

**THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF FREEMASONRY**  
**—AN UPSET THESIS**  
*by George Woolmer*

**PART I—INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

**Introduction**

What is the origin of Freemasonry?

Is knowing any use?

The origin of Freemasonry is a mystery, and the vast majority of members would probably like to know. But in practice this knowledge would help determine the ‘ancient landmarks’ of the Order, and its aims. This would enable us to gauge the movement’s success. It might also help dampen attacks on the movement—many, no doubt, by those with ancestors who benefited from Freemasonry. Overall, it might help the movement to get on with its mission—unless it’s lost!

This paper aims to determine the origin of Freemasonry.

From this aim, one sub-aim develops and another is added; these are:

1. To determine the vital occurrences and decisions in the formation of Freemasonry.
2. To determine the salient occurrences and decisions in Freemasonry’s development.

**Definitions**

The paper uses a number of key terms, the meaning of many of which, if thought of at all, vary from person to person. Here defined are the meanings which this paper endeavours to ascribe.

***Jerusalem Church***

The Jerusalem Church, centred at ‘New Jerusalem’, that is, Qumran, and led by James the Just, brother of Jesus, stemmed from the sect based there, the Essenes, also known as the Nazarenes, and taught that Jesus was the rightful Davidic King of the Jews, was a mortal man, had survived his crucifixion; and whose teachings included his wish for a just and egalitarian world, the right of every individual to have responsible self-determination, and that the individual, by living an altruistic life founded on such teachings, would achieve communion with God.

***Gnosticism***

Gnosticism is based on the construct that if by acquisition of knowledge and the use of the intellect an individual achieves an altruistic life then that individual gains a divine spark, light or principle, which upon the death of the individual continues on.

***Christian Gnosticism***

Christian Gnosticism is the belief that, by gaining a true knowledge of Jesus, including that he was a mortal, not a god, survived his crucifixion, and was the rightful Davidic King of the Jews, together with knowing his altruistic teachings, including his call for justice and egalitarianism for all and the right of responsible self-determination, one can, without the aid of an interceding priest, personally attain a closeness to the Supreme Being of the Universe, thereby receiving a divine spark, light or principle, which, upon personal death, continues on.

### ***Rosicrucianism***

Rosicrucianism, a movement launched in 1614, Protestant and anti–Roman Catholicism and oppression, and only practicable in Protestant countries, spoke of a hidden vault with ancient documents which would help restore knowledge and truth, including of Jesus, called for intellectual, spiritual and social freedoms, and declared that a new age of enlightenment was coming; attracting learned and scientific people, indeed it did: under the Rosicrucian inspiration there dawned the Age of Reason.

### ***Lodge***

A lodge can be of the operative stonemason type or speculative, the context in which the term is located designating its nature.

### ***Operative lodge***

An operative lodge is one of practicing stonemasons.

### ***Operative lodge building***

An operative lodge building is a structure used by locally serving stonemasons and associates as a workshop and mess hall and, sometimes, a barracks.

### ***Operative lodge mason***

Operative lodge masons are a group of stonemasons associated with an operative lodge building.

### ***Operative masonry***

Operative masonry is the work carried out by operative masons, that is, building, which sometimes includes design, and always the preparation of building stone and building in stone.

### ***Non-operative***

A non-operative is any member of an operative lodge who is not an operative stonemason or a speculative mason, being a member for many possible reasons, for example a building owner keeping a close check on building progress; in some historical cases it is now not known if non-stonemason members were speculative or not; in these cases they are conservatively listed as non-operatives.

### ***Nascent Freemasonry***

Nascent Freemasonry is where concepts and procedures are not sufficiently in place to justify the conclusion that the masonry involved is in possession of sufficient of the basic knowledge and aims of Freemasonry to enable the occurrence of speculation potentially able to improve society; but at the same time has moved on from operative masonry, including that encompassing some non-operatives.

### ***Proto-Freemasonry***

Proto-Freemasonry is the intermediate stage between the masonry of nascent Freemasons and the Freemasonry of speculative Masons, and is marked by the possession of pieces of knowledge and ritual to do with the better society message, but insufficient to be able to grasp the message as a whole, or to proselytise it; overall, however, it is on the track which leads to Freemasonry.

### ***Speculative lodge***

A speculative lodge consists of a distinct group of Freemasons, this group having its own maintenance measures, and general ways of conduct, such as aims, ideas, beliefs, rules, procedures, ceremonies and customs, and a sense of its own being.

### ***Speculative Masonry***

Speculative Masonry, which occurs in an open speculative lodge, consists of beliefs, knowledge, ideas, aims, ceremonies, procedures, rules and customs built around ritual to produce Freemasonry, the nature of which is in some dispute, but generally considered to be an endeavour by all measures thought appropriate, except political and religious when working as a lodge, to achieve a happy and

felicitous way of life for all humankind, this being through the bringing about of adequately resourced, just and democratic societies.

### ***Higher degree***

A Higher degree is any degree, grade or order which can be obtained only after the gaining of the three speculative Craft degrees; except the Mark, which is a natural part of the Craft and should be given there: Higher degrees are higher rather than further because the core were originally attainable by few.

