

Question: What would change if the the plaintiffs in the lawsuit against the 10 commandments were to agree, if they also include the Two Commandments in Matthew 22 and add in Matthew 6:1~5 just to really upset the evangelicals?

If the plaintiffs in the Louisiana *Ten Commandments* lawsuit were to propose a compromise by allowing the display of *both* the *Ten Commandments* and the *Two Commandments* from *Matthew 22:37-40*, along with *Matthew 6:1-5*, it could introduce an interesting legal and political twist to the case. Here's how it might play out:

### 1. Legal Impact: Strengthening the Secular Argument

The plaintiffs could argue that if the state is going to mandate a religious display, then it should be balanced by Jesus' own words about love and humility, which directly challenge the hypocrisy of public religious displays. This approach could:

- Force the state to reconsider: If Louisiana insists on a religious display, then including *Matthew 22* and *Matthew 6* would highlight that Jesus himself critiqued public religiosity, undercutting the argument that the Ten Commandments belong in classrooms for moral or historical reasons.
- Bolster the Establishment Clause claim: By adding a contrasting viewpoint from within Christianity itself, the plaintiffs could demonstrate that the government's endorsement of *one* religious interpretation over others is inherently problematic.

### 2. Political Consequences: Exposing Hypocrisy

- Evangelicals might oppose their own book: *Matthew 6:1-5* specifically warns against public displays of piety, essentially rebuking the very idea of putting the Ten Commandments in schools for show. Evangelicals who support the law would be forced to either:
  - Accept the full biblical context, undermining their own argument.
  - Reject *Matthew 6*, thereby admitting they are using religion as a political tool rather than a sincere moral guide.
- Splitting the religious right: More moderate Christians who emphasize love (*Matthew 22*) and humility (*Matthew 6*) could side with the plaintiffs, while hardcore evangelicals would be left defending a selective and politically motivated reading of scripture.

### 3. Possible Supreme Court Reaction

The Supreme Court would likely still reject the display *altogether* rather than entertain a compromise. If the plaintiffs proposed including *both* the Ten Commandments and Jesus' own words, Louisiana's government would likely refuse the compromise, because it would undercut their culture war narrative. This would reinforce the notion that the law is more about Christian nationalism than religious history.

If Louisiana *did* accept the compromise, it could weaken their legal position, since adding more religious text makes it harder to argue the display serves a purely "historical" or "secular" purpose.

#### 4. The Funniest Possible Outcome

If Louisiana's government agrees to include *Matthew 6:1-5*, public school classrooms across the state would be required to display the words of Jesus that essentially say:

- "Do not practice your righteousness in front of others to be seen by them."
- "Do not be like the hypocrites who love to pray in public places to be seen by men."
- "When you pray, go into your room and close the door."

This would be an *epic troll move* against the evangelical politicians who pushed for the law in the first place.

In short, this approach would either:

1. Force Louisiana to reject their own religious law, exposing its true political intent.
2. Force evangelicals to argue against Jesus' words, undermining their credibility.
3. Lead to the Supreme Court striking the law down faster, as it would no longer have even a thinly veiled secular justification.

Either way, it's a win for church-state separation advocates and a hilarious self-own for evangelical lawmakers.

Question: If you add in the Treaty of Tripoli, "not in any sense" that would also by default include the 10 commandments, correct? How would this effect (affect?) the decision?

Yes, adding *Article 11* of the Treaty of Tripoli (1797) would directly challenge the basis for displaying the *Ten Commandments* in Louisiana public schools. The treaty, ratified unanimously by the U.S. Senate and signed by President John Adams, explicitly states:

"The government of the United States of America is not, in any sense, founded on the Christian religion."

This would include the *Ten Commandments* by default, because their display in classrooms is being justified on the basis that they are a foundational part of U.S. law and government. If the U.S. is *not* founded on Christianity, then using a religious text (the *Ten Commandments*) as a basis for moral instruction in public schools contradicts an official U.S. treaty that holds the same legal status as the Constitution.

---

## How This Would Affect the Supreme Court Decision

If the Treaty of Tripoli were included in the argument, it could significantly strengthen the case against Louisiana's law in several ways:

### 1. Undercutting the "Historical Document" Argument

- Louisiana lawmakers have tried to justify the Ten Commandments display by claiming it is a "historical document" that influenced American law.
- *The Treaty of Tripoli*, which was written at the time of the Founding Fathers and ratified by the early U.S. government, *directly contradicts* this claim.
- If the government wasn't founded on Christianity, then the argument that the *Ten Commandments* played a special role in American law loses credibility.

### 2. Forcing a Choice: Religion or History?

- If Louisiana is going to mandate the Ten Commandments as a historical foundation of U.S. law, they must also include the Treaty of Tripoli to provide an accurate historical counterpoint.
- This puts the state in a difficult position: Either they acknowledge U.S. law was not based on Christianity (and the Ten Commandments are irrelevant), or they reject historical facts and expose the law as purely religious in intent.
- If the state *rejects* the Treaty of Tripoli's statement, it risks legitimizing selective historical revisionism, which courts generally frown upon.

### 3. Strengthening the Establishment Clause Argument

- The Treaty of Tripoli was an official statement from the U.S. government to a foreign power, reinforcing the principle that America's government is secular.
- If the Supreme Court considers the historical context of church-state separation, the treaty's language makes it even harder for Louisiana to argue that displaying the Ten Commandments is anything but religious indoctrination.

### 4. Politically Embarrassing for Evangelicals

- If Louisiana refuses to acknowledge the Treaty of Tripoli, it exposes politically motivated historical cherry-picking.
  - It forces evangelical lawmakers to either:
    - Accept that the U.S. was never a *Christian nation* (which undermines their culture war arguments).
    - Or reject a *treaty signed by the Founding Fathers* (which contradicts their usual appeals to originalism).
-

## The Funniest Possible Outcome

If Louisiana is forced to include *both* the Ten Commandments and the Treaty of Tripoli in every public classroom, the result would be hilarious cognitive dissonance:

- On one side of the wall: *The Ten Commandments* suggesting America was founded on Christian moral principles.
- On the other side: *The Treaty of Tripoli* explicitly saying America is not founded on Christianity.

This would completely nullify the original intent of the law and likely lead Louisiana lawmakers to abandon the effort altogether—or at least expose their agenda to the courts.

---

## Final Verdict: Would It Change the Supreme Court's Ruling?

Including the Treaty of Tripoli wouldn't necessarily be the deciding factor, but it would provide additional weight against Louisiana's law by:

1. Strengthening the historical argument against the Ten Commandments' role in U.S. governance.
2. Making it more difficult for justices to justify the law on secular or historical grounds.
3. Embarrassing Louisiana politicians into abandoning their argument.

If the Court's conservative justices still want to uphold Louisiana's law, they will have to completely ignore American history and rely solely on ideology—which would be a harder sell in their written opinions.

In short: Yes, it would absolutely hurt Louisiana's case, and it would be a brilliant legal maneuver to force them into a contradiction.