee that assures every Frenchman that he will not be subjected to the dogma of a religion. It thus appears that no Church decree can alienate the individual freedom of the French as a people. For this reason, any law or decree that contravenes our constitution cannot remain in French legislation.

The same is true for anything that does not rest on the foundations of the French constitution and that would oppose the first principle of France, that of a Secular Republic. Therefore, by these instituted Sunday laws, my rights have been and are still being violated, this is presented in *[(French) Article 5 de la Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen de 1789 (translated into English from the original text)]*, which states among other things that: **“[...] Everything that is not forbidden by the Law cannot be prevented, and no one can be forced to do what it does not order”.**

Thus, by preventing French citizens from working on Sundays, the French State, which is a Secular Republic, violates their rights.

Having separated Church and State, it is clear that any law or decree which, such as the Sunday laws, are derived from religious texts, and thus contravene our constitution, cannot remain in French legislative texts. It is the same for those which are not based on secularism or are not anchored on the foundations of the Republic.

However, with the so-called “*Sunday*” laws, we are far from such a reality in France because, by associating the term “*dominical*” with the mandatory weekly rest day in France, the legislators have acted that this day is a religious day.

To continue, let us now look at this fundamental notion of secularism, by reading the following: **“Secularism guarantees freedom of conscience. From this derives the freedom to manifest one's beliefs or convictions within the limits of respect for public order. Secularism implies the neutrality of the State and imposes the equality of all before the law without distinction of religion or belief.**

Secularism guarantees believers and non-believers the same right to freedom of expression of their beliefs or convictions.

It also ensures the right to have or not to have a religion, to change it or to no longer have one. It guarantees the free exercise of worship and freedom of religion, but also freedom vis-à-vis religion: no one can be forced to respect dogmas or religious prescriptions.

Secularism implies the separation of the state and religious organizations.

The political order is based on the sole sovereignty of the people of citizens, and the state — which neither recognizes nor salary any cult — does not govern the internal functioning of religious organizations.

From this separation is deduced the neutrality of the State, territorial communities and public services, not of its users.

The secular Republic thus imposes the equality of citizens vis-à-vis the administration and the public service, whatever their convictions or beliefs. Secularism is not one opinion among others but the freedom to have one.

It is not a conviction but the principle which authorizes them all, subject to respect for public order”. [Extract from: *Droits et libertés. Qu'est-ce que la laïcité ? Tiré du site internet : <https://www.gouvernement.fr/qu-est-ce-que-la-laicite> (translated into English from the original text)].*

In this text, I would like to extract a sentence that I believe is the pivot of all that I have just presented. I invite you to read it again:

“[...] no one can be forced to respect dogmas or religious prescriptions. [...]”.

This sentence alone demonstrates the nonsense of the dominical laws! Indeed, how can we understand it when the Sunday laws show quite the opposite. In France, we are far from the reality presented in this excerpt because, as we have seen, the laws obliging French citizens not to work on Sundays are of a religious nature.

In doing so, the dominical laws, which force all or part of the French people not to work on Sunday, make France out of step with what it professes. Indeed, in a State that recognizes itself as a Secular Republic, **“[...] no one can be forced to respect dogmas or religious prescriptions. [...]”**, because **“Secularism guarantees freedom of conscience”**.

Where is my freedom of conscience as a Frenchman when, as a Sabbath-observer, ancient laws that the Catholic Church instituted and that have been brought up to date by French legislators, continue to keep me, for 25 years, in a state of debasement and precariousness? On this day and for centuries, France, by making its own practices stemming from a religion, rejects the first basis of a secular Nation!

To understand what this means, let us examine what should qualify France as a “*secular republic*”. To do this, let us reread this excerpt from a text already quoted:

“[...] Secularism implies the neutrality of the State and imposes the equality of all before the law without distinction of religion or belief. [...] Secularism implies the separation of the state and religious organizations.

The political order is based on the sole sovereignty of the people of citizens, and the state — which neither recognizes nor salary any cult [...]"

What this site of the French government presents here is simple:

The reality of "laïcité" is materialized by the fact that the (French) State does not recognize in all that is of its competence, thus also at the level of its legislation any text, laws, decrees, dogma, knowledge etc. which is of a religious nature.

The French government is separated from any religious organization, so no influence of this type can remain in "**The secular Republic**" that is France! With this base, the State "**imposes the equality of all before the law without distinction of religion or belief**".

All this is difficult to reconcile with all that we have just seen, and which have as their basis the Sunday laws. Let us now review these same bases but in reverse and let us reason by the absurd:

Any Nation, which keeps in its legislation, in the management of its administration and its public service, its territorial communities, laws or provisions stemming from the dogma or beliefs of a religion, is not a "Secular Republic"!

Any country, which discriminates against a part of its people and forces them to observe religious prescriptions and/or laws, cannot bear the name of "Secular Republic".

Not so absurd as that, since this deduction that I have just exposed is none other than the reality presented by this text on secularism, considering that if one thing is true, its opposite is also true.

In this excerpt we have also discovered, the uniqueness of secularism which is not an opinion or a belief, but is what founds things and allows everyone to be able to freely express their opinions, without being hindered, as long as they do not contravene the rules established in the Republic!

In all that was presented, here is what for me must make us think and bring us to fight, according to the rules of the Republic, so that what follows, cannot have any more the top in France:

"Any society in which the guarantee of rights is not assured, nor the separation of powers determined, has no constitution."

[Article 16 (Français) de la Déclaration des Droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen de 1789 (translated into English from the original text)].

Let's link this *article 16 of the constitution* with these so-called dominical laws:

Can we then say that the French Society has a Constitution, with regard to what this article 16 describes, when the fundamental rights of all or part of the French citizens are discriminated?

How could such laws see the day and worse still persist, in a country, which is a Secular Republic?

One cannot be at the same time a thing and at the same time its opposite. One cannot at the same time practice religious precepts and boast of being a Secular Republic by discriminating all or part of its citizens, by forcing them to practice prescriptions of the Catholic dogma.

This is tantamount to favouring this religion to the detriment of others.

It is time for France to emancipate itself from these religious laws which are without foundation and which gangrene it so that it becomes what it should always have been, a Secular Republic, cradle of the rights of the man, and where no discrimination is perpetuated, by those the same ones charged to protect us and to defend our rights, our legislation and our constitution!

On this day, the question is not simply whether or not to repeal the dominical laws. The real questions that each of us, especially our legislators, the members of the Council of State, the members of the Constitutional Council must ask ourselves are:

What are our foundations, in France as a people?

What are our values? If the answer to these questions is the French Constitution and the rules of the Republic and secularism, then the only decision that must be taken is the repeal of these discriminatory laws that are the dominical laws!

How to profess one thing and do its opposite! :

If these iniquitous laws incriminated in this file are not reformed, it will mean that it will be henceforth admitted that we are in violation of our constitution and that we are thus acting the destruction of the Republic to tend towards another political system interested only in a part of the French population and constraining the others.

Or, we choose to be in the reality of what we have, for centuries, established in our constitution and in our legislation, and let us make sure, from now on, to be a strong Nation, a just Republic and a Secular State where no trace, even tiny, of discriminatory or religious laws remains.

To continue, I would say that my objective is that the following should prevail in France from now on:

“[...] So that the claims of the citizens, based henceforth on simple and indisputable principles, will always turn to the maintenance of the Constitution and the happiness of all.” [*Préambule de la Déclaration des Droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen (Français) de 1789 (translated into English from the original text)*].

The goal of every French citizen should be to ensure that nothing violates our constitution, which is presented here as contributing to our happiness as a people. Let's go on to discover other aspects of these laws that violate the rights of Sabbath and Shabbat observers.

To get to the heart of the matter, we have already seen how the provisions of the Sunday laws discriminate against adult Sabbath and Sabbath observers, especially in their work, now let's find out how these laws affect the lives of our children. Here is what has been instituted in this matter:

“Pursuant to (French) Article L. 221-5 of the Labor Code, the weekly rest period must be given on Sunday.

Moreover, (French) Articles L. 221-3 and L. 224-1 prohibit the employment of apprentices on Sundays and public holidays.

However, establishments manufacturing food products for immediate consumption, hotels, restaurants and drinking establishments, as well as all the establishments listed in (French) Article L. 221-9 and the industries listed in (French) Article L. 221-10, are allowed to give their personnel weekly rest by rotation.

For this reason, since 1975, circulars have authorized the work of apprentices on Sundays and public holidays, considering that, in companies benefiting from an exemption under common law, apprentices, insofar as they follow the rhythm of the company, can work on these specific days.

However, five Court of Cassation rulings handed down on January 18, 2005 held that these circulars could not call into question the prohibition on having an apprentice work on Sundays and public holidays.

Sectors of the craft industry where activity is particularly high on Sundays and public holidays, in particular those of the bakery-pastry industry, now encounter a problem in training and employing minor apprentices, the case of adult apprentices having been settled by article 23 of law no. 2005-32 of 18 January 2005.

Moreover, the ban on Sunday work for apprentices under the age of 18, combined with the requirement for a weekly rest period of two consecutive days and the weekly closing day of the establishment, may make apprenticeship in these sectors difficult to implement. [...]

[Réponse du Ministère des petites et moyennes entreprises, du commerce, de l'artisanat et des professions libérales publiée dans le JO Sénat du 07/07/2005 – page 1840. Travail des apprentis le dimanche et les jours fériés 12e législature. Taken from the French Senate website: <https://www.senat.fr> (translated into English from the original text)].

What is presented here is dramatic for young people who are not of age and who wish to become apprentices! Of course, we understand that these minors must be protected, but in light of other criteria, let's analyze what this really means and implies:

Thus, an employer craftsman who has apprentices, must give them two consecutive days off, one of which must necessarily be Sunday.

Before continuing, let's rediscover what the French national collective bargaining agreement for the hairdressing industry has decreed on this matter:

“Employees will benefit from a rest period of 24 consecutive hours set for Sunday by application of Article L. 221-5 of the Labor Code and 1 additional day, allocated in rotation in agreement with the employer and according to the needs on duty. (1) [...]

(1) Paragraph extended subject to the application of the provisions of Article L. 221-4 of the Labour Code, under the terms of which the weekly rest period must have a minimum duration of 24 consecutive hours, to which must be added the consecutive hours of daily rest provided for in Article L. 220-1 (Order of 3 April 2007, art. 1).”

[Extract from: Article 10 de la Convention collective nationale de la coiffure et des professions connexes du 10 juillet 2006. Étendue par arrêté du 3 avril 2007 JORF du 17 avril 2007 (translated into English from the original text)]

Thus, this second day of rest must be given either on Saturday or on Monday. So far this does not seem to be a discriminatory hindrance to young Sabbath or Shabbat keepers who are apprentices in the craft industry, because they can, it seems, be off on Saturday and Sunday. But in reality things are quite different.

To tell you about it, with my 35 years of professional experience as a mixed hairdresser, I would say to you that Saturday being the leading day in this sector of activity, where the remuneration of the hairdressers is often doubled, in order to respect the obligation to close the two consecutive weekly days, one of which is Sunday, the hairdressing salons will generally close on Monday.

As a result, young Sabbath or Shabbat observers cannot be present in the company on Saturday, their hiring becomes problematic for the employer.

The objective being to train apprentices in order to optimize their sales figures and not being able to make their employees work on Sundays, the managers of the hairdressing salons will more easily hire as an apprentice a young person who agrees to work on Saturdays, than one who, by conviction, refuses.

For this business manager, to do otherwise would be a very important loss of earnings.

We can see that these Sunday laws with the prohibition of working on Sundays do not only impact professional hairdressers who, like me, observe the Sabbath or the Shabbat, but also hinder young people who have the same faith base in their job search.

This discrimination means that our young Sabbath or Shabbat observers are not free to train for the profession of their choice.

Indeed, persevering in this way may be a hindrance to a professional career in the future.

The youth is the future of the country, I find it very harmful when a young person is not free to choose the career he wants to embrace!

It should be noted that in accordance with the principle of non-discrimination of *[(French) Article L1132-1 du Code du Travail]*, any employer who refuses to train a young person because of his or her convictions is outlawed and is guilty of reprehensible practices.

For there to be a change leading to equity for the professional future of Sabbath or Shabbat-observant youth, one of two options should be put in place:

Repeal the dominical laws or agree to waive the rule by granting a special dispensation for young Sabbath or Shabbat observers to be present on Sunday in a company that agrees to it. They could then continue their apprenticeship or training without being prevented from doing so by these laws.

In order to do so, this exemption should also be accompanied by a modification of the clause arbitrarily fixing two consecutive days of rest. This would allow those for whom this exemption is intended to benefit from their weekly rest period in a different way, for example on Saturday and Monday.

The same chances of success would then be offered to them! In addition to all that has already been said, I would add that the Sunday laws, being Catholic in essence, have created a religious monopoly that for centuries has discriminated against the rights of Protestant Christians, Sabbath observers, or Jewish people, Shabbath observers.

We are obliged to be unemployed on Sundays, while in order to observe the Sabbath or the Shabbat, we do not work on Saturdays.

If we were to take into account all those Sundays when we were forced to be unemployed, it would represent a considerable loss of income.

As long as these medieval laws remain, they discriminate against me and all Sabbath and Shabbat observers, because under the *35-hour* work week we are required to work only **five days a week**, instead of the **six** that are the prerogative of all other French people who wish to do so.

By forcing Sabbath and Shabbat observers not to work on Sundays, the French state is oppressing us.

We are thus hindered and do not have the same chances of success as those who observe Sunday. As a result, we have a shortfall of one day per week which adds up to **52 days per year**.

Thus, these laws prohibiting work on Sundays are arbitrary and pernicious, because they discriminate against the rights of French Sabbath and Shabbat observers.

By doing so, the French state acts in a discriminatory way and violates the laws that prohibit such things.

This tells us: **“Men are born and remain free and equal in rights. Social distinctions can only be based on common utility”**.

[(French) Article 1er Déclaration des Droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen de 1789 (translated into English from the original text)].

Let's complete with this other text: **“[...] All Citizens, being equal in his eyes, are equally admissible to all dignities, places and public employments, according to their capacity, and without any other distinction than that of their virtues and their talents”**.