### ***Freemasonry***

Freemasonry is the product of speculative Masonry, the nature of this being in question, but generally thought to be centred on an endeavour, by all measures thought appropriate, to achieve a happy and felicitous way of life for all humankind, this being through the bringing about of adequately resourced, just and democratic societies.

### ***Freemason***

A Freemason is a person practicing Freemasonry; also a Mason.

### ***Preamble***

Always with the paper's aim firmly to the forefront, each factor will be probed. That historical material which is thought to be the most accurate will be used—ever bearing in mind that the knowledge explosion is blasting out at a phenomenal rate. Much which was thought of as fact only a short time ago is now superseded and, in many cases, overturned. The scrutiny will be done in as objective a manner as the investigator is capable of.

It is now realised, of course, that the 'history' handed down to us is the preferred story, at any level, physical to intellectual, of the victors in life's continuous struggles. They write it. They put in what they want, and they censor out what they do not like. As Gardner (335) says, the old 'history is largely based on recorded propaganda'. Consider, as a recent case, the 'history' produced by the Soviet Union. So it was with the old dictators—the Church and the State. But in many countries a new, free, educated and tolerant generation is now at work. Science and the search for fact are respected. Ignorance, superstition and the inculcation of doctrine and propaganda are opposed. One result is that at last clearer glimpses of history's great pageant are beginning to emerge.

There are some who think that because modern Freemasonry bans the discussion of politics and religion in open lodge then such discussion is a closed shop in Masonic circles. Of course not; in fact, just the opposite. Freemasons are supposed to leave their lodges imbued with the spirit of doing what they can to improve their society, of which politics and religion form a large and vital chunk. And there is no way that the past can be validly examined without analysing the religious and political power structures which drove it.

Freemasonry quite strictly and wisely allows—encourages—its members to hold the religious beliefs of their choice, so long as a Supreme Being is at the forefront, and so long as it is 'moral'. Anglican Christian Freemasons, for example, by their very Masonic creed, respect the religious beliefs of, say, Spiritual Christians, or Islam, and so on. Freemasonry, therefore, is an excellent body to notice without prejudice those early forms of Christianity now being put back on the world stage by modern discoveries and scholarship, and which need to be discussed in many historical contexts, let alone current society.

Owing to the vast separation in space of Europe and this student, there has been no ability to search out prime documents and material. It is therefore of necessity based on secondary materials. Nevertheless, as many others have already done a great deal of searching, this should prove to be not a real handicap,.

It must be clearly stated that this thesis is not produced from solid 'fact' alone. The field is relatively obscure, and has been very extensively muddled by Masonic writers. Much supplied 'fact' is downright wrong. Knowledge in many of the areas which have to be examined is sparse or absent. Therefore, supposition and deduction are also employed. It is nice to recall that deduction, conjecture, even inspiration, are often associated with knowledge breakthroughs. It is the wider angle, the broader view, which sees more.

It is suggested that judgement of the wisdom or otherwise of the veracity and value of the on-going outcomes here arrived at might best be reserved to the paper's end.

## **BACKGROUND**

By working backwards, initial investigation suggests that a number of historical events and factors are involved in Freemasonry's origin. Further, these appear to be intricately entwined. Placing those thought fundamental, and thus in need of close examination, in chronological order produces: King Solomon's Temple, the Essenes, Jesus, Southern Gaul, Rome, Constantine the Great, Roman Catholicism, the Crusades and Jerusalem's Temple Mount.

It is hoped that these topics will help provide a solid foundation for later progressions.

### **King Solomon's Temple**

The celebrated Temple of Jehovah, built by Solomon, King of Israel, son of David, in Jerusalem c 974–937 BC (Montgomery:143), is a convenient icon of the times to which today's Freemasonry can be usefully traced. It is of interest, also, that King Solomon, so long pilloried by religious sectarians for allowing the existence in his court and kingdom of more than his particular religion, is today beginning to be seen as a ruler with advanced ideas. Consider for example, the Gardner (15) comment that Solomon was an 'advocate of religious toleration'. This, of course, is exactly the position of Freemasonry. The accolade 'wise' as applied to Solomon may well have more substance than is realised.

By the fifth century BC the royal family of David had lost the throne, as had the family of Zadok lost the High Priesthood. A group of loyalists and traditionalists formed around these families, culminating in the formation of the Essenes.

A new and invigorating culture came to Middle Eastern region with its overrunning, in 332 BC, by the Greek, Alexander the Great. Hellenism brought a new freedom of thought, which in turn brought a better life for the population.

The Roman conquest of Palestine in 65 BC, with direct control of Judea assured in AD 6, brought forth militant nationalism, Roman cruelty and heavy taxation contributing. The diaspora Essenes (Thiering, Apex:109)—those dispersed throughout the known world—were at the forefront of this patriotism.

### **The Essenes**

The core of the Essenes, the old aristocrats of Israel, maintained and evolved a strict culture focussed on 'truth, righteousness, kindness, justice, honesty and humility along with brotherly love' (Knight, Key:214). Their Judean headquarters had become, in Herod's time (74–4 BC), Qumran on the Dead Sea, where they established, mainly symbolically, a new 'temple'. They named their centre 'New Jerusalem' (Thiering, Jesus:47,51). Here they maintained their customs for generations, as if they were actually in control of Jerusalem.