[(French) Article 6 de la Déclaration des Droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen de 1789 (translated into English from the original text)].

Consider also this other text: **“No one should be disturbed for his opinions, even religious ones, provided that their manifestation does not disturb the public order established by the Law.”** *[(French) Article 11 Déclaration des Droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen (Français) de 1789 (translated into English from the original text)].*

Let's also take this into account: “**1° Any direct or indirect discrimination based on actual or supposed membership or non-membership of an ethnic group or race shall be prohibited in matters of social protection, health, social benefits, education, access to goods. [...]**

2° Any direct or indirect discrimination based on sex, actual or supposed membership or non-membership of an ethnic group or race, religion or belief, disability, age, sexual orientation or identity or place of residence is prohibited with regard to membership and involvement in a trade union or professional organisation, including the benefits provided by such organisation, access to employment, employment, vocational training and work, including freelance employment or self-employment, as well as working conditions and professional promotion.

This principle shall not preclude differences of treatment based on the grounds referred to in the preceding paragraph where they meet an essential and determining occupational requirement and provided that the objective is legitimate and the requirement is proportionate”.

[Extract from: « (French) Article 2 loi n°2008-496 du 27 mai 2008 portant diverses dispositions d'adaptation au droit communautaire dans le domaine de la lutte contre les discriminations. » (translated into English from the original text)].

Let's end with this: “**1. Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion;**

This right includes freedom to change one's religion or belief and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest one's religion or belief, in worship, teaching, practices and observance.

2. Freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs shall be subject only to such limitations as are prescribed by law and are necessary in a democratic society in the interests of public safety, for the protection of public order, health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others”.

[Article 9 de la Convention européenne des droits de l'homme Liberté de pensée, de conscience et de religion, articles 1-2 (translated into English from the original text)].

I have referred to all these texts that are in force in France in order to highlight the following:

All French citizens are equal, and no discrimination should be exercised against them, notably in terms of access to employment or with regard to their faith. However, as we have seen, it is what the Sunday laws have instituted in France that discriminates against Sabbath and Shabbat observers.

In effect, they are asked to submit to a religious constraint, that of the majority, even though it is not their own faith base and they are at a professional disadvantage. It should also be noted that restrictions on religious freedom can only be put in place within a specific framework:

“To preserve public safety, the protection of public order, health or morals, or the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.”

Dominical laws do not fall within this scope. We are indeed faced with a pure constraint that sets its own rules.

It is certain that if Sunday were part of these formal restrictions, no authorization would be granted while there are derogations in this area resulting in higher remuneration.

This law establishes it: **“The collective agreement sets out the compensation granted to employees deprived of dominical rest [...].”**

In the absence of an applicable collective agreement, the authorisations are granted on the basis of a unilateral decision by the employer, taken after consulting the works council or employee representatives, where they exist, and approved by a referendum organised among the staff concerned by this exemption from dominical rest.

The employer's decision, approved by referendum, determines the compensation granted to employees deprived of dominical rest as well as the commitments made in terms of employment or in favour of certain groups in difficulty or disabled persons.

In this case, each employee deprived of Sunday rest benefits from a compensatory rest and receives for this working day a remuneration at least equal to twice the remuneration normally due for an equivalent period.

“[...] Only voluntary employees who have given their written consent to their employer may work on Sundays on the basis of such authorisation. [...]

An employee of an enterprise benefitting from such an authorisation who refuses to work on Sundays may not be discriminated against in the performance of his or her contract of employment.

Refusal to work on Sundays for an employee of an undertaking benefitting from such authorisation shall not constitute a fault or a ground for dismissal [...] **“In the absence of an applicable collective agreement, every year the employer shall ask every employee who works on Sundays whether he or she wishes to benefit from a priority to take up or resume employment in his or her professional category [...]**”.

The employer shall also inform the employee, on this occasion, of his or her right to stop working on Sundays if he or she no longer wishes to do so.

In such a case, the employee's refusal shall take effect three months after his or her written notification to the employer.

“In addition, an employee who works on Sundays may at any time request to benefit from the priority defined in the preceding paragraph [...]”.

[Extract from: “(French) Loi n° 2009-974 du 10 août 2009, article 2, réaffirmant le principe du repos dominical et visant à adapter les dérogations à ce principe dans les communes et zones touristiques et thermales ainsi que dans certaines grandes agglomérations pour les salariés volontaires” (translated into English from the original text)].

Let's complete with this other text: **“Industries in which materials susceptible to very rapid alteration are used and those in which any interruption of work would result in the loss or depreciation of the product being manufactured, as well as the categories of establishments and establishments mentioned in the following table, are allowed, in application of article L. 3132-12, to give weekly rest by rotation for the employees employed in the work or activities specified in that table”.**

[(French) Article R3132-5 du Code du travail Français (translated into English from the original text)].

The derogations allowing certain trades to work on Sundays demonstrate, in France, if it were necessary, that this cannot harm society or the State. Nevertheless, the Sunday laws and their derogations allowing certain sectors to work on Sundays do create discrimination. I am going to present you this reality by taking as a frame the news of 2013, where large DIY stores in France rose up against these Sunday laws by opening without authorization. Faced with this outcry, the response of the government at the time was to issue the following decree:

“Subject: Temporary inclusion of do-it-yourself retail establishments on the list of categories of establishments that can legally derogate from dominical rest. Entry into force: the text enters into force the day after its publication.

Notice: this decree adds DIY retail businesses to the list of categories of establishments benefitting from a derogation with regard to dominical rest in application of article L. 3132-12 of the Labor Code (French).

Retail establishments trading primarily in DIY materials and equipment, hardware, paints-enamels-varnishes, flat glass, and construction materials are thus concerned. This provision is scheduled until July 1, 2015, pending the vote on a new legislative framework on exceptions to dominical rest [...]”

[Extract from: (French) Décret numéro 2013-1306 du 30 décembre 2013 portant inscription temporaire des établissements de commerce de détail du bricolage sur la liste des établissements pouvant déroger à la règle du repos dominical. J.O. Numéro 0304 du 31 décembre 2013 (...)] (translated into English from the original text)].

This decree intended to satisfy the DIY stores was rejected by the Council of State because of its temporary nature, in order to remedy the crisis the French government decreed the following:

“[...] This includes retail establishments dealing primarily in do-it-yourself materials and equipment, hardware, paints, enamels and varnishes, flat glass, and building materials [...]. Do-it-yourself retail businesses on the list of categories of establishments benefiting from an exemption from dominical rest pursuant to article L. 3132-12 of the Labor Code (French)”.

[Extract from: (French) Décret n° 2014-302 du 7 mars 2014 portant inscription des établissements de commerce de détail du bricolage sur la liste des établissements pouvant déroger à la règle du repos dominical (translated into English from the original text)].

This is how DIY stores have joined the “privileged” who can work on Sundays.

It is important to understand what contributed to change things, and to do this we must take into account the text of the law that the French State used to establish this decree to end the crisis. To do this, let's discover the content of the text that is used in this decree, by reading this extract :

“Certain establishments, whose operation or opening is made necessary by the constraints of production, activity or the needs of the public, may by right derogate from the rule of dominical rest by allocating the weekly rest in rotation.

A Conseil d'Etat decree determines the categories of establishments concerned.”

[(French) Article L3132-12 du Code du travail (translated into English from the original text)].

Thus, this *[(French) Article L3132-12 Code du travail]*, which was the salvation of the French State in this crisis, is also its Achilles heel, because here by specifying in this law that DIY stores can derogate from the rule of Sunday rest because they meet the **“needs of the public”**, a breach has been opened.

This term “public needs”, not being clearly defined, is understood to extend to all trades meeting these criteria.

All businesses that meet the needs of the public should therefore be able to open on Sundays. To understand this, I bring you the following reflections:

How would opening a DIY store on Sunday be more useful than the hairdresser or the garage? As a hairdresser, I have to do clients' hair on Sundays for their wedding, communion, etc.

And, go and tell those who have a breakdown on Sunday and cannot find a garage that this activity does not meet the “public needs”!

Before continuing, I think it is wise to specify that the objective I have in mind in this chapter is not to force all businesses to open on Sundays, but simply to allow those who wish to do so to carry out their activities, with employees working on that day, without being prevented from doing so by laws that are themselves in contradiction with other laws and that, being of religious origin, contravene the French constitution.

From now on, two choices are possible:

The first choice finds its raison d'être in the *[(French) Loi du 9 décembre 1905 concernant la séparation des Églises et de l'État]*, which presents what should happen to the laws and decrees of the Church that have insidiously infiltrated the Republic.

This law of “July 13, 1906” stating that “**The weekly day of rest shall take place on Sunday**” having religious roots is in inadequacy with that of “December 9, 1905” which establishes that “**The Republic does not recognise, financially support or subsidise any religion**”.

Since it cannot coexist, one of the two should be repealed. Of the two laws, that of 1905 represents our identity as a French people, free and not subject to a religion. Indeed, liberty, equality and fraternity constitute the three pillars of the French Nation, which is a Secular Republic. It thus appears that it is this “Article 2 of the French law of July 13, 1906” that should be repealed or amended.

The second choice is that, for there to be equity, and for French citizens who observe the Sabbath or the Shabbat not to be discriminated against and for their chances of success not to be less than that of the rest of the French people, an exemption should be granted to them following the example of what has been done for establishments that have them.

Thus, companies that employ a Sabbath or Shabbat observer and allow him or her not to work on Saturday because of his or her faith, could in return be able to allow him or her to work, on a voluntary basis, as many Sundays as he or she wishes, without being prevented from doing so by the dominical laws.

Being a minority, it is very likely that those who are not concerned are far from suspecting the very real suffering of those who observe Saturday as their day of rest. It is time for France to stop this discrimination. In this regard, here is what the French constitution has established:

“[...] Everyone has the duty to work and the right to get a job.

No one may be harmed, in their work or employment, because of their origins, opinions or beliefs. [...] *[(French) Préambule de la Constitution de 1946 (translated into English from the original text)].*

We are far from it with these Sunday laws! If there is any need, here is another strong argument to demonstrate that the ban on working on Sundays instituted by these laws referred to throughout this dossier is discriminatory against Sabbath and Shabbath observers.

These laws, I repeat, contravene the French constitution and have no reason to exist in a Secular Republic.

France as a Secular Republic must offer, as we have seen, to all French citizens, regardless of their faith base or religious creed, the same chances of success, especially in professional matters! All this allows us to reaffirm that these two options are perfectly relevant and that the French legislators should take them into consideration:

On the one hand, they have the choice of abolishing all Sunday laws with a religious character, as we have seen, in order to fit in completely with the principles of secularism advocated by the Republic.

On the other hand, in order not to create a mass popular uprising, the choice of keeping the Sunday laws is also possible, but it should be accompanied by measures to ensure that there is no discrimination against this minority whose day of rest is Saturday.

To do otherwise would be to recognize that France can infringe the rights of some people with impunity, while such actions expose it to legal sanction.

The following text attests to this:

“1 The enjoyment of any right set forth by law shall be secured without discrimination on any ground such as sex, race, colour, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, association with a national minority, property, birth or other status.

2 No one shall be discriminated against by any public authority on any ground such as those mentioned in paragraph 1". [Extract from: "Protocole numéro 12 à la Convention européenne de sauvegarde des droits de l'homme et des libertés fondamentales, articles 1 et 2 "Interdiction générale de la discrimination" (translated into English from the original text)].

The French state is thus violating this and all other laws reported in this document, by continuing to place the yoke of Sunday laws on Sabbath and Shabbath observers. Thus, the social equality that is dear to France is trampled underfoot.

These Sunday laws do not respect the inalienable right of each individual to practice his or her faith without being discriminated against and to have the same opportunities for professional success.

Thus, these laws prohibiting work on Sundays violate the faith of those who, like me, observe the Sabbath and the Shabbat and constitute an obstacle to their professional future.

By perpetuating them, the French State acts in a discriminatory way and practices, by this very fact, acts tainted with "excess of power".

Even if this reality is not perceived by those who are not concerned, I have been able to demonstrate, being myself impacted, how heavy the yoke of laws prohibiting Sunday work is in France.

One might think that there is no remedy to this crisis which, even if it only affects a minority, can eat away at France from the inside like a gangrene!

And yet, legislative texts such as the following one exist and can bring solutions:

"In order to protect the health and safety of workers, minimum rules on working time must be introduced in all Member States.

Under the European Working Time Directive (2003/88/EC), each Member State must ensure that every worker has the right to: A limited weekly working time, which cannot exceed 48 hours on average, overtime included;

A minimum period of daily rest, at the rate of 11 consecutive hours every 24 hours; A break time during working time, if the worker is active for more than six hours;

A minimum weekly rest period of 24 hours without interruption for each seven-day period, which is added to the daily rest of 11 hours;

Paid annual leave of at least four weeks per year; Additional protection in the event of night work, for example:

The average working time cannot exceed 8 hours per 24 hour period;

Night workers may not perform arduous or dangerous work for more than 8 hours per 24-hour period [...]" [Conditions de travail – Directives sur le temps de travail de la Commission européenne (translated into English from the original text)].

It is important to note that this European law reinforces the basis of workers' rights in Europe (and therefore in France).

We find here almost the same axes as in the law [(French) loi du 13 juillet 1906 établissant le repos hebdomadaire en faveur des employés et ouvriers], nevertheless this sentence so much criticized "[...] **The weekly day of rest shall take place on Sunday [...]**" is not present, this making this text leaves free to choose the day of rest which must be observed.

It is therefore time for the French State to stop amending these Sunday laws by putting band-aids on a "gangrenous base" because solutions exist!

France being European, it should reform its laws and abrogate the second paragraph of the law of **July 13, 1906** which institutes "[...] **The weekly day of rest shall take place on Sunday [...]**" and this, because it is a transgression of the French constitution.

3 Reality of the unconstitutional nature of the Bailly report, an essential support governing the French Sunday laws

To begin this part, I would say to you that the Sunday laws are so well anchored in the French laws and in the routine of the French, that our legislators and the French people in its great majority ended up forgetting that these laws were above all, resulting from the cru of the Catholic Church, that they are of religious essence and as such should not be taken again in the constitution or in any legislative text that it is.

We will discover these realities in this section. To realize these realities, we must take the time to fathom the new norms that have been established in this sense, and which are based on a report, dealing with this theme, commissioned to *Mr. Bailly* by *Mr. Ayrault* (when he was *Prime Minister*). Here is an extract:

“In the collective consciousness and history of France, Sunday plays a special role. It remains a fundamental anchor point in the social and family life of the French.

[...] Nevertheless an observation is blindingly obvious: No one wants Sunday to become an ordinary day.

Sunday is an historical, cultural and identity reference point for everyone, that constitutes a landmark in the week. It is therefore not a day like any other. [...]

According to studies and surveys, confirmed by the conducted interviews, Sunday is a day for refocussing (rest, relaxation, spiritual activities, etc.), a day for sharing (family, friends, joint leisure activities) and an activity day (outings, excursions, pastimes, etc.).

Since 1906, French labour law has provided for the existence of a weekly rest period, and the fact that this rest day must in principle take place on Sunday.

The legitimacy of such a regulation is based on the specificity of Sunday, explained above and on the fact that the existence of a day of rest common to a large proportion of employees enables everyone to derive greater well-being from this rest day, by allowing them to share part of their free time with other individuals.

This is a question of the synchronisation of leisure time. The associative practise of sporting, cultural or religious activities, as well as the activities of families or friends require that the rest time of those who wish to participate be coordinated”. *[Excerpt from: Rapport sur la question des exceptions au repos dominical dans les commerces : vers une société qui s’adapte en gardant ses valeurs, du 2 décembre 2013 de Monsieur Jean-Paul Bailly (translated into English from the original text)].*

In addition, I invite you to read the following: **“The Constitutional Council was seized on April 6, 2016 by the Council of State (decision n° 396320 of the same day) of a priority question of constitutionality (QPC) posed for The city of Paris.**

This question related to compliance with the rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution of the fourth paragraph of Article L. 3132-26 of the Labor Code and the words “or, in Paris, the prefect” appearing in the second paragraph of paragraph III of article 257 of law n° 2015-990 of August 6, 2015 for growth, activity and equal economic opportunity.

In its decision no. 2016-547 QPC of June 24, 2016, the Constitutional Council declared unconstitutional the fourth paragraph of article L. 3132-26 of the labor code and the words “or, in Paris, the prefect” appearing in the second paragraph of paragraph III of article 257 of the law of August 6, 2015.

[...] 1. – The principle of Sunday rest: As the Bailly report points out, “since 1906, French labor law provides for the existence of a weekly rest, and the fact that this rest must in principle be given on Sunday.

“The legitimacy of such a regulation is based on the specificity of Sunday (...) and on the fact that the existence of a day of rest common to a large part of the employees is such as to allow everyone to take more well-being of this day of rest, by allowing them to share part of their free time with other individuals.

This is a question of synchronization of the time devoted to leisure: The practice of associations, sports, culture or religion, as well as family or friendly activities, require that the rest time of those who wish to participate in them be coordinated.”

In the labor code, the provisions on weekly rest now appear in chapter II “Weekly rest” of the third title “Rest and public holidays” of the third part “Hours of work, salary, profit-sharing, profit-sharing and employee savings”.

The first three articles of Chapter II “Weekly rest” provide: “Article L. 3132-1: It is prohibited to make the same employee work more than six days a week. “Article L. 3132-2: The weekly rest period shall last at least twenty-four consecutive hours, plus the consecutive hours of daily rest provided for in Chapter 1.” Article L. 3132-3: In the interest of employees, weekly rest is given on Sunday.” These provisions on weekly dominical rest are of public order.

Derogations to the terms of distribution and organization of working time within the framework of the calendar week, by agreement or by extended collective or company agreement, cannot therefore have the effect of authorizing an employer to require his employees to work more than six days a week.

[...] Consequently, the Constitutional Council declared the contested provisions contrary to the principle of equality... [Excerpt from: *Commentaire Décision n° 2016-547 QPC du 24 juin 2016 Ville de Paris “Dérogations temporaires au repos dominical des salariés des commerces de détail à Paris” (translated into English from the original text)*].

These two texts that we have just discovered show us the reality of Sunday rest that has been instituted in France since 1906.

If we focus on the second one, we realize that Mr. Bailly's report is a reference in this matter, in the sense that it is quoted, in this dispute brought before the Constitutional Council, in the same way as the articles of the Labour Code dealing with weekly rest.

All of this shows that Mr. Bailly's report has become the backbone of Sunday rest in France, just like the legislative texts.

Thus, it seems essential to consider, beforehand, the arguments contained in this report in favor of dominical rest, as instituted in France.

First of all, it is interesting to note that his report is intended to deal with “*the question of exceptions to dominical rest in shops*” and that in these lines, it is Sunday rest that is being discussed.

We find here again this religious connotation that is given to Sunday rest which is presented as being “dominical”, therefore reserved for the Lord, that is what this term means. Now that this point has been made, let's get to the heart of the matter. In this text, Sunday rest (*Dominical rest*) is presented as a great benefit to society.

On this day, the objective is to set up activities destined to the collective development, to the social cohesion.

It is presented as a day for rest, relaxation, spiritual activities, outings, excursions, etc. It is also said that it is a great plus for the French to have the same weekly day of rest, in the sense that it would participate in social cohesion and would allow French citizens to share in a coordinated way a part of their free time with others.

It should be noted that even if the majority of French people are attached to their Sunday as a day of rest, even if this day is a blessing for many, nevertheless this does not make a religious law legislatively acceptable and therefore unconstitutional.

Therefore, any law that would be enacted in our legislation and that would contravene our constitution, should be repealed, even if it was aimed at the welfare of the greatest number of French citizens.

We have experienced this reality with the vaccination laws against covid 19, which were amputated of a paragraph that was nevertheless important, because it was intended to preserve the health and life of the greatest number of French citizens.

To rediscover it, I invite you to reread the chapter entitled “*On the alleged internal illegality of the vaccine laws*”.

With this example, we understand that as noble and beneficial as the dominical laws are for all or part of the French people, being carried by a religious legislative basis which contravenes the French constitution, they must be abrogated.

We understand that this argument of Mr. Bailly, presenting the benefits of the dominical laws for the majority, cannot justify their perpetuation.

To continue, I would say that in order to highlight the religious and therefore unconstitutional character of *Mr. Bailly's report*, we need only to note the quality of some of those who contributed to its implementation. To do this, let us read the following:

“By letter of September 30, 2013, the Prime Minister entrusted me with a mission on the issue of exceptions to Sunday rest in shops.

He asked me: “to examine the difficulties posed by the current system and to shed light on the multiple issues of the opening of certain businesses on Sundays – social, societal, economic, competitive, environmental issues”. [...]

All those who wished to be heard were. Thus, we have heard from trade unions and employers' organizations, employee coordinations, chambers of commerce and industry, chambers of trade, local elected officials, prefects and directors of administration, members of parliament who have worked and reflected on these issues, representatives of the Catholic Church, and of course all the ministers concerned and their offices.

[...] “In the collective consciousness and history of France, Sunday plays a special role. It remains a fundamental anchor point in the social and family life of the French. [...].”

[Excerpt from: Rapport sur la question des exceptions au repos dominical dans les commerces : vers une société qui s'adapte en gardant ses valeurs, du 2 décembre 2013 de Monsieur Jean-Paul Bailly (translated into English from the original text)].

Let's complete with this other extract which clearly shows the active participation of the contributors to the report of *Mr. Jean-Paul Bailly*: **“Everyone was able to express themselves and be listened to. Many people had prepared these meetings very meticulously and left us written contributions”**.

[Excerpt from: Rapport sur la question des exceptions au repos dominical dans les commerces : vers une société qui s'adapte en gardant ses valeurs, du 2 décembre 2013 de Monsieur Jean-Paul Bailly (translated into English from the original text)].

I would say to you, that it is for me surprising that “*representatives of the Catholic Church*” are present at this hearing carried out to establish a law of the French Republic which is, let us recall it, laic. In order to better understand my astonishment, let us review the principle of secularism explained below:

“Secularism implies the neutrality of the State and imposes the equality of all before the law without distinction of religion or belief. [...] Secularism implies the separation of the state and religious organizations.

The political order is based on the sole sovereignty of the people of citizens, and the state — which neither recognizes nor salary any cult [...]. *[Droits et libertés. Qu'est-ce que la laïcité ? Extract taken from the website: <https://www.gouvernement.fr/qu-est-ce-que-la-laicite> (translated into English from the original text)].*

Thus, in view of the definition of secularism, the representatives of the Catholic Church had no place to contribute to the Bailly report.

Indeed, the French Republic being secular, this **“implies the separation of the State and religious organizations”**.

This means that legislative decisions cannot, under any circumstances, be based on religious influences, because **“the State is neutral with respect to dogma and other religious writings”**.

Thus, at the price of their blood, the revolutionaries bequeathed to us a secular Republic where the Catholic Church has no more right of city, in the affairs of the nation, and singularly in its legislation, and in his report, *Mr. Bailly* ignores it by inviting catholic representatives to pronounce on the validity of the Sunday laws.

What could they say to him:

Repeal these obsolete and medieval laws, because they are religious and contravene the French constitution!

Of course not!

On the contrary, they gave him material to support his thesis, which became the legislative basis of the Sunday laws.

This reality emerges from the terms that *Mr. Jean-Paul Bailly* uses in his report and which takes up the Catholic thought. To understand it, I invite you to reread this famous report, which you will find in the introduction of this part, and then to compare it with the following text which is of the Catholic persuasion:

“During Sunday and the other days of the prescribed feast days, the faithful will abstain from works or activities that prevent them from worshipping God, the real joy of the Lord's Day, the practising of deeds of mercy and the proper relaxation of mind and body. [...]

Family necessities or great social usefulness are legitimate excuses for the whole point of the Sunday rest.

The faithful shall ensure that legitimate excuses do not introduce habits prejudicial to religion, family life and health.

The love of truth seeks holy leisure, the necessity of love welcomes just work”. [Excerpt from: “S. Augustin, civ. 19, 19; Catéchisme de l'Église catholique, II. Le jour du Seigneur; la Libreria Editrice Vaticana” (translated into English from the original text)].

Let's read this as a supplementary text: **“The institution of the Lord's Day helps to ensure that everyone enjoys sufficient time for rest and leisure to cultivate their family and their cultural, social and religious life”**. [Excerpt from: “Cf. GS67, §3. Catéchisme de l'Église catholique; II. Le jour du Seigneur; la Libreria Editrice Vaticana” (translated into English from the original text)].

This other text informs us: **“Christian piety dictates that Sunday is traditionally dedicated to good works and the humble service of the sick, infirm and the elderly.**

Christians will still sanctify Sunday by giving time and care to their families and loved ones, which may be difficult to give on other days of the week.

Sunday is a time for reflection, silence, culture and meditation that encourages growth”. [Excerpt from: “Catéchisme de l'Église catholique; II. Le jour du Seigneur; la Libreria Editrice Vaticana” (translated into English from the original text)].

As you can see, the substance of *Mr. Bailly's* report finds its *raison d'être* in Catholic writings. When we look at the texts I have just quoted and compare them to his report, it is undeniable that he has been strongly influenced by Catholic dogma.

The very choice of words attests to this.

Thus, by allowing the Catholic representatives to bring their contributions to the elaboration of his report, which has become the backbone of the Sunday laws instituted in the secular Republic that is France, *Mr. BAILLY* renders null and void the said report, as well as all the laws that have resulted from it.

Now that this backbone has been put in place, let us return to another crucial point of *Mr. Bailly's* report, by rereading this excerpt:

“In the collective consciousness and history of France, Sunday plays a special role. It remains a fundamental anchor point in the social and family life of the French. [...]

Sunday is an historical, cultural and identity reference point for everyone, that constitutes a landmark in the week. It is therefore not a day like any other. [...]"

This is the backbone of *Mr. Bailly's* report and the reason for the continuation of the Sunday laws.

Dominical rest is thus presented as **"playing a special role in the collective consciousness and history of France"**, it is also, according to Mr. Bailly, **"a fundamental anchor in the social and family life of the French"** and finally, dominical rest is even considered as **"a historical marker"**, which makes it, according to this report, **"not a day like any other"**.

What is said here is strong and heavy of consequences, but the immediate question that comes to me is:

What is this "historical marker" that is linked to dominical rest and, by extension, to the laws linked to it, that has such a large place in the "history of France" and that has marked the "collective conscience" of the French?

In order to better understand the real link between dominical laws and history, I invite you to go back in time and stop at this period located a little after the French Revolution which lasted from May 5, 1789 to November 9, 1799.

Let's see what happened a little more than a decade later: **"With the Republicans coming to power, a series of legislative and regulatory provisions secularize the country:**

Abolition, with the exception of civil servants, of the Sunday rest obligation instituted in 1814. [...]

Abolition of public prayers, abolition of the religious oath before the courts, secularism of nursery schools [...], neutrality of public education in matters of religion, philosophy and politics and non-confessionalism of public education and secularism of teaching staff in public education [...]

Abolition of official public prayers at the opening of each parliamentary session [...]"

[Assemblée Nationale. La séparation des Églises et de l'État. Quelques repères chronologiques. Les jalons historiques, partie 1879-84. Taken from the site: <https://www.assemblee-nationale.fr/histoire/eglise-etat/chronologie.asp> (translated into English from the original text)].

Here we discover that in the history of France one of the first steps that the very young Republic undertook, was to undo the institutions of any religious influence.

To do this, we have witnessed **"a series of legislative and regulatory provisions secularize the country"**. Among these measures implemented, we find the one enacted in 1814 that acts the **"Abolition, with the exception of civil servants, of the Sunday rest obligation instituted in 1814"**.

This shows, if it were necessary, that the dominical laws do not have secular or republican roots, but as we have already seen, they are religious and come from the Catholic Church. I think it is interesting to note that, from the moment that Sunday as a weekly rest day ceased to be compulsory, other provisions were put in place.