Herod, a tool but also a user of the Romans, was no fool. He relentlessly taxed and suppressed, as need be, the local population, but at the same time milked money from diaspora. He pushed the idea of a 'New Covenant' amongst both the dispersed Jews and as many gentile converts as his agents could get, whereby the 'Old Testament' scheme of sacrifice for salvation could be exchanged for baptism into the New Covenant, accompanied, of course, by suitable payments. It was, notes Thiering (Jesus:41,42) an 'immensely successful' scheme, bringing in the cash to fulfil his great building

projects. The Essenes had a similar programme, which funded their way of life. That which they saved—apparently a large measure—was secreted away for their expected eventual return to power.

At this great turning point in history, the Jews, perhaps uniquely a most religious and practical people, desperately wanted a Messiah—Christos or Christ in Greek—to deliver them from their Roman servitude. By ‘Messiah’ was meant ‘anointed one’, usually a priest-king, but not, of course, to the monotheistic Jews, divine. All of the Davidic kings had been labelled ‘Messiah’ (Baigent, Blood:342).

Those studying and translating the Dead Sea Scrolls, discovered near Qumran in 1947, for example Eisenman and Wise (Andrews:487), found that the Essene documents had been subtly encoded. Beneath the ordinary surface language they found a thorough, on-going and systematic, constant use of terms, terms which had double meanings, and which did not vary in their real meaning from document to document. This is referred to as the pesher technique, and was commonly used in oppressed and dangerous circumstances, in this case the Roman. One of the official scholars of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Dr Judith Thiering (Jesus:34), found that the same pesher system had also been used in the writing of the New Testament’s Gospels and Acts, and unfolded a whole new veracious and definitive historical underlay to these records.

### **Jesus—the egalitarian man**

The New Testament informs us that Jesus was a direct descendant of King David. The peshers, as translated by Thiering to the code’s rules, which are given and which anyone can test and repeat, tell us that Jesus was an Essene (Thiering, Jesus:134), spending time at Qumran. His philosophy, however, enlarged upon the Essene tendency to ancient Gnosticism (Lawrence:377). He believed in peace and acceptance of the Gentiles, siding with the poor, the handicapped and the socially excluded, and fighting against oppressing structures (Thiering, Jesus: 85,100). He broke out of Jewish religious introversion, and gave a new, enlightened, form of it to the larger world.

One of Jesus’s disciples, known as Simon the Zealot, Simon Camanios and Simon Magnus, also portrayed by pesher (Thiering, Jes:106) as Lazarus, is at the centre of one of the most important Pauline ‘miracles’, raising the dead. The Essenes had very strict rituals indeed; the resurrection ritual was ‘ancient’ (Knight, Mes:87). Its practice throughout the Middle East is well known. The rite completed the initiation of candidates into the circle.

Generally candidates ‘underwent a figurative death and were wrapped in a white burial shroud. They were then raised from their tomb by a sacred ritual and the “resurrected” individual “became a brother amongst them”.’ (Knight, Mes:87)

The peshers give a detailed account: Simon was a leader in a failed Jewish rising against Herod (Rome) in AD 32, and returned to Qumran to hide. The peace-wanting Essenes, however, excommunicated him—peshers (Thiering, Jes:131–133)—and treated him as dead, placed him in grave clothes, and confined him in a burial cave. Jesus, however, a powerful Essene leader, heard of this and for personal loyalty reasons forgave and released him; thus he ‘raised Lazarus’.

### **The reversal of Jesus’s message**

For his various troubles Jesus was crucified, but the peshers make it clear (Thiering, Jesus:145–160) that he survived his crucifixion. He then removed himself and his wife, Mary Magdalene, from Palestine. He had a daughter and two sons (Thiering, Apoc:448,449). He disappears from the pesher record in AD 70 (ibid:449).

It is also now becoming more generally thought that Jesus’ original mission was hijacked by Paul, by what is referred to by some theologians as the Pauline Heresy. James the Just, brother of Jesus, and his successor, fostered the Nazarene or ‘Jerusalem Church’ (Andrews:373) in Jerusalem, which maintained the Jesus–Gnostic approach, treating Jesus as a mortal. At core it was a progression of the One–God—Jehovah Jewish religion. They were at first dismayed about and then hostile—Acts 21—to the Pauline line. A Nazarean text (Baigent, Mes:137) labels Paul as the ‘enemy’. He preached that

Jesus had died a sacrificial death and had been resurrected in the flesh to allow believers to come back to life in the flesh. Jesus was a god. As a second string to his system Paul taught that women were second class—thereby humbling half of humankind—and that Christianity needed interceding priests (women not allowed), authoritarianism and hierarchy.

As an evangelist Paul—with whom Peter was to throw in his lot—had his problems. James taught the worship of the one, indivisible, God, Jehovah. Paul taught the worship of Jesus. Paul was operating with a Jewish theology in a Roman world hostile to the Jews and their religion, with Jesus, a candidate for the throne of Judea, being seen by Rome as a political reactionary (Knight, Mes:106–7). He was in fledgling competition with a mass of established Mediterranean religions, each headed by a divine figure. But although Paul's religion was rejected in the East, it began—particularly with its promise of bodily resurrection—to make headway in the West. The Pauline, Peter assisted, religion went on to become the Roman Religion, and then the Roman Catholic Church.