Thus the weekly rest, was even established for a time on Monday and called "holy Monday". As this text shows:

"— A saint to whom one can give credit. /

— No more sacred than consecrated, it's said. /

— Because four days a week is enough. /

— Bring him out of oblivion, it's Holy Monday. /

— Instead of going to work let's stop at the wine bar. /

— And let's have a drink to protest about the morals of parish priests. /

— Against the capital and the bosses [...] /

— **Abolish bourgeois and religious norms [...]** /

— *A saint you can give credit to. /*

— **That of the craftsmen and workers [...]**”

[Extract from: “L’homme qui tutoyait Serge: la saint Lundi; voir Apogée et déclin de la saint Lundi dans la France du XIXe siècle de Robert Beck, revue d’histoire du XIXe siècle, dans Organe de la société d’histoire de la révolution de 1848 et des révolutions du XIXe siècle” (translated into English from the original text)].

Here we discover the freedom which should be that of any French citizen to be no longer under the yoke of laws and religious decrees.

This implies being free in conscience to observe a weekly day of rest that is not designated in advance. Unfortunately, in view of what has been presented previously, it is clear that this freedom has not lasted.

Let us see what led to the fact that these dominical laws were not completely eradicated at the time of the French Revolution, and that they continued to exist for civil servants.

To do this, we must go back a little further in French history. It teaches us that after the post-French Revolution period and the rejection of Sunday rest of Sunday by French citizens, the repercussions were catastrophic for them because they found themselves outside the protection of the Church.

Moreover, *Napoleon* could thus declare:

“The people eating on Sunday, they must be able to work on Sunday”.

This period of history was bad for the French who were legally exploited by the bosses who could make them work *7 days a week*.

It is thanks to *Pope Pius VII* that the condition of French workers was improved. He had a political opportunity to change the future of the young French Republic, using the thirst for power of its ruler, who aspired to become emperor.

Since the rule that had been established was that the coronation of an emperor had to pass through the consecration given by the Catholic Church, *Napoleon* found himself forced to make concessions to the papacy, willy-nilly.

Under pressure from the Pope, he opted for Sunday to be a day of rest for civil servants. But, certainly that for this great conqueror, the “*deal*” was not so difficult to act, since, at that time, Protestantism being still incipient, the major part of the French was catholic.

With this in mind, here is what was agreed upon: “*No public holiday, except for Sunday, may be established without the permission of the Government. [...] Sunday will be designated as the day of rest for public officials*”.

[Extract from: “Concordat du 23 Fructidor an IX régissant la vie religieuse en France, signé par Bonaparte, Premier consul et le pape Pie VII. Articles XLI et LVII” (translated into English from the original text)].

It is the fact that the majority of French people belong to Catholicism that allowed a rule of Catholic faith to be integrated into the laws of the Republic. To understand this, it is important to read this: “**His Holiness the Sovereign Pontiff Pius VII, and the First Consul of the French Republic [...]**

Who, after the exchange of their respective enabling legislation, have adopted the following convention: Between His Holiness Pius VII and the French Government.

The Government of the Republic recognises that the Catholic, Apostolic and Roman religion is the religion of the great majority of French citizens.

His Holiness also recognises that at this time this same religion is waiting for its chance to serve the French people and is still looking forward to the great and glorious benefits to be accrued from the establishment of the Catholic faith in France, and from the particular profession of the Consuls of the Republic [...]. *[Extract from: “Le Concordat de 1801 du premier consul, Bonaparte” (translated into English from the original text)].*

It is above all important to note, from what we have just read, the following extract:

“[...] From the establishment of the Catholic faith in France, and from the particular profession of the Consuls of the Republic [...]”.

These consuls of the Republic who held power in the fledgling French secular republic were described as having a special profession for Catholic cults. However, as guarantors and guardians of the secular republic that is France, these people, including Napoleon, were not to appropriate the dogma of any religion in the name of this republic.

The Catholic religion – being that of the majority and especially that of the Consuls of the Republic – became by this edict the **“religion of the Republic”**, it is thus quite naturally that the day of worship that it had instituted, could find its place within the people. This reality that we have just seen persists.

Nevertheless, in order to understand the nonsense of dominical rest – let's remember that dominical means *“of the Lord”* – which was instituted for public servants, we must return to this excerpt from one of the texts already presented: **“[...] Secularism implies the separation of the state and religious organizations. [...]**

From this separation is deduced the neutrality of the State, territorial communities and public services, not of its users.

The secular Republic thus imposes the equality of citizens vis-à-vis the administration and the public service, whatever their convictions or beliefs. Secularism is not one opinion among others but the freedom to have one.

It is not a conviction but the principle which authorizes them all, subject to respect for public order [...]”.

[Droits et libertés. Qu'est-ce que la laïcité ? Extract taken from the website: <https://www.gouvernement.fr/qu-est-ce-que-la-laicite> (translated into English from the original text)].

It is about the neutrality of the French State, of the territorial communities and of the public services with regard to religions, which implies that no religious law can be inserted in the edicts or the texts of the Republic and find a perennality there.

In view of what has been observed in reality, this is purely theoretical, for how can one speak of secularism and neutrality when it is obvious that a law of the Republic has its roots in religious laws, subjecting civil servants to the law of dominical.

This point having been made, let us return to the beginnings of dominical rest for civil servants.

Bonaparte, out of ambition, conceded to Pope Pius VII, therefore to the Catholic Church, a legislative basis that instituted that **“The rest of civil servants will be fixed on Sunday”**, once this reality was ratified in the French legislation at a time after the French Revolution, history teaches us that it became irremovable.

The fact of alternatively changing a law by instituting religious texts, within the Republic according to the circumstances, is like playing with fire in a fireworks room, it will always end up exploding in your face.

This reality is evident in the dominical laws, because the finality of what we have just seen is that a law that remains active, even if it is contested and unconstitutional, is an open door that allows for legislation. Thus, on the strength of the first legislative bases instituted by Napoleon, it is quite natural that the weekly Sunday rest was generalized to all the socio-professional layers.

It should be noted that the choice of Sunday as a day of rest was naturally imposed on the legislators, since this day of rest was already observed by civil servants. This provision was therefore naturally extended to all professional sectors by the *[(French) Loi du 13 juillet 1906 établissant le repos hebdomadaire en faveur des employés et ouvriers]*.

All of the above leads to the conclusion that this little phrase **“weekly rest must be given on Sunday”** of the [(French) *Loi du 13 juillet 1906 établissant le repos hebdomadaire en faveur des employés et ouvriers*], has become in this century an anachronism within a Republic that prides itself on being secular, and therefore disassociated from *“religious matters”*. The historical elements that have been presented have shown that dominical rest has not always been legitimized in France.

Thus, Mr. Bailly's report is nonsense, because we have just seen that dominical rest, contrary to what one might think, is not a completely positive historical legacy that the reformers and instigators of the Republic have left in the **“collective conscience and history of France”**.

As a historical marker, Sunday is rather a gaping wound that remains and that with time, not being healed, has become gangrenous.

To remain in the theme of the *“historical marker”*, let us highlight the bloody and oppressive character at the origin of the dominical laws in France. Let us see what its foundations are.

To begin with, let us recall that Sunday rest was the day of worship instituted, originally by the Romans to venerate the *“god”-sun*, then, the Catholic Church transformed it into **the Lord's Day**.

The text [Extract from: *“Code de Justinien III. 12, de feriis, 3.”* (translated into English from the original text)] establishes the following: **“From the Emperor Constantine to A. Helpidius: All judges, all citizens and all occupations must rest on the honourable day of the sun [...]”**.

We can also add the [Excerpt from: *“The Convert's Catechism of Catholic Doctrine, 3^e édition, p. 50”* (translated into English from the original text)] establishes the following: **“We observe Sunday instead of Saturday because the Catholic Church, at the Council of Laodicea [363], transferred its sanctification from Saturday to Sunday”**.

Over the centuries, the laws put in place by the Catholic Church were designed to ensure that the Sunday decreed as the *“Lord's Day”* could be revered. The following presents the text to us [Excerpt from: *Catéchisme de l'Église catholique; II. Le jour du Seigneur ; la Libreria Editrice Vaticana*] establishes the following:

“Sanctify Sundays [...] Every Christian must avoid imposing on others unnecessarily what would prevent them from keeping the Lord's day [...] Despite economic constraints, the public authorities will ensure that citizens have time for rest and divine worship [...]”

Reading this text, without taking into account the realities attached to it, one might think that in the past Europeans, over whom the papacy dominated, were free to choose whether or not to observe Sunday rest, also described here as the *Lord's Day*.

Unfortunately, this was not the case, because the the obligatory reverence for **“Sunday”** as **“the Lord's Day”** came to be the cause of suffering, spoliation and martyrdom in Europe over the centuries for all those who refused to revere this day of worship instituted by the Church. We shall see.

But before that, in order to understand the reason for and the nature of the sufferings of those who refused to revere the *“Lord's Day”* – who worked on that day or who observed the Sabbath and the Shabbath as a day of worship – we must not lose sight of what the high Catholic dignitaries had decreed, and which I invite you to reread the [Extract from: *“Canon 29 du concile de Laodicée (Date approximative l'an 363).”* (translated into English from the original text)] establishes the following:

“Christians should not judaize by resting on the Sabbath, but should work on that day, honouring the Lord's Day [Sunday] by resting”.

It is on these bases that the Catholic Church was able to declare heretical all those who were outside the fixed framework, i.e. those mentioned above. Let us see what was worth being qualified as heretical by the high Catholic authorities.

The text [*Excerpt from : Mansi SC, vol. 33, Cols. 529, 530 (translated into English from the original text)*] establishes the following:

“Such is the condition of the heretics of that time who have nothing to justify except for hiding behind the pretext of God’s Word to overthrow the Church’s authority [...]”

Thus, **“a person who rejects Catholic dogma and holds only to the word of God”** is a heretic. To continue, I would say that at that time, it was not good to have only the word of God as a basis of faith, because the price to pay was heavy. This text tells us about this:

“[...] Archbishops and bishops oblige a priest and two or three laymen of good opinion under oath, or more if necessary, to faithfully, diligently, and frequently search for heretics, by combing houses and underground chambers known to be suspect, searching lean-to buildings, the added constructions under roofs and any other hiding places, which we command to be destroyed.

And if they find heretics, or believers, or wrongdoers, who receive them or defend them, after having taken precautions to prevent them from escaping, [...] So that they may be punished with the required chastisement.

We command that whoever knowingly allows a heretic to dwell in his premises, whether for money or for any other reason, according to his confession or as it is proven, his premises shall be forfeited for ever and his body shall be given into the hands of the Lord to do with it as he should.

[...] Let the house where a heretic is found be destroyed and the land confiscated. We order the house where a heretic is found to be destroyed and the land confiscated.

“[...] How to deal with the sick who are deemed heretical or suspected of heresy. We order that no one who is deemed heretical or suspected of heresy shall be allowed to use a physician. [...]”. [*Excerpt from: The Council of Toulouse (1229) or Gregory IX forbids the Bible to the faithful (translated into English from the original text)*].

This text presents the persecution of the faithful children of God, they were tracked, like beasts. Any place that could hide them was searched in order to flush them out and punish them.

Their goods were to be seized and their houses destroyed.

And why? Because they continued to read the Word of God. They were banned from doctors, so when they were sick they were doomed to die like stray dogs.

We have already seen that this term in Catholic language represented those who had faith only in the Word of God and who refused to observe Catholic dogma.

Let us now look at what happened to those who did not fit into the “*mold*” and did not revere Sunday, that is, the “*Lord’s Day*” instituted by Catholic dogma. To do this, let us read the following: “*They were warned to appear before them, during a given period of time and to declare and show the things they had seen, known and heard about any person, living or dead, who had said or done anything against the Holy Catholic Faith.*

Who had cultivated and kept the law of Moses or of the Muslim sect or the rites and ceremonies thereof; Or committed various crimes of heresy, by keeping Friday and Saturday evenings special and by wearing clean linen on Saturdays and wearing better clothes that day than on other days.

By preparing food for Saturdays on Fridays, in cooking pans over a small fire; Who do not work on Friday and Saturday evenings like on other days; Who make sure that all lamps are clean and fitted with new wicks on Friday evenings; Who place clean sheets on the beds and clean tablecloths on the table [...]

With the above-mentioned person being considered and dealt with as being excommunicated and cursed [...]

**Let their days be few and evil; let their substance be for the enjoyment of others and let their children be orphans and their wives be widows. Let their children be forever in need and let no one help them;
Let them be driven out of their homes and dispossessed of their property by usurers; And let no one show them any compassion”** [Extract from: “*Déclarations, actes et Édits de la Juridiction royale et le Saint-Office de l’Inquisition, Valencia, 1568*” (translated into English from the original text)].

Let's complete with an excerpt presenting those who were Jewish as heretics that the Inquisition (*the Catholic Church*) burned:

“The year of the Lord 1481 [...] began here in the Holy Office of the Inquisition against the Judaizing heretics, for the exaltation of the faith. Through him, from the expulsion of the Jews and the Saracens until the year 1524 [...].

More than twenty thousand heretics have recanted their criminal beliefs and more than a thousand obstinate heretics have been delivered to the flames, after being tried according to the law”. [Excerpt from: “*Llorente, Histoire critique de l’Inquisition d’Espagne, p.274-275*” (translated into English from the original text)].

Let us now come to these texts. In these two historical texts, we discover that at the time of the medieval supremacy of the Catholic Church, a part of the European people had to pay a very heavy tribute, these were the observers of the Sabbath and the Shabbat.

One could easily imagine, given the fate reserved for those described here, that if they were treated so harshly it was because they must have been, like the terrorists of our modern era, dangerous. Far from it! What were their crimes?

They were declared heretics by the Catholic Church and had to endure the worst suffering, even death, simply for choosing to cling to the word of God, and to it alone, by rejecting the teachings of this dogma.

Now that this point has been made, let us develop what these texts present. The first highlights the anti-Semitic and discriminatory bases that the Roman Catholic Church had once established – through its vengeful arm, the Inquisition – against Jews, but also against Sabbath-observant Christians.