### **Southern Gaul**

Meanwhile in Judea the Jews, led by the Zealots, became increasingly restless under the Romans; the apparent murder of James the Just in AD 62 set the kindling alight. Wiser heads, realising that revolt against Rome could only lead to disaster, must have taken it as a cue to make preparations for the coming calamity. The great quantities of bullion and treasure accumulated by the various sections of the Jewish community, including the Herodian, and a similar 'mission' by the Essenes, were cached in secret vaults deep beneath the Temple Mount, as recorded by the Copper Scroll found at Qumran in 1947. Included were a mass of documents and records.

Many fled the region, some taking ship to the port of Narbonne in Southern Gaul, where there was a large Jewish (Andrews:348) population. The Jews had a 'large and thriving community' (Baigent, Blood:33) centred on the ports of Marseilles and Narbonne. This extended inland, for example to the Pyrenees-le-Chateau region, the whole being the eastern flank of the Pyrenees; a mountainous domain giving natural sanctuary. They took with them not only valuables but also records and documents (Gardner:1), including those to do with the Davidic Bloodline, and Jesus's original 'religion'.

Southern France abounds in legends that Mary Magdalene went to Southern Gaul, so establishing the 'Holy Grail' or Jesus family in the west (Baigent, Blood:299, Andrews:6,7). Gardner (128) quotes the *Raban Mer MS* 'The Life of Mary Magdalene' on this. The tradition of Jesus being in the west, particularly Southern Gaul (Baigent, Blood:passim), is common and widespread. As already noted the Thiering pesher presentations state that Jesus and Mary had three children.

### **Ruthless Rome**

The Jewish revolt began in earnest in AD 66. The Romans retook Jerusalem, most barbarously, in AD 70. Herod's grand new Temple was sacked and destroyed. Its priests, however, obviously aware that the Romans knew about its visible treasures, doubtlessly left them for the looters, counting on this removing attention from a painstaking search beneath the foundations.

Rome's horrendous slaughter of the Jewish population, although single-mindedly directed at eliminating the opposition, was not complete. For example, Julius Africanus, writing about AD 200 (Gardner:112), said that aristocratic survivors dispersed to other lands; taking with them records and genealogies. Eusebius, writing in the fourth century, said that these people observed a strict dynastic progression. The Roman Empire, anxious to stamp out all trace of the Davidic line, over centuries hunted down and murdered all of that line whom they could find.

Where Jesus died appears not to be known. It could have been in Southern Gaul or elsewhere. If elsewhere, his body, probably mummified, was taken to Southern Gaul, a natural sanctuary, as it appears that it was considered necessary to securely hide him from the ever-inquiring Romans, anxious to stamp out all trace of the Davidic line. Those responsible—a son included?—may have also thought that the body could possibly serve at some future time as a counter to what was seen as the ever-growing Pauline heresy. The area was—and remains—riddled with old Roman mines

(Baigent, Mes:283) and probably an exhausted horizontal one was used to entomb the body (Andrews:162–165). The shaft would have been blocked, and probably a rock slide used to obliterate the entrance.

The growing Roman Church was out to destroy the Nazarene Church. All evidence, from any source, of the original Jesus and his movement at odds with Paul's was sought out and destroyed. A letter of Bishop Clement of Alexandria, c AD 150–215, an early 'father' of the church, found at a monastery at Mar Sabra in 1958 (Gardner: 71) decreed that some of the original content of Mark be exercised, because it did not conform with Church requirements. He wrote that 'truth' had to be overridden by 'faith'. He included as an example a section of John never before known of.

A form of Christianity—one of several cults—was introduced by the Roman conquerors into England in the early third century. Mainly going its own way and influenced, in that shore distant from Rome, by Eastern Gnostic Christianity, it gained a foothold first in central urban areas, but had penetrated to provincial regions by the fifth century, 'Pagan' Saxons later wiped it out in lowland England, but not in the Celtic West.

### **Constantine—the con man**

Rome's greatest strategist, organiser and doer, Constantine, quite expediently (Baigent, Mes:59) used the Sol Invictus cult to strengthen 'his primary, indeed obsessive, objective'—unity of Empire. He saw that Roman Christianity, both with its familiarities and the new resurrection doctrine, so attractive to the masses, plus its 'turn the other cheek' line, could be grafted onto his unity plans. This religion would help smooth the pathway to his political desires. He gave it money and status. Meanwhile Eusebius of Caesurae, the pillar of early Roman Catholic history writing, in about AD 324 increased the drive to search out 'heretics', with the Christian Gnostics as the prime target.

To put his Roman Christian Religion policy into practice, Constantine in AD 325 called a meeting of the various types of Christianity at Nicaea, where he let it be known that his edict was paramount. The Eastern Church representatives, like Arius, well argued that there was but one God, and that Jesus was an instrument of God but not a god or part of a god.. On 20 May, however, Constantine saw to it that the Roman three—god view prevailed. The Empire adopted the Trinitarian doctrine for Christianity.

Imperial Rome had diverted the course of history, writes Gardner (2), to suit its own agenda, the new course being continued to the present day. Intolerance of alternative viewpoints became the norm. The Church banned education, as the 'spread of knowledge' would encourage heresy. Across Europe literacy fell to almost zero (Knight, Mes:71), and science gave way to superstition. The Dark Ages had begun.

In England, Ireland and Scotland, however, the Celtic Church grew. It drew its primary impetus from Egypt, Syria and the Mediterranean (Baigent, Blood:151,157) world. It had its own Bible—unacceptable to Rome—with an emphasis on the Old Testament; Jewish customs were observed and there was a general rejection (Knight, Mes:199) of Jesus as a god. In fact the majority of active bishoprics as late as the 1400s in Western Europe (Gardner:17) were Arian.

At about AD 400, following the Roman Church's harassment, copies of Gnostic Church books and documents of the Judean origin and nature of Christianity were buried in a large jar at Nag Hammadi in Upper Egypt. They were copies of texts mostly dating from no later than AD 150.

In 410 Rome was sacked by the Visigoths; they move on to settle in Southern Gaul, including in the Rennes-le-Chateau region. They were Arians, with Gnostic viewpoints. They assimilated well with the locals, who included noble families which no doubt included some descended from the rich, clever and aristocratic Jewish families that had settled in the region in the first century. Some of these families were undoubtedly passing down the information on the original Jesus, his humanity, and his mission, and the fact that wealth and proofs were in secret vaults beneath the Temple Mount. Ever

rottening, autocratic Rome, meanwhile, working with dogma and not free thought, continued to crumble. The last Emperor of the West was forced to abdicate in 476.

Until the fall of the Roman Empire, the Roman Church continued to carry out the ancient excommunication rite on those members it expelled. This was to act as if the offender were literally dead, dress him in grave clothes, and put him in a grave for a while (Thiering, Jes:132). After that he was spiritually 'dead', and sent away. In time, suitably repented, he might be 'resurrected'.

### **The original Christian movement**

In the early fifth century a people known as the Merovingi entered the Languedoc or Southern Gaul. Coming from the Rhine, they claimed to have come earlier from Troy. Priory of Scion documents (Baigent, Blood:287) state that they originated in Judea, among the Benjamites. A literate, highly civilised people, they practiced Gnostic Christianity and to an extent mixed with the local population. It appears certain that they intermarried with the Davidic-Jesus Bloodline (Baigent, Blood:329) and gained or maintained its secrets. In 448 a Merovingian prince named Merovee became King of the Franks.

The fortunes of the original Christian movement continued to decline. In AD 634 Palestine was captured by Arabs, with Jerusalem destined to become a vital Islamic centre. In 640 a Pauline Bishop had burnt the world's greatest library, that at Alexandria. Knowledgeable people the world over still cry about that. It is said to have had some 700,000 manuscripts including, of course, many on the original Christian movement. The patriarch of Constantinople, however, was overjoyed at what he described as this 'great achievement'. Then the Roman Church managed to buy out the leaders of the British Celtic Church, getting them to convert to the Roman line at Whitby in 664.

### **The Roman buy-out**

On the continent, Clovis, grandson of Merovee, King of the Franks, began to conquer wide areas of France. The Roman Church saw its opportunity and in 496 offered him the title of 'New Constantine' and leadership of a 'Holy Roman Empire'. Clovis saw himself as a new Emperor of a New Roman Empire. The price was conversion to Roman Christianity. He paid it and, as a victorious general, turned the fortunes of the Roman Church in Western Europe, giving it the monopoly there for a thousand years.

Dagobert II, 651–679, descended from Clovis, came to the throne in 674. He began to curb the power of the Roman Catholic Church, paying the price by being assassinated in 679.

Sigisbert IV, 676–c 700, son of Dagobert II, disappeared from (Church-controlled) history, although Priory documents (Baigent, Blood: 262, 270–272) state that as an infant he was smuggled to the domain of his mother, Visigoth Princess Giselle of Razes. There is no independent proof, of course, of any of this, but he is said to have surfaced in the Languedoc in 681, and inherited his uncle's title, Duke of Razes, and to have adopted the cover surname of Plant-Ard.

Islam continued to expand. The Moors swept into southern Spain in 711, bringing esoteric knowledge from Egypt, the Middle East, Greece and early Italy, knowledge lost to the Western World with the ascendancy of Roman Catholicism.

### **England**

In England, Althestan, c 895–939, grandson of Alfred the Great and son of Edward the Elder, both scholars, great organisers and conquerors, carried out building activities. For example, he repaired the Roman Walls of Exeter (Cryer:154) and is the reputed founder, in 932, of the monastic house which was the forerunner of the Cathedral of Exeter. The *Regius MS* c 1390, and *Cooke MS* c 1410, the two oldest English mason 'charges' known, state that Athelstan gave a charter to masons in Wessex. He sought, and his son Edwyn also, to hold annual assemblies of masons at York, where, as part of the proceedings, charges were composed.



During 1993 repairs to Canterbury Cathedral, a discovery was made which archaeologists described as ‘astonishing’ (Kennedy:200). The remains of the old pre-Norman cathedral, built 700s to Conquest, were found, showing the building was excellent and about the same size as its Norman successor. Overall, there is clear archaeological evidence, Kennedy (199) maintains, of sophisticated building teachings in England for hundreds of years before 1066. Much other work was going on in London (Markham, Views:81) in the ninth century, including Westminster Abbey, 1050. The Normans brought their own building programme, such as the White Tower, the Town of London, and the rebuilding of St Paul’s.

### **Southern France**

Coming via the Balkans in the 10th century, a form of Christian Gnosticism called ‘the pure’, or Catharism, was easily adopted in southwest Europe, particularly the Languedoc. Jesus, in general, was regarded as a prophet not a god, (Baigent, Blood:47). Further, he had not died of crucifixion, and the Cathars refused to worship the cross; they described Rome’s interpretation of the crucifixion as a ‘fraud’ (Gardner:270). And the Cathars were reported to possess something fabulous; the ‘Holy Grail’ (Baigent, Blood:33–43, 56).

The Bloodline continued to grow, and by now families included (Knight, Mes: 79) the Counts of Champagne, Fontaine and Aragon, the Lords of Gisors and Payen, and the noble families of de Bouillon, St Clair, Brienne, Joinville, Chaumont, Blanchefort and Hapsburg. Unprovable information (‘Rex Deus’ families, Gardner:198) also includes William I—the Conqueror, c 1027–1087—of England and his son, William II, 1065–1100. The latter was assassinated in the New Forest; according to legend, because he planned to replace the Roman Church in England with the old Celtic form.

### **The Crusades**

In 1037 Moslem Arabs took Jerusalem, but allowed pilgrims access. Then, in 1071, the Seljuk Turks seized the city, devastated it, and stopped Christian pilgrimage. This was the trigger for the Crusades. Looking at the names of those involved in the First Crusade, 1096–99, those of Bloodline families are prominent, with Gardner (220) claiming that they were its planners.

With great brutality Godfroi de Bouillon, Duke of Lorraine, captured Jerusalem in 1099. On a high hill near the city he ordered an abbey built, named the ‘Abbey of Notre Dame de Mont Sion’ (Baigent, Blood:112). Both monks and knights were there quartered, the knights being named ‘Chevaliers de l’Ordre de Notre Dame de Sion’. Here, at about the beginning of this time or before, the Bloodline seemed to have conferred and produced a secret action order; the Prieuré de Sion or Priory of Sion. Sion was led by a Grand Master or ‘Nautonnier’, who also took direct command of the knights; his name was Hugues de Payen.

There must have been a Bloodline ‘masterplan’ (Knight, Mes:76) to recover the wealth and manuscripts the line knew were hidden deep in the Temple Mount. After problems with de Bouillon then Baldwin, probably Pope-related, it seems a core of the Sion group, then formed as the ‘Milice de Christ’ in 1114, (Andrews:396) went into action as soon as the third ruler, Baldwin II, came into power, in 1118. This was under the name ‘The Poor Fellow Soldiers of Christ and of the Temple of King Solomon’ (Iverson:28).

### **The Temple Mount, Templars, treasures and documents**

The original nine Knights Templar, definitely (Baigent, Blood:116) including some of the Order of Sion, were led by Hugues de Payen, a nobleman under the Count of Champagne. Their patron was Bernard of Clairvaux, 1090–1153, head of the Cistercian Order.

Moving to the Temple site—Solomon through to Herod—they lived there for nine years. The ‘Copper Scroll’ of the ‘Dead Sea Scrolls’, read in 1956, confirms that there was a great wealth of gold bullion and hidden ‘treasure’ (Baigent, Blood:87). It also mentions scrolls: ‘The knights laboriously tunnelled deep into the Temple Mount, eventually striking secret vaults.’

The sudden enormous wealth of the Templars has to acknowledge that they found the treasure placed there by the Jews before the last Roman onslaught of AD 70.

All of the material was extracted by 1127. It is alleged that the hidden items included a 'wealth of ancient manuscripts' (Gardner:265). These must have included orthodox Judaic, Essene and Nazarene material, which was removed to Europe with it then being taken in the care of most of the knights (Baigent, Blood: 63).

It seems most probable that documents were found cached with the treasures, and that they confirmed the essentials of what was said by Christian Gnostics, and what had been passed down in the Languedoc region. It is almost certain that the Templars secretly practiced the 'old' religion, as when later under torture various members confessed that they had been told that there was the only one, omnipotent, God, that Jesus was not a god but a man, and that the crucifixion dogma was wrong (Baigent, Temp:59). Further, when the Templars started commissioning their marvellous cathedrals not one depicted a crucifixion scene (Gardner:265).

### **SOME CONCLUSIONS**

This background has generated conclusions. Many are subject to serious contention; but they open the way for a critical prodding of the 'past' as written by each segment's time and faction victors.

#### **Politics and religion**

1. Discoveries of telling archaeological evidence, particularly of ancient documents, together with modern theological research, indicate that Jesus was a man, had an enlightened, egalitarian, message for the world, that he survived his crucifixion, and that he fathered children,
2. The body of Jesus was apparently entombed in a mountain side in a rugged region of Southern France.
3. In the first millennium Southern France became a sanctuary for the postulated Jesus Bloodline families and their supposed knowledge, including that on the true nature of Jesus, the existence of direct descendants of his, and the repository of wealth and religious documents in the Temple Mount.
4. The Priory of Sion seems to have become a major player in European affairs.
5. The Templars appear to have found themselves in possession of documentary proof that original Christianity was of the Jerusalem Church type,
6. Putting the Temple Mount documentary proof together with what was already known, it is contended that, through the Bloodline families, Sion and the Templars, it appears the Templars thought that the Roman Catholic Religion was not only a false form of Christianity, but one without scruples, including on wholesale slaughter, when it came to protecting its interests.
7. It is concluded that Sion and the Templars found themselves in possession of great and dangerous information; information which would have to be kept for a long time.

#### **Building**

1. In pre-Norman England, King Athelstan, c 895–939, and his son presided over a complex building programme which almost certainly included mason organisations.
2. There is now archaeological evidence of the use of sophisticated building techniques in England for hundreds of years before the Norman Conquest of 1066.
3. After their conquest the Normans at once commenced an ambitious building programme.

#### **Operative lodges**

1. There is no known record of operative lodges in England at this time, although the level of building being accomplished infers that they had to be in place.  
(1) The first Old Charges, if correct, feature the holding of mason assemblies in Athelstan's time; this infers organisation.

## **Freemasonry**

1. No trace.

## **PART II—THE MAIN BODY**

Here the foundations are built on. Here the intertwinings begin in earnest. Here comment is called for; again, although it becomes harder, this will be as objective as possible. Keeping the aim strictly in focus should help. Some conclusions may not find favour. It can only be suggested that judgement be based not only on a specific piece of information but on the ever-growing whole complex.

Each section should bring forth its findings. Although individually small, each should add to the ever-growing picture. From these, ongoing small conclusions should keep popping up.

### **The Knights Templar**

News of the stupendous treasure find was given to the noble families of Europe, together with that of the documents and their evidence; no doubt the nature of this was withheld from some. It was soon widely rumoured that the Templars possessed some un-spelt-out stupendous ‘mystery’. In a very short time ‘no price was too high’ (Gardner:262) to be associated with them. Funds, land, property grants and recruits flocked to them. The Spanish king gave them one third of his kingdom (Gardner:262). From 1128 the Order expanded at an ‘extraordinary pace’ (Baigent, Temp:43), and ‘within a decade of their return the Templars were probably the most influential body the world has ever known’ (Gardner:261). Pope Innocent III in 1139 issued a Bull saying that no secular or ecclesiastical power could claim their allegiance—they were responsible to him alone.

In 1128, apparently believing they had achieved their original aim, those behind the Order of Sion separated it from the Knights of the Temple (Knight, Mes:89). Sion then withdrew into the shadows, as an extremely clandestine organisation, one holding enormous secrets. The Templars, with their own Grand Master, remained as an obvious and great arm of power.

The Templars developed their own ‘rites and rituals’ (Baigent, Temp:53) probably from both Jewish procedures handed down in the Languedoc and the information contained in documents presumably found in the Temple Mount, although none of this can be proved. It is believed that also involved were Middle Eastern procedures; their practitioners were very much indeed conversant with secret keeping and secret societies. What it is certain is that in a very few years rumours of the Order having ‘strange rituals’ (Knight, Mes:87) began circulating. One was of the ancient resurrection type, claims Knight (Mes:87–88), where the Templar candidate suffered a figurative death to his old life, was shrouded and graved, then ‘resurrected’ to his new life. The usual props were used, including a skull and crossbones (Knight:295), as depicted on Templar ship sails.

A Scottish noble, of Norman descent, Henri de Saint Clair, Baron of Roslyn, accompanied Godfroi de Bouillon on the First Crusade. It is of interest that Hugues de Payen, the initial Grand Master of both Sion and the Knights of the Temple, was married to Catherine de Saint Clair (Knight, Key:295), niece of Henri. Hugues de Payen visited Scotland in 1128 (Gardner: 272), where he conferred with David I, King of Scots, about Templar lands and the Celtic Church, which still survived in Scotland. The chief Scottish Templar Preceptory was built near Roslyn, on Saint Clair land.

A Templar knight was not alone. Each had the support of men-at-arms and various serving brothers. The organisation had a multiplicity of arms, including a fleet, bankers, priests and artisans. They also had their own building squads, to construct their preceptories, castles and churches and, later, cathedrals. ‘The greatest builders of all times’, wrote Jackson (comment to Cryer, Making: 155) ‘were probably the Templars in the tenth and eleventh centuries. . . They erected thousands of buildings of great merit.’ They acted with incorporated or sponsored groups of stonemasons, from architects to labourers; these had the traditional mason structures and customs, as well as a layer of Templar observances; they also enjoyed Templar privileges, such as freedom from taxes (Baigent, Temp:136). No doubt being a ‘Templar Mason’, although stricture-bound, was highly valued.

In 1146 the Knights Templars adopted the Rose Cross as their symbol. This was a red cross pattée. Even-armed and splayed, its form can be seen today with the St John cross. Its four arms are arrow heads, meeting at a fine point in the centre, although in practice many varieties were produced. This cross was nothing to do with the crucifixion of Christ, claims Andrews (413). It was a figurative marker. It symbolically demonstrated the map-marking of the site where Jesus's body lay entombed.

Why red? Why 'rose'? In ancient times, notes Andrews (289), red crosses were sometime placed on the graves of those who had led exemplary lives. Further, Mackey (722) states that red was a royal colour of the Jews. Mackey (747–8) also states that the ancients regarded the rose as a symbol of secrecy, and notes that Jesus referred to himself as the 'rose of Sharon'. Andrews says that some Templar sarcophagi include a rose, and that in 1188 the Priory of Sion took a third title—*l'Ordre de la Rose-Croix Veritas*.

**Conclusions include:**

1. In a matter of months the Templars jumped from obscurity and near poverty to be the toast of Europe; they must have gained a great asset.
2. Europe flooded the Templars with gifts and land; this indicates that they had indeed found or proved matters of extraordinary consequence.
3. Following their apparently stupendous finds, the Templars became great players in many fields in both Europe and the Middle East.
4. Reconstruction indicates that after its success Sion withdrew from the Templars, which it then used as its armed service, and melted into the shadows.
5. The Templars almost certainly developed strange rituals, including a resurrection or raising one.
6. Henri de Saint Clair, a Scottish noble, a member of the First Crusade, was apparently associated with the Templar find.
7. The Templars became great builders, including of the Notre Dame cathedrals; they formed or obtained their own strict building squads.
8. The Templars adopted a red cross pattée; it is construed that, rather than representing the crucifixion it was a symbolic marker of the site of the tomb of Jesus.
9. The Templar's cross was red, it is thought, because of its old association with goodness and Jewish royalty, while the rose was also used to mark Jesus and secrecy; if all this symbology is correctly interpreted, then its combined use by the Templars can hardly be a coincidence.

**The tomb of Jesus**

Upon their obtaining great wealth the Templars immediately gained control of the Mount Cardou region. A still extant 1130 document (Andrews:263) indicates that they had been in the area from 1127. Chateaux, preceptories, forts and watchplaces were built, which enabled the entombment site and whole region to be closely watched and guarded. In the Rennes-le-Chateau area alone there were an amazing six (Baigent, Blood:91) preceptories, an unprecedented concentration, particularly for such a remote and unimportant backwoods area.

It is reasonable to assume that the tomb was being guarded from Rome. Rome undoubtedly knew which Jesus story was valid. It obviously did not know of the precise site of claimed entombment. As Rome had always actively sought out and destroyed all evidence which exposed it to question, it is probable that the Templars—or more likely Sion—decided to watch the site. They probably expected to exist as organisations for a long time.

It is to be noted that buildings were placed in lines, longitudinally and latitudinally, which point to the spot, even though out of sight of it. Andrews (481–2) thinks that the Templars used a simple surveying technique learnt from the Arabs.

It is probable that the Templars opened the tomb, if for nothing else but to confirm its contents; which could well have been in the usual kind of stone sarcophagus of the first century. Perhaps it even had a Rose of Sharon on the lid. Perhaps there was a chest of documents. They then re-entombed the remains. In 1156 (Baigent, Blood:91), for example, notes that a contingent of non-French-speaking German miners were brought in. They were forbidden to fraternise. It could be that some of the Temple Mount documents or copies were also included in this supposed re-entombment.

### **Conclusions**

1. The Templars immediately took control of the Mount Cardou region, putting up an extraordinary number of buildings; the inference is that they were protecting the tomb of Jesus.
2. The Templar buildings pointed to the site of Jesus's tomb; again, the inference is there.
3. It is probable that the Templars re-entombed the remains of Jesus, and possibly with copies of the postulated Temple Mount documents.

### **Templars—the Builders**

As noted the Templars built most extensively. They had a network of properties and preceptories across England and Scotland, the two main Scottish ones known being at Roslyn, near Edinburgh, and Aberdeen. All of Christian Europe seems to have been similarly treated. Some of their architects had worked in Palestine (Vibert:41) and the Middle East, bringing back new knowledge and techniques. Byzantine forms (Baigent, Temp: 136) were used; all this reflected their secret break from the Roman Church's grip.

The Cistercian Order had shared its beginnings with Sion and the Templars (Baigent, Blood:90). In AD 1127 it shared in some of the Temple fortune with the Order, and which also became a great builder. It cooperated with the Templars in building the 'almost improbable' (Gardner: 262) Notre Dame ('Our Lady') Gothic cathedrals, the first being begun in Paris in 1163, which had a mason 'logia' (Brodsky, comment to Stevenson:58), occupied by the 'operative' masons. These cathedrals were named not for Jesus's mother, Mary, but—surprisingly—dedicated to 'Our Lady', Mary Magdalene (Gardner:118). One of the 'guilds' building these cathedrals was named the 'Children of Solomon' (Gardner:266). The 'golden age' of operative memory, states Jackson (Ros:118) is usually accepted as the cathedral building period of the 12th to the 15th centuries.

### **Conclusions**

1. The Templars built very extensively, and right over Europe; they had an intimate relationship with building groups, including logia.
2. One of the Templar building groups was named the 'Children of Solomon'.

### **Religious tolerance**

The Templars, although ostentatiously Christian, were 'noted exponents of religious tolerance' (Gardner:323), connected themselves with Islam and, states Baigent (Blood:78), French publications declare that they wanted unity between bloods, races and religions. They studied the Middle East, most interesting when considering Ward's (1–5) statement that the Middle East and Islam had secret societies with signs and ceremonies similar to those of Freemasonry. That the Templars 'delved' (Andrews:271) into Arab knowledge is incontrovertible.

The Templars had a special relationship with the Cathars of the Languedoc, who had developed a free culture, one as sophisticated as the Byzantium (Baigent, Blood