Signs to recognise those who observed the Sabbath were determined, obliging the people to report any evidence that a person or group was observing the Sabbath. These signs were well targeted.

Among other things it was necessary to find those who worshipped God in a special way from Friday evening and during the day on Saturday, that is, during the Sabbath and those who prepared food for Saturday on Fridays, who stopped working from Friday evening to Saturday evening and who dressed in their best clothes on Saturdays, etc.

It is on this basis and by specifying the symbols of the way in which the Lord's Sabbath must be observed, that the Catholic Church was able to declare all those who observed these practices to be heretics.

Excommunication and death affected all of their families. According to the anathemas of the Catholic Church, all were destined to suffer eternal damnation and the torments of hell. These edicts forbade showing any mercy towards them or assisting them in any way.

Among other things, in order to discourage offenders it was decreed that their property would be seized and that they were to be cursed. Their families were reduced to begging and their fate was death by starvation.

The underlying purpose of this decree was to present the observance of the Law of Moses and that of the Sabbath or the Shabbat as heresy. And as we have already studied the penalty for heresy was suffering and death.

Countless Sabbath observers (Christians) and Shabbath observers (Jews) were burned for their faith. Their only crime had been to reject Catholic dogma and base their belief solely on God's Word.

It was a truly evil time when the Sabbath or the Shabbat observers had become flesh to be burned at the stake.

This is what we discovered in the second historical text we read. It states that in the **year 1481**, more than **1000 Jewish** heretics, who observed the Sabbath, **were judged and burned at the stake.**

In reality, torture always preceded such festivities! Are you aware of the abomination practised by the Catholic Church?

Can you imagine that **1000 Jews or Seventh-day Adventists would be burned in one year in this century?** And why would that be?

Not because they were bloodthirsty people! But just because they chose to honour the Lord by discreetly observing the Sabbath or the Shabbat. If plans were made to find them it was because discretion was second nature to them.

To do otherwise by blatantly observing the Sabbath would have resulted in them dancing in the moonlight with the flames.

This is what history teaches us about the Catholic laws forbidding work on Sundays and imposing work on Saturdays, thus on the Sabbath. Thus, history leaves us with abominable memories that are linked to these Catholic dominical laws, yet they still remain the pillar of French laws.

Moreover, these unspeakable works, this stalking, this genocide, this anti-Semitism, this anti-Judaism that the Catholic Church perpetrated against those who observed the Sabbath or the Sabbath, did not stop only at what we have already seen before, because here is what was also set up by this religion in Europe:

“To the Jews, who through their own fault were condemned by God to perpetual slavery [...]

In truth, they are ungrateful to the Christians, for instead of thanking us for the kindly treatment, they heap invectives upon us and instead of the slavery they deserve, they manage to claim their superiority. [...]

That, won over by the piety and goodness of the Holy See, in the end they will recognise the error of their ways and that they should waste no time in seeing the true light of the Catholic faith and that they accept while they persist in their errors, and realise that they are slaves because of their deeds, while Christians have been set free by the grace of our Lord God Jesus Christ and that it is unjustified for this reason that the sons of free women serve the sons of slaves.

Therefore [...] **All of the Jews shall live in one district, which shall have only one entrance and one exit, and if there are not enough places [in that district], then there will be two or three more or as many as are necessary;**

In all cases, they shall reside entirely among themselves in designated streets, and shall be fundamentally separated from the residences of the Christians, [This is to be enforced] by our authority in the city and by that of our representatives in the other states, lands, and estates mentioned above.

Moreover, in all of the states, lands, and estates in which they live, they shall have only one synagogue, in the usual location, and they shall not build new synagogues, nor possess their own buildings.

Furthermore, all of their synagogues, other than the one authorised, shall be destroyed and demolished.

And the properties they now possess shall be sold to Christians within a period of time to be determined by the magistrates themselves.

Moreover, concerning the question that Jews must be recognisable everywhere.

[To this end] men must wear a hat, women, some obvious sign, yellow in colour, which must not be hidden or covered in any way, and must be firmly affixed [sewn].

And moreover they cannot be absolved or excused from their obligation to wear the hat or any other such emblem on any occasion and under any pretext, whatever their rank or importance or their capacity to tolerate [this] adversity, whether by a chamberlain of the Church, clergymen of an apostolic court, or their superiors, or by legates of the Holy See, or their immediate subordinates [...].

They shall not work or provide work on Sundays or any other holiday declared by the Church.

Nor should they incriminate Christians in any way or spread false or falsified conventions. And they shall not in any way play, eat or fraternise with Christians.

And they shall not use any terms other than Latin or Italian in the accounting ledgers they keep with Christians, and, if they should use such words, such agreements shall not be binding on Christians [in the case of legal proceedings].

Moreover, these Jews must limit themselves to trading in old rags, or cencinariae (as they say in the vernacular), and may not trade in grain, barley, or any other commodity essential to human welfare.

And those among them who are doctors, even if called and summoned, will not be able to attend or take part in the care of Christians.

And they shall not be considered superiors, [even] by poor Christians. And they must close their loan books completely every thirty days [...].

And the statutes of the states, territories and domains (in which they have lived for a certain period of time) concerning the primacy of Christians, will have to be brought into conformity and followed without exception.

And if they should, in any way, fail to submit to the above, this should be treated as a crime: In Rome, by us or by our clergy [...] by their respective magistrates, exactly as if they were rebels or criminals according to the jurisdiction where the offence was committed [...]

And may be punished at the discretion of the appropriate authorities and judges". [Excerpt from: "Lois et arrêtés auxquels doivent obéir les Juifs vivant dans les États du Saint-Siège, décrétés par l'évêque de Rome, le pape Paul IV, Servus servorum die du 14 juillet 1555" (translated into English from the original text)].

Here we discover that the Catholic High Authority had enacted one of the worst anti-Semitic laws in history. Under the guise of doing justice to Jesus Christ this law consisted of punishing the Jewish people who had martyred him.

Pope Paul IV declared that it was because the Jews had contributed to the killing of Jesus that they deserved to be removed from their ranks and dispossessed of their property.

This Catholic law against the Jews was so radical, especially in respect of their property, that in my opinion there was only one such case in the last millennium, and that was under Hitler and the Nazis!

Are you aware that thanks to this law the Catholic Church made slaves of the Jewish people? Let us review the excerpt that describes this situation. Here is what was recorded:

"To the Jews, who through their own fault were condemned by God to perpetual slavery [...] Instead of the slavery they deserve [...] and realise that they are slaves because of their deeds [...]"

We also saw that the Jews had been stripped of all of their rights and had been decreed to be inferior to Christians. The Catholic Church parked them in lawless areas, just as one would with cattle.

In all of history only the *Nazis* have acted in this way and they did so for only a few years, whilst the Catholic Church has acted in a discriminatory manner by debasing and despoiling the Jewish people for centuries.

The Catholic Church also used the Sunday Laws as its servant in this debasement of the Jews. Let us review what this text advocated in this regard:

“[...] They shall not work or provide work on Sundays [...]”.

Here we find the oppressive basis of the laws forbidding working on Sundays. Jews were enjoined not to work on Sundays and they were also not to allow their employees to work on that day.

Since they did not work on Saturdays, it was therefore a great loss of earnings for them, which put them at a disadvantage compared to their direct competitors who worked on Saturdays.

This situation has continued into this century, and as an observer of the Sabbath, I am paying the price. I present this reality to you in the section **“Brief career synopsis, philosophy of life and discriminatory oppression”**.

To continue, I would say to you that the lowering of the Jewish people, under the background of the Sunday laws, by the Catholic Church was dramatic, from rich merchants that they were until then, they became ragpickers. Apart from the dispossession of their property, they were also deprived of the exercise of their faith, their synagogues were destroyed in their majority and another of the Catholic actions was to limit their number.

Thus, the debasement of the Jewish people by the Catholic Church had considerable consequences. Through these actions, this religion has debased and marked the Jewish people for centuries, as deeply as the digital tattoos used by the Nazis to mark their representatives.

This law was far-reaching because it forbade a Jewish doctor to treat a Christian under any circumstances. Let's rediscover the part of this law that states this:

“[...] And those among them who are doctors, even if called upon and summoned, will not be able to attend or take part in the care of Christians. [...]”.

Things were really drastic and oppressive, because if a Jewish doctor was present at an accident where there was a Christian who was badly wounded, he could not intervene and had to let the wounded person die for lack of first aid, which he was forbidden to give. To do otherwise would expose him to being afflicted by the law.

Can you imagine how tragic and absurd this law was? Usually, when illness or an accident occurs, one does not consider religious or social affiliations, but is simply obliged to help.

And even in this century to do otherwise would mean we would be breaking the law. Because failure to assist a person in danger is a punishable offence.

The only goal of this ban on Jewish doctors treating Christians, which the Catholic Church had instigated, was to separate Jews from Christians.

Do you realize that, to this day, these Catholic laws have left lasting traces of disunity between Jews and Christians?

To continue, I would say that what is paradoxical is that of all the Catholic decrees that had been abrogated – during the French Revolution – the one that has found its place in the Republic is the one in the name of which the Jews and Sabbath observers were stripped of their property, tortured and killed at the infamous stake.

Moreover, this Catholic doctrine, which imposes Sunday as the day of rest, continues, with impunity, to martyr Sabbath observers. I am a living example of this.

Worse, here we are faced with that day of rest which the Romans established to revere the “*sun-god*” and which the Catholic Church has taken over as the Lord's Day.

We are, as we have seen, in a religious legislative base that remains in the French Republic that presents itself as secular.

Why this state of affairs? Probably because the Catholic Church and its first representative, *Pope Francis*, have as their objective, as was the case with Pope PY VII, to give permanence to the Sunday laws by using their influence on the nations to achieve this.

My words could be qualified as simple feelings or as assertions not based on facts. However, don't be fooled, as you have certainly noticed, I always support my arguments with evidence. Here is one of them with this excerpt from a speech by Pope Francis:

“An employment pact: this is the wish expressed by Pope Francis at his first meeting in Campobasso, the capital of the Molise region in south-central Italy.

During a meeting with the world of labour and industry at the regional university, he addressed the workers and entrepreneurs of this region to express his closeness to them with regard to “the tragedy of unemployment”. “So many jobs could be recovered thanks to a strategy set up with the national authorities that know how to take advantage of the opportunities offered by national and European standards”.

[...] “This is one of the greatest challenges of our time, converting to a development that respects creation”. [...] The report states, “to respond to the new and complex issues that the current economic crisis poses, locally, nationally and internationally”.

Another challenge in the world of labour and industry:

“Reconciling working time with time spent with the family”.

“It is a point that allows us to discern and to evaluate the human quality of the economic system in which we find ourselves”, he added.

The pope took the opportunity to return to the theme of Sunday working, “which is not only of interest to believers but to everyone as an ethical choice”.

“Sunday without work affirms that the economy does not have priority over people, over gratuitousness and non-commercial relations, over family relationships and friendship and for believers over the relationship with God and with the community”.

And ask yourself this question:

“Is working on Sunday a real freedom?” *[Excerpt from: “Message du pape François en visite pastorale en Molise, Italie, le 5 juillet 2014, présenté par Radio Vatican” (translated into English from the original text)].*

In this message, the pope presents key points that oblige European leaders not to question the dominical rest. Among other things, he says in relation to the dominical rest that *“it does not only interest believers, but is of interest to everyone as an ethical choice”.*

The word *“ethics”* that the pope uses here is very important because it comes from the Latin *“ethicus”*, which means *“morality”*.

By making this statement, the pope makes Sunday a mandatory observance for all those who have morals, which implies that those who do not observe Sunday do not have morals. In support of this idea, he had already proclaimed in this regard:

“Reconciling time at work with time spent with the family [...] It is a point that allows us to discern, to evaluate the human quality of the economic system in which we find ourselves”.

In this sentence, the pope presents the quality of a government's economic system as being linked to the management of working hours and the rest it offers its people.

By his words he therefore states that a European government, which would not make a plan to ensure that its people can have quality time spent with their families outside of working hours, would have no ethics. And to present the day of rest that should be observed in such a state, the pope says:

“Sunday without work affirms that the economy does not have priority over people, over gratuitousness and non-commercial relations, over family relationships and friendship, and for believers over the relationship with God and with the community”.

Sunday is presented by the pope as the means by which a state has given priority to the well-being of its people and not to its finances.

To anchor his plea in the minds of the people, he makes a statement that is highly significant.

“Is working on Sunday a real freedom?”.

This question that the pope poses, in support of his argument, leaves room for reflection and is highly subjective and can be interpreted in different ways.

To me, it means that those who work on Sunday are slaves to work! In response to this, the question I ask is this:

When I, a Sabbath-observer, am forced by French laws to observe the Catholic dominical day of rest, which was originally instituted for the purpose of worshipping the “Sun God”, am I not being deprived of my freedom precisely because of these oppressive laws that prohibit Sunday work?

Shouldn't freedom of thought and belief be the right of all those who live in a state (like France) whose foundations are based on human rights? This speech of the pope is only a subtle way used by the Vatican to incite the European leaders not to touch the Sunday rest.

The durability of these laws is due to the role the Vatican plays in the European political arena. Although the Papacy's legislative power over nations is supposed to be over, in reality it is quite different.

In the news, we often see that once appointed, the high dignitaries of European nations value having the pope on their side. Here is what we can learn about this:

“Visit this Tuesday, June 26 to the Vatican by French President Emmanuel Macron.

[...] The visit of French presidents to the Vatican is now a tradition, and it was René Coty, president under the Fourth Republic who inaugurated it, in a way. In June 1957, he was received by Pope Pius XII at the Apostolic Palace.

It was during this trip to the eternal city that he took possession of the title of canon (chanoine) of honor of St John of Lateran, an ancient custom that had fallen into disuse under the Third Republic. [...]

General Charles de Gaulle will visit the Vatican twice; [...] He too will take possession of the title of Canon (chanoine) of Honor of the Lateran, devolved since Henri IV to the French Head of State. Valéry Giscard D'Estaing made no less than three visits to the Vatican during his seven-year term:

In December 1975, in October 1978 [taking possession of the title of canon (chanoine)], then in January 1981. [...] In 14 years of power, François Mitterrand only visited the Vatican once, in February 1982. [...]

Mitterrand will accept the title of canon (chanoine), but will not take possession of it. In January 1996, President Jacques Chirac paid a State visit to the Vatican, the first since that of Charles de Gaulle in 1959.

After an interview with Jean-Paul II, he took possession of his title of Canon (chanoine) of the Lateran. [...]

Nicolas Sarkozy will visit the Vatican twice during his five-year term in 2007 [taking possession of the title of canon (chanoine)] [...]

François Hollande, elected in 2012, will be received by Pope Francis in January 2014. [...] François Hollande will accept the title of canon (chanoine), but will not take possession of it”.

[En images, les visites des présidents français au Vatican. Taken from: <https://www.vaticannews.va/fr.html> (translated into English from the original text)].

Let's complete with this other most apt text: **“[...] The title of “the first and only honorary canon (chanoine) of the Arch-Basilica of the Lateran” goes back to royalty and to Louis XI.**

It was reactivated by King Henry IV, who, after recanting his Protestant religion and receiving absolution from the Pope, donated the Benedictine abbey of Clairac, in Lot-et-Garonne, to the Lateran. In exchange, he received this canonical title, subsequently awarded to the kings of France.

Since then, a mass has been celebrated every year on December 13 in the Basilica of Saint John in Lateran, in Rome, in honor of France.

All the kings of France, then the heads of state, were honorary canons (chanoines), but it was not until 1957 that President René Coty came to Rome to really take possession of this title.

[...] The Elysee Palace specifies that the title of canon “is part of the package of the office of the president” and that “it cannot be refused”. It is nonetheless symbolic, bringing the presidency closer to the Catholic Church, and rich in meaning for the French faithful – who are also voters. [...]

Emmanuel Macron's choice is in line with his speech to the French bishops' conference, during which he expressed the wish to “repair” the “damaged” link between the Church and the State. [...]

As the Observatory of Secularism, a commission under the responsibility of the government, reminds us, “secularism implies the separation of the State and religious organizations”.

The deputy La France insoumise Alexis Corbière believes in La Croix that “as president of the secular Republic it is not correct to receive a religious title in this way, even in an honorary way” and calls on Emmanuel Macron to break with this tradition”. [Extract from: *Pourquoi le président français devient-il chanoine de Latran? Emmanuel Macron, en visite au Vatican, a reçu mardi ce titre honorifique qui remonte à la royauté. Par Anne-Aël Durand et Samuel Laurent. Publié le 26 juin 2018 à 11h20. Taken from the site: <https://www.lemonde.fr> (translated into English from the original text)].*

We discover in these lines that the visit of French presidents to the pope is part of a long tradition in France inaugurated by President *René Coty*, in 1957. And this, whatever their level of belief.

Nevertheless, this step of the French presidents to visit the pope is a deliberate and well calculated political choice. This act of theirs is most likely due to the majority composition of Catholics in Europe.

Following the example of Bonaparte with Pope Py VII, they hope to attract the good graces of the papacy.

Thus, the president of the Republic who would repeal the laws prohibiting Sunday work would be very badly seen by the pontiff and thus by Catholics. His political longevity could be seriously compromised.

To continue, let's look at the title of **“the first and only honorary canon (chanoine) of the Arch-Basilica of the Lateran”**.

All this seems to be a good thing. Nevertheless, how can we accept that such a title, which has its origin in bloodshed, continues to exist in the Republic?

To better understand this state of affairs, let us recall how this title of *“the first and only honorary canon (chanoine) of the Arch-Basilica of the Lateran”* was born.

The reason for its existence is the persecutions, murders and despoilment, among others, of Protestants perpetrated by the Papacy throughout the ages.

This title was originally attributed to monarchs of the past who had pledged allegiance to the Catholic Church and had supported these bloody deeds.

History has taught us that, under the directives of the Papacy, these monarchs led civil wars during which all those who rejected Catholic dogma were mercilessly slaughtered.

Thus, by accepting this title, French Presidents have acknowledged to accept this bloody heritage of the works perpetrated by the Catholic Church, especially towards the Christian martyrs who observed the Sabbath.

In doing so, they pledge allegiance to the Pope and to Catholic dogma, as did the monarchs of the past.

Is this not completely unrealistic in a republic, like France, which is supposed to be secular and therefore not subject to religions?

This has been denounced by the *Observatoire de laïcité* and by a deputy of the France insoumise, as we have seen before!

Unfortunately, although France is a republic that is “no longer” under Catholic domination, it is still, like for the Sunday laws, a slave to this ancient religious rite that is “the title of canon” instituted by this religion. Where is the freedom?

This situation is Ubuesque.

We are faced with a government that, although it is disassociated from religions, has no latitude to abrogate an ancient religious custom.

To the point where here is what this text attributes the following to the French State:

“[...] The Elysee Palace specifies that the title of canon “is part of the package of the office of the president” and that “it cannot be refused”.

How can the title of “*the first and only honorary canon (chanoine) of the Arch-Basilica of the Lateran*” continue to hold sway in the secular republic that is France?

Historical and current events therefore demonstrate to us that papal supremacy still prevails and that its domination over the leaders of nations is very real and timeless.

This reality is well represented in the second text that we saw earlier, and which presents the posture of the head of state Mr. Emmanuel MACRON.

To discover it, let's reread this extract from this text:

“[...] Emmanuel Macron's choice is in line with his speech to the French bishops' conference, during which he expressed the wish to “repair” the “damaged” link between the Church and the State. [...]”.

We have discovered here that Mr. Emmanuel MACRON's objective is to “repair” the “damaged” link between the Church and the State.

To understand the scope of the words of the President of the Republic, we must first of all question what has been damaged or broken between the (Catholic) Church and the (French) State and which in this century, and in the Secular Republic that is France, deserves to be repaired.

History, as we know, teaches us that the link that was broken between the Catholic Church and the French State was enacted by the *[(French) Loi du 9 décembre 1905 concernant la séparation des Églises et de l'État. Version consolidée au 19 mai 2011. Titre 1er : Principes. Articles 1 et 2]*, which decreed, as we have seen, the separation between these two entities.

Thus, to “repair” the “damaged” link between the Catholic Church and the French State, it would be necessary to reform the French constitution to be able to move from a Secular Republic to a kingdom governed by a monarch, or to another form of governance where the State would be as before under Catholic dominance.

Thus, it is most certainly because of the reverence that these European leaders have for the Pope that these Sunday (dominical) laws persist.

In doing so, the issues of Sunday (dominical) laws have for centuries gone beyond the religious framework to take root in the political sphere because, in the shadows, the Vatican continues to weave its web of intolerance.

This is why declarations such as those concerning the foundations of Sunday laws can exist in France, of which here is an extract:

“[...] In the collective consciousness and history of France, Sunday plays a special role. [...] Sunday is an historical, cultural and identity reference point for everyone, that constitutes a landmark in the week. It is therefore not a day like any other. [...]”

This text, by Mr. Bailly, let us recall, in its full form, supports the foundations of the new laws prohibiting working on Sundays in France.

Thus, when he states **“In the collective conscience and history of France”**, he refers to the period when the French people were under the bloody yoke of the Catholic Church.

All these elements allow us to conclude unequivocally that Mr. BAILLY's report, the backbone of the Sunday laws, has a purely religious character, the essence of which no longer needs to be demonstrated.

Sunday laws have become established in the French political landscape, giving them longevity even though they are unconstitutional, because of their religious essence.

Thus, all of the above allows us to affirm that this report by Mr. BAILLY has no place in French legislation, it should not be maintained, but repealed.

Finally, I ask you now, the members of the Council of State, as well as those of the Constitutional Council, what will you do on this day?

Are you going to continue to perpetuate this iniquitous heritage that Bonaparte left us, by letting this medieval law continue to discriminate against a part of the French citizens, while it is unconstitutional, or are you going to act either by contributing to their repeal, or to their reform, in order to restore equity.

May the following questions help you make your decision:

— *Why does a law allowing Sabbath or Shabbat observers to “earn a living” by working on Sundays bother you?*

— *How does it bother you if an employer finds it convenient to hire a Sabbath or Shabbat observer or observers who want to work on Sundays?*

— *Don't we have the right to work whilst upholding our convictions?*

— *Are we sub-human?*

— *Why shouldn't we be entitled to the same chances of success as the rest of the French?*

And let us not talk about derogations that are impossible to apply for minorities, because the law must apply uniformly to everyone, since recent developments allowing DIY stores to work on Sundays show otherwise.

Derogations do exist, so why should they not extend to us Sabbath or Shabbat keepers?

It is important to note that working on Sunday and resting on Saturday is part of the Sabbath or Shabbat observers' faith framework.

Working on this day is therefore not demeaning or punitive for us.

Like the Sunday rest for Catholics, Saturday for us Sabbath or Shabbat observers, is the day established for worship, family, fraternity, fulfilment, physical and psychological rest, etc. It is a day of rest for all of us.

Thus, in view of what I have developed, the objective is to allow for a more just appreciation of the dominical laws.

The ultimate goal is to achieve either their repeal or their adaptation in order to stop this latent discrimination against Sabbath or Shabbat observers, whether young or adult.

4 Open Letter: Case to Repeal Catholic Sunday Law That Oppress Sabbath Observers and Shabbat Observers

On this day, I address all Sabbath and Shabbat observers and especially Seventh-day Adventists who have decided to make the Sabbath the essence of their doctrines. I come to you because this is a serious and solemn time.

I have undertaken a titanic struggle against the dominical laws that oppress us by prohibiting us, in several countries, including France, from working on Sundays.

These nations have as their legislative basis the dominical laws that the ancient Roman religion instituted and that the Catholic Church has taken over, at the cost of the *lowering, dispossession (spoliation), torture and genocide* of a myriad of Sabbath-observant Jews and Christians. I present this reality in my book entitled “**Infamy of the State**” in the chapter “**Reality of the unconstitutional nature of the Bailly report, an essential support governing the French Sunday laws**”.

To get to the heart of the matter, I would say that Sunday laws play a major role in the final conflict to be waged on this earth. Here is the prophecy that Mrs. White leaves us on this subject: “[...] **But when Sunday observance shall be enforced by law, and the world shall be enlightened concerning the obligation of the true Sabbath, then whoever shall transgress the command of God, to obey a precept which has no higher authority than that of Rome, will thereby honor popery above God. He is paying homage to Rome, and to the power which enforces the institution ordained by Rome.**

He is worshiping the beast and, his image. As men then reject the institution on which God has declared to be the sign of his authority, and honor in its stead that which Rome has chosen as the token of her supremacy, they will thereby accept the sign of allegiance to Rome ‘the mark of the beast.’ And it is not until the issue is thus plainly set before the people, and they are brought to choose between the commandments of God and the commandments of men, that those who continue in transgression will receive ‘the mark of the beast.’ - The Great Controversy, 449. TDOC 216.5.” [EGW.Writings. The Doctrine of Christ. LESSON SEVENTY-THREE. The Sabbath Reform. The mark of the beast. Taken from the website: <https://m.egwwritings.org/en/book/1387.2320#2320>].

Here again is what the Lord left us as instruction through Mrs. White: “[...] **God's word must be recognized as above all human legislation. A “Thus saith the Lord” is not to be set aside for a “Thus saith the church” or a “Thus saith the state.”**

The crown of Christ is to be lifted above the diadems of earthly potentates. — The Acts of the Apostles, 68, 69. ChS 161.3 [...] We as a people have not accomplished the work which God has committed to us. We are not ready for the issue to which the enforcement of the Sunday law will bring us. It is our duty, as we see the signs of approaching peril, to arouse to action. Let none sit in calm expectation of the evil, comforting themselves with the belief that this work must go on because prophecy has foretold it, and that the Lord will shelter his people. We are not doing the will of God if we sit in quietude, doing nothing to preserve liberty of conscience. [...]

Testimonies for the Church 5:713, 714. ChS 162.1. It is our duty to do all in our power to avert the threatened danger. We should endeavor to disarm prejudice by placing ourselves in a proper light before the people. We should bring before them the real question at issue, thus interposing the most effectual protest against measures to restrict liberty of conscience. — Testimonies for the Church 5:452. ChS 162.2. When God has given us light showing the dangers before us, how can we stand clear in His sight if we neglect to put forth every effort in our power to bring it before the people?

Can we be content to leave them to meet this momentous issue unwarned? — Testimonies for the Church 5:712. ChS 162.3 [...]. We have been looking many years for a Sunday law to be enacted in our land; and now that the movement is right upon us, we ask, Will our people do their duty in the matter?

Can we not assist in lifting the standard, and in calling to the front those who have a regard for their religious rights and privileges? The time is fast approaching when those who choose to obey God rather than man, will be made to feel the hand of oppression. Shall we then dishonor God by keeping silent while His holy commandments are trodden under foot? While the Protestant world is by her attitude making concessions to Rome, let us arouse to comprehend the situation, and view the contest before us in its true bearings.

Let the watchmen now lift up their voice, and give the message which is present truth for this time. Let us show people where we are in prophetic history, and seek to arouse the spirit of true Protestantism, awakening the world to a sense of the value of the privileges of religious liberty so long enjoyed. — *Testimonies for the Church* 5:716. ChS 163.1. **The people of our land need to be aroused to resist the advances of this most dangerous foe to civil and religious liberty.** — *The Spirit of Prophecy* 4:382. ChS 163.2 [...] [EGW Writings. Christian Service. Taken from: <https://m.egwwritings.org/en/book/13.1131>].

I would say that when reading what is said here, one has the impression of being in another universe, that of the prophecies of the book of Revelation.

Nevertheless, what is presented is “palpable” and intelligible:

As soon as laws proclaim the obligation of Sunday observance and men obey and choose to reject the Sabbath, sign of the Lord's authority, to submit to the laws of the papacy, father of the Sunday laws, established as the mark of the sovereignty of the pope, then the reality of “**the mark of the beast**” will be manifest.

In this context, she also calls us to awaken consciences, so that the truth may be brought to all and religious freedom preserved, the goal being that the word of God for the present time may be preached, despite the persecutions that will be put in place against those who refuse to “bend their backs” before the Sunday laws by choosing to reject them. In such a context, she exhorts the members of God's faithful people to stand firm in the face of what they will have to endure.

Mrs. White adds that **we are not faithful servants of God “if we sit in quietude, doing nothing to preserve liberty of conscience”, especially that which we have in not wishing to observe the Sunday laws.** She tells us, moreover, in regard to these laws, that it is our duty as Christians to avert this danger which threatens us.

To do this, she invites us to “**thus interposing the most effectual protest against measures to restrict liberty of conscience**” and to “**to be aroused to resist the advances of this most dangerous foe to civil and religious liberty**”.

We understand, then, that the directives left by Mrs. White call upon us to be ready to defend ourselves when national reforms shall have put in place the Sunday laws designed to restrict our religious liberty. And here we are! Based on what we have just seen, I would say that it is imperative for Seventh-day Adventists to see beyond the dominical laws, therefore the Sunday laws, because what is at stake in the invisible is titanic.

As we have just seen, the prophecy left to us by the late prophetess, Ellen G. White, who lived within the Seventh-day Adventist religion, presents the obligation to observe Sunday laws as being the sign of the last great conflict to be waged on this earth at the spiritual level. In doing so, Seventh-day Adventists have been on the lookout for decades, waiting for Sunday laws to be put in place, in order to fight them. However, I would say to you that the time for waiting is over because these laws are indeed in place. Indeed, Sunday laws are already oppressing us, the observers of the Sabbath and Shabbat. I am one of their victims because these laws have kept me in precariousness for the **last 27 years.**

I present this reality in my book entitled “**Infamy of the State**” in the chapter “**Brief career synopsis, philosophy of life and discriminatory oppression**”.

By these Sunday laws, which I remind you are of a religious essence, because they have as their paternity the ancient people, the Romans, and as their maternity the Catholic Church, the observers of the Sabbath and the Shabbat of past centuries and of this generation, are discriminated against in terms of their possibility of professional success. This is particularly true for my profession, hairdressing, a profession where the large number of customers is on Saturdays.

This discrimination is also evident for all professions that do not have exemptions allowing them to work on Sundays, and who can generally do so only 5 times a year and this, during holidays, such as those at the end of the year.

These Sunday laws prohibit hiring on Sundays, these are therefore two consecutive days where an employee who observes the Sabbath or Shabbat and who finds employment in a hair salon, will not be able to work, the first on Saturday by his faith, the second on Sunday because of the Sunday laws.

And why this state of affairs?

I repeat, because of a religious law while France is a Secular Republic that prides itself on no longer being under the yoke of religions. If this situation is difficult for adults, Sabbath or Shabbat observers, it is even more so for our children when it comes to entering the world of work. Let's take the concrete case of young Sabbath or Shabbat observers who wish to work as hairdressers:

In my book entitled **“Infamy of the State”** in the chapter **“Historical and legislative reality of the unconstitutional character of the Sunday laws”**, I provide you with proof that these laws which are established in France impose that the day of rest for hairdressers and especially their apprentices be on two consecutive days, Sunday being obligatory.

Which leaves as an alternative for the second day, Saturday or Monday.

Saturday being the flagship day of this activity, hair salons have generally adopted Monday as their closing day. Closing on Saturday would be “financial suicide” for them because, on this day, it is often a third of the week's turnover that is made.

Thus the young person who observes the Sabbath or the Shabbat, not being able to be there on Saturday, finds himself outside the legislative framework allowing him to become an apprentice hairdresser. The same is true for most of the other trades not benefiting from this exemption.

As you can see, the Sunday laws are already active. The time has come for us to fight for their repeal. I have initiated a process so that the French Constitutional Council can, under cover of the Council of State and the administrative judges of the Bordeaux Court of Appeal, repeal the dominical laws and the vaccinal laws against covid 19. The process I have undertaken is a QPC.

It should be noted that the legislative texts used as an argumentative basis in my legal file intended for the repeal of these laws were included in my book **“Infamy of the State”**.

Thus, these supports presented in my book, being of supranational scope, they will be able to help, I believe, the French Sabbath and Shabbat observers to defend themselves, but also those of other nations who have suffered or are still suffering under these iniquitous laws. Now that these points have been established, for information, here are the bases of a QPC: **“The Council of State was led to rule on the question of the articulation of the mechanism of the priority question of constitutionality (QPC hereinafter), instituted by the constitutional reform of July 23, 2008, and the European legal order. Under the provisions of Article 61-1 of the Constitution, this procedure allows any person party to a trial or proceeding to argue that a legislative provision infringes the rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution.**

If the question satisfies certain conditions, it is up to the Constitutional Council, seized on reference by the Council of State and the Court of Cassation, to rule and, where appropriate, to repeal the legislative provision concerned. [...]”

[(French) Conseil d'État. Dossier thématique du 10 mars 2022. Le juge administratif et le droit de l'Union européenne. 2-2 Un dialogue des Juges [4] a permis de concilier l'office du juge administratif Juge national et comme juge de droit commun du droit de l'Union Européenne. 2-2-1 le conseil Constitutionnel, le Conseil d'État et la CJUE ont jugé que le contrôle prioritaire de la constitutionnalité des lois était compatible avec le droit de l'Union. Taken from the website: <https://www.conseil-etat.fr> (translated into English from the original text)].

In this text, mention is made of *[(French) Article 61-1 de la Constitution "du 4 octobre 1958" (translated into English from the original text)]*, let us discover its content by reading the following: **"When, during proceedings in progress before a court, it is argued that a legislative provision infringes on the rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution, the Constitutional Council may be referred to this question upon referral from the Council of State or the Court of Cassation, which shall rule within a specified period.**

An organic law shall determine the conditions of application of this article."

In this text, an organic law is mentioned. Let us discover this excerpt which establishes a chilling reality about the fight that I have undertaken and which concerns all observers of the Sabbath and the Shabbat:

"The jurisdiction shall rule without delay by a reasoned decision on the transmission of the priority question of constitutionality to the Council of State or the Court of Cassation. This transmission is carried out if the following conditions are met: [...]

"1° The contested provision is applicable to the dispute or procedure, or constitutes the basis of the prosecutions;

"2° It has not already been declared to be in conformity with the Constitution in the grounds and operative part of a decision of the Constitutional Council, unless circumstances change; [...]" *[(French) Article 23-2 de la LOI organique n° 2009-1523 du 10 décembre 2009 relative à l'application de l'article 61-1 de la Constitution (translated into English from the original text)].*

What is important to remember here is that if the Constitutional Council (French), in one of its decisions, has already declared that the text of the law that a citizen presents for repeal through a QPC was in accordance with the Constitution (French), a new QPC cannot be introduced to re-examine another request for repeal on the same subject. In practice, what does this imply?

Thus, if this QPC that I filed, by which I request that the members of the Constitutional Council, under the cover of the administrative judges of the Bordeaux Court of Appeal and the members of the Council of State, be able to repeal the Sunday laws as well as the vaccinal laws against covid 19, is rejected, these unfair laws will then be recognized by the Constitutional Council as being in accordance with the Constitution, and they will never again be able to be repealed, unless circumstances change.

We are well aware that given the domination of the papacy over the nations, having allowed it to integrate the Sunday laws into their legislation, no new circumstances will be able to hinder the dominical laws.

Thus, if you do not support me in this fight that I am waging against these laws, these yokes will perhaps never be removed from us again.

Thus, this fight is not only mine, but also that of all the observers of the Sabbath and the Shabbat of this generation and those to come.

Not taking part in what is happening today, in order to win the case (win the battle) against the Sunday and vaccinal laws against covid-19, is to close, perhaps forever, this opportunity offered to us by the Holy Spirit.

The time to wake up, Sabbath and Shabbat keepers has come!

This is even more true for you, Seventh-day Adventists, who keep the guidelines that the Lord left us through His servant, the late prophetess, Mrs. Ellen. G. White. The time for this prophecy of the servant of the Lord, above recalled, presenting the characteristics of **“the mark of the beast”, has come.**

Let us remember, it was to be “set in motion” as soon as nations chose to elevate Sunday laws by giving them a place of honor in their legislation, thus obliging their citizens to observe them.

To continue, I would say to you that some of you must certainly live in nations where the Sunday laws do not oppress them, nevertheless, this does not prevent them from acting. To understand this, we must not lose sight of the reality contained in *[1 Corinthians 12 verses 12-27]*, presenting the people of God as an inseparable unit like our body.

In doing so, when one part is in pain, it is the whole being that is in suffering.

Thus, the Lord, calling us to be the guardians of our brothers and sisters, even those who are not directly concerned by the oppression of these iniquitous laws incriminated in this letter, can act to support their their beloved ones in Christ.

All of you Sabbat and Shabbath keepers, and especially you who proudly bear the name of Seventh-day Adventist and who have the faith, as it is also my conviction, that Mrs. Ellen G. White was a prophetess of the Lord, you cannot remain idle while the Sunday laws oppress us.

It would therefore be desirable if the Protestant Christian peoples, especially the Seventh-day Adventists, could take a stand to combat these laws and to make the world aware of their iniquitous reality. On this day, sentinels of God, I need you who faithfully carry the standard of Christ to lead this crusade.

To do this, I invite you first to read my book entitled **“Infamy of the State”**, available for free download on the following tab of my website:

- <https://www.kenny-ronald-marguerite.com/infamy-of-the-state>

In addition, there is also a French version of my book, under the title **“Infamie d'État”** which is also downloadable on the following tab of my website:

- <https://www.kenny-ronald-marguerite.com/infamies-d-etat>

After reading this book, I invite you to make it known by sharing it by: **email, Facebook, WhatsApp, Instagram, Tik Tok, etc.** The knowledge contained in this work must cover the surface of the earth as the water of the sea does for the oceans.

Based on the above and to allow you to judge the merits of this legal process that I have undertaken, I put the elements at your disposal that may be useful for a better understanding of the case. To do this, you will simply need to make a request via the **“contact”** tab on my website, the address of which appears at the bottom of this letter.

Finally, I would say that I am moving forward with the support of the Spirit of God, and I have faith that you will hear my call and bring me your help.

Unity is strength, I hope that this book, which I am making available to you in English and French, will allow us to be heard by the greatest number and to be victorious.

P.S.: I am a French speaker and I translated this open letter myself, not having been able to hire a professional English-speaking proofreader since the urgency of the situation required that it be published as soon as possible. Please excuse me for any mistakes (grammar, spelling, etc.) that you find.

Maranatha,

Your servant, Kenny Ronald MARGUERITE.

5 Of Suffering and Ink

To begin this part, I would say that generally in life, following the experiences that I live, particularly the negative ones, I sit down and reflect and in a spirit of prayer, I seek to understand what happened to me and the reasons for what I lived or suffered. With these established bases, in the case of Mr. Vincent GUILGAULT, this unjust civil servant, I looked for avenues of reflection to explain his behavior.

Have other people, like me, experienced these misadventures, these tribulations under his yoke? Could it be my basis of faith that poses a problem for him, because the very names of my companies demonstrate that I am a Christian, because the first is called Éditions Dieu t'aime sas (EDT SAS) which means in English Edition God loves you and the second has the trade name Éditions Galaad.

So, is this gentleman anti-Christian? Or is he a fanatical follower of the Catholic Church and is he aware of my books which denounce the abominable acts as well as the transgressions of the word of God which are behind this religion?

To discover these realities, I invite you to read my books entitled **“Inquisitiô (The three angels' message), volume II The reality of the attack of the little horn of Daniel 7 against the Law of God and the times of prophecy. Historical part”** and **“Inquisitiô (The three angels' message), tome III. The reality of the attack of the little horn of Daniel 7 against the Law of God and the times of prophecy. Prophetic part”**.

To continue, I would tell you that to this day I am fighting like a lion so that my cause is heard. In doing so, when I realized that the President of the Republic, Mr. MACRON and his government would not provide me with any concrete help, not wanting to give up and with a view to diversifying the potential possibilities of support, I therefore undertook to make my situation known to elected officials.

To do this, I wrote an open letter that I sent on August 10, 2021 to all French senators and deputies, on their messaging services available on the websites of the Senate and the National Assembly.

Unfortunately, no one intervened. Perhaps I was naive in hoping for a response? I also sent an email to the president of the territorial community of Martinique on the same date (August 10, 2021), from this side, ditto, no response.

No one wanted to hear me at the level of the State and other political bodies, in doing so, on this day, December 18, 2024, I find myself in a more critical situation than a homeless person. Has Mr. GUILGAULT's plan finally been achieved?

Do you realize that I asked for help from the representatives of the people, our deputies and our senators, more than three years ago and no follow-up was given, leaving me **“macerate in my juice of suffering”**.

That the upper echelons of the State do not deign to hear my cry is one thing, but that the representatives of the people, the elected officials who are supposed to represent us, do the same, that devastates me. What analysis can be drawn from what is happening to me? How can we understand that no one has reacted, even by trying to inquire about my situation to know if what I am reporting is reality, especially since I have provided proof of what I am saying?

Nothing “abnormal” a priori about all this! A business leader can be prevented from working by the State, among other things because of the vaccinal laws against covid 19, therefore hindered in spite of himself and be broken, spolied by a civil servant, without anyone feeling concerned.

It is true that we know the administrative slowness but when I find myself with less than the minimum vital to live, does my case not deserve at least a verification of my statements?

To continue, I would say that the crowning glory of this affair is that this official whose name I have mentioned so many times, managed to bring a business leader who had two businesses that were beginning to prosper, to find himself in a worse financial situation than that of homeless people (SDF).

Here is an image that comes to mind when considering my situation:

I find myself like a man who was shipwrecked on a desert island with only a crate of canned goods for a living. On this island, there is no way to open these cans that do not have an easy opening. You can hit them with stones, but it only deforms them but does not open them because these cans are made of reinforced steel.

So, while there is a small fresh water point nearby, a cargo of canned goods that would have allowed him to live for months, here he is fainting, and on the verge of dying the most atrocious death, of hunger, on a load of canned goods.

This image represents well what I am experiencing because, on the one hand I have two companies, but I wasn't able to work there for months, because I am not vaccinated and the vaccinal laws against covid 19 forbade me to do so, while they themselves contravene the constitution.

On the other hand, this aid which could have allowed me to keep my head above water was no longer paid to me, because of the approximate handling of my file by this tax official. I have been living in great suffering for months!

Nevertheless, on this day, I realize that the ways of heaven are inscrutable and that the Lord guides us on the most incomprehensible paths so that we can work in his name.

When I took up the pen to write this book, my primary objective was simply to make my voice heard so that the blatant injustice of which I am a victim, under the yoke of Mr. GUILGAULT, would cease. To do this, I took several steps, I had, among other things, good hope of being heard by the President of the Republic, a deputy, a senator, the prefect of MARTINIQUE, a local elected official, etc. finally someone, but here it is, more than three years later none of them have moved.

I have already presented to you all the steps that I have put in place.

So, as already presented, at that time, things had become so difficult that I also intellectualized that from now on I was part of the "disadvantaged", by submitting, at the beginning of February 2022, an application for aid to the CCAS of my city of residence.

My words are in no way pejorative, they simply come from the fact that it is generally those who are in great precariousness who approach this organization.

In response, I was granted aid of 200 euros, 100 of which were paid in February 2022 and the rest in March. This approach that I undertook at the CCAS left two feelings in me:

The first is the need to ensure that justice is done to me and that the unspeakable acts of this tax official, making me go from the state of business leader to that of begging, are known by as many people as possible.

The second feeling that drives me towards this approach is gratitude, because seeing myself reduced to such a condition which is certainly very difficult, but that the Lord opened this door to me, allowing me to have this help from the CCAS filled me with joy.

I am grateful to those who are part of the committee for the allocation of this aid within the Lamentin Town Hall (MARTINIQUE). May the Lord bless and protect you all, as well as your loved ones.

It is comforting for me to know that these structures are listening to the needs of the little people. Yes, I still have not "digested" the non-return of the senators, the deputies or the president of the CTM, while I am in this great precariousness.

I am aware that I am not the only one in this situation, but even just a response to show that our fate does not leave our elected representatives in complete indifference would have made all the difference.

Did France need a new poor person, did it need a new person on welfare, living on minimum social benefits?

Where is France going, if from now on the iniquitous (malicious), the powerful, can oppress, with complete impunity, the little people?!

So, having found myself alone with my pain, with no one to help me, I had to do what the Lord gives me to do best, dissect texts to extract the substantive marrow. It is with a pen of suffering that I do it.

The end result is that the primary reason for which I undertook to write, and which is the chapter entitled “**New evidence on the responsibility of the civil servant Mr. Vincent GUILGAULT, as head of the FIP accounting department other categories, in the alleged external illegality**”, has become secondary and an insignificant part of my work presented in this book.

Today, I glorify God for guiding me on this path, for allowing me to search for texts in order to present my right to defend myself and along the way, by dint of “to potasser (studying)”, I came across a gold mine of information that allowed me to go well beyond my initial approach.

So, today, I am given the opportunity to defend the cause of those not vaccinated against covid 19 who have been bullied, stigmatized. Why? While the various texts that I report in this book clearly show that there is a transgression of the law in what is put in place, by France but also by many countries.

Then, in a second step, the Spirit of God inspired me to fight for my rights as well as those of all Sabbath and Shabbat observers who have been oppressed by Sunday laws for centuries.

What more noble fight than that of shedding light on what women and men have experienced and where they have unjustly lost their lives, under the wrath of the black widow that is the Catholic Church, just because they had chosen to remain faithful to the Lord and rejected the dogma of this religion.

This is how the result of my sufferings under the yoke of this iniquitous official who works in taxes gave a result in three poles which ended up in this book forming only one, as if by a fusion, thus, in these pages all my struggles found the same setting (jewel case), to be able to express themselves.

To continue, I would like to tell you a secret:

I am not a lawyer, and these subjects that are dealt with in this work, until recently, just before I started writing, I did not master them at all, and the texts that I quote in these lines were for the most part unknown to me.

Amazing, you might say, why, especially with regard to the vaccinal laws against covid 19, have lawyers not carried out these analyses that are presented here? How can a neophyte have the audacity to present such a file?

In response, I would tell you that it is the Spirit of God who guided me to these texts and I want to glorify the Lord for this spiritual sword that he gives me to carry to you, singularly, to those who are suffering because of these discriminatory laws which, concerning the vaccinal laws, prevented them from carrying out their activities because they were not vaccinated against covid 19 or, within the framework of the Sunday laws, which force them to be unemployed, in spite of themselves on Sundays.

I know that for many of you, presenting the all-powerful of God and highlighting the magnificence of his works may seem pure madness.

And yet! Only the future will tell if the legal cases that I am carrying out and which are presented in this book will be favorable to me. If I win my case, especially in the case relating to the vaccinal laws against covid 19, it will be clear that the Lord is indeed on my side and that I have not lost my mind, his all-powerful will thus be recognized. Because where jurists, lawyers, deputies, senators etc., have not been able to defeat the vaccinal laws against covid 19, I, who do not have legal training, under the aegis of God, have been able to.

So, listen, because the future will tell us what it is!

Some might have capitulated, would not have laid themselves bare by revealing such difficult and personal elements, but writing helps me to externalize the unthinkable, especially since I do not endorse violence as a means of dialogue, because other means of expression to make oneself heard exist.

Proof of this is, because although unjustly oppressed, cornered, I do not resort to violence but to the pen, to make myself heard and I thank the Lord for what he has done with me (makes me become).

One of the realities that is mine on this day is that I will not give up, until justice is done to me, and I will cry out with all my soul against the abominations that I have suffered. In the Mighty name of Jesus Christ, he the King of kings and the Lord of lords, all those who are at the origin of my downfall **“will not have my skin”**, I will fight to the end like a lion.

So, while the pitfalls present themselves like the Red Sea and the problems and difficulties follow me like the raging Egyptians. I am certainly destitute, but I continue to move forward despite life's storms thanks to my faith and the fact that I know I serve a great God. So I know he will act, one way or another!

In doing so, one thing is certain, although I am weakened by this extremely difficult and damaging situation for me (you now know the details of the case), these people will not destroy me because, as I have indicated, the Lord gives me the ability to put, through my pen, my experiences and my feelings, it is my outlet.

This book was written in French and English, so my story which goes beyond understanding will be known beyond borders.

I am not asking for vengeance, I am letting God act in his time. My goal is that justice be done to me, as well as to all those who have suffered and are still suffering the repercussions of the vaccinal laws against covid 19 and the Sunday laws, which are nevertheless unconstitutional and who therefore do not have the right to be in France.

To continue, I would say that we have come a long way, so far!

Throughout these lines I am convinced that I have armed you, with a view to asserting your rights or those of all those who are or have been suffering under the iniquitous rule of the vaccinal laws against covid 19 and the Sunday laws.

With this argument, the fruit of my reflection, I would like to challenge you, whether you are French or an inhabitant of another part of the globe:

1. Now that you have read this book, do you think I am paranoid?
2. Do my words seem like quibbles to you?
3. Do you think that in this century, in this country that is France, which prides itself on being the country of human rights, that what I have experienced has a reason to exist?
4. Can a civil servant, in an iniquitous (malicious) manner and without any reason, torment a business leader by forcing him to close his doors and reducing him to a state of begging, without anyone protesting...?
5. Can a government, which is supposed to serve the people, in the country that has the reputation of being the country of human rights, with impunity enact discriminatory and baseless laws and decrees in order to oppress a part of its people, without anyone protesting?
6. Where have gone the law, justice, fraternity and chivalrous qualities that make the honor of the human being?
7. If you were in my place what would you do, or if you were in the place of these caregivers who find themselves without resources, because they chose in their soul and conscience not to be vaccinated against covid 19, or that of these Sabbath or Shabbat observers who suffer the iron yoke of Sunday laws what would you wish?

To you who are reading me, do not forget that my current pain and that of the unvaccinated against covid 19 who have been forced into unemployment, or that of the Sabbath or Shabbat observers who are hindered by these iniquitous Sunday laws, could well be yours, or that of one of your loved ones.

Well, what you would have wanted for yourself, do it for us!

Let your cries rise from the depths of the universe to denounce these abominations that we are made to experience as those who are not vaccinated against covid 19, or as Sabbath or Shabbat observers or that I lived under the yoke of Mr. Vincent GUILGAULT without the representatives of the State intervening.

I expect your help, do not wait for death to strike us to come with flowers, cry on our graves and set us up as martyrs of the system.

It is now that we need you, today is the day when you must act, not only so that justice is done for me, but even more, in order to deliver all those who have lost their jobs because of the vaccinal laws against covid 19 or the Sabbath or Shabbat observers who are dispossessed by Sunday laws.

It is up to us to change things, by the grace of God.

To do this, (again I give you a little biblical wink), one of the beautiful images I have of unity that brings victory is presented in [*Ecclesiastes 4 verses 9-12, King James Bible*] which establishes the following: **“Two are better than one; because they have a good reward for their labour. 10 For if they fall, the one will lift up his fellow: but woe to him that is alone when he falleth; for he hath not another to help him up. Again, if two lie together, then they have heat: but how can one be warm alone? And if one prevail against him, two shall withstand him; and a threefold cord is not quickly broken.”**

This text in its essence, presents, for me, the union as making the strength. The victory of the Allies, despite their faith or their diverse convictions, during the Second World War, shows us the value of the unity of all against tyranny.

You must now act.

My fiancée Nicole and I have done more than our part, because this book, as you have been able to realize, which is the fruit of a long and hard work, we offer it to you, so that you can change things.

Indeed, in accordance with what the Spirit of God inspired me, this document had to be free, so that all those who feel concerned by the cause can read it and mobilize.

Share this support (book) with as many people as possible, by all means, **by email, Facebook, WhatsApp, Instagram, Tik Tok, etc.**, I make it available to you in French and English, on my site. You will find these coordinates at the end of this chapter.

One of the blessings that God gave me was to touch the heart of my fiancée Nicole, so that she could agree to give shape to my ideas and correct this long document that you have in your hands in its French version.

Unfortunately, the correction could not be complete, since this file had to come out as soon as possible, so mistakes may remain, and we ask you to excuse us for this.

To continue, I would say that I have worked on average 8 to 12 hours a day on this file, in English and French versions, since October 2021 and I am in the process of finalizing it today, December 18, 2021.

The goal being that it comes out as soon as possible. At the same time, I continued, as I said, to work on my other works.

You received the fruit of this work for free.

In return, I have included a request for financial assistance that I am asking from those who will read me. Thus, even if I am currently in need, because of a situation beyond my control, I am hopeful of receiving help. Thanks to her, and this already makes me happy, I will be able to share my thoughts and convictions which will not fall into disuse.

My work will therefore not be in vain because it will, I am sure, enrich those who will read my books. So that you can understand my philosophy and my faith, I will present you with an allegory:

Imagine that you have an orange tree that gives you abundant oranges that are as sweet as honey, which you intend to sell. However, situated where you are, no one knows that you have any for sale. As a result, your oranges rot on the tree while you are in need. To change this situation, you make plans to sell them and to do so you present them at a fair so that as many people as possible can taste them. Knowing that they are as sweet as you want them to be, you know that those who come and taste them will be conquered and that you will be able to live off your harvest.

This persona that I adopt to present my books may seem presumptuous to you. Nevertheless, for me, my works are like oranges, since they are the fruit of extensive research and a lot of hard work. Given their content, I am confident that they will provide you with knowledge that will strengthen you. I still have much to tell you through my books, which are in the process of being published.

I invite you, through their lines, to make new journeys. Before continuing, I would like to make it clear that I did not study literature, I am above all a passionate author not a writer.

I address various themes in my books, as is the case in this one, which are dear to my heart and which highlight my deep convictions. This love of writing came to me one day when I had to reflect on the fleeting duration of our life on Earth.

Many people have worked, enjoy the fruits of their labour during their lifetime, but often after their death there is nothing left of what they were, of their thoughts, or of their convictions. They go down into the grave and **“wither away like the ether”**.

I have no knowledge of what my forefathers were like. What their convictions were or what they did during their lives. All of this remains a mystery to me. Especially since I hail from the Caribbean, I come from a people who have experienced the chains and alienation of slavery. My need to write and my passion for words have stemmed from these reflections! On the other hand, when I read books that great authors like Tertullian, Martin Luther or Ellen G. White, the great reformers, etc., wrote a long time ago, I get to know them and their writings strengthen me. My need to write and my passion for words have stemmed from these reflections!

My ambition in this life is neither wealth nor fame. My abiding goal is to bring my knowledge to this generation and to leave a literary legacy to future generations. My deepest wish is to convey my knowledge and convictions in writing in order to share my books with those who will enjoy them and who, I hope, will be inspired by them. **There is still much to do.**

If this book you have in your hands has strengthened you, I invite you to read and distribute my other works to as many people as possible, because they will certainly bring you knowledge that will certainly also be beneficial to you. Many of these books are, or will soon be, by the grace of God available for free download on my website.

Unfortunately for me, “money being the sinews of war”, since I have already invested all of my funds in the publishing of these first books that I presented to you before, in the section entitled “REMINDER OF FACTS AND PROCEDURE”, in doing so, I no longer have the means to continue this work. Indeed, apart from these books that I mentioned, I still have *5 other works (Book)* that I have already put in place the framework but which are awaiting completion.

To conclude this beautiful journey that we have made thanks to this book, I would say to you that I hope that it will find its audience and that you, who will be led to read it, will not remain insensitive to this call for help that I address to you. I therefore appeal to your generosity. If you have been touched by this book, please help me to continue to fortify and help the greatest number of people. To do this, if you feel like it, you have the possibility to make a donation on one of the tabs **“Donate (with Paypal)”** or **“Faire un don (avec Paypal)”** present on my site: **kenny-ronald-marguerite.com**. **NB:** (tab located on the screen, on the left for computers and at the bottom for the mobile phones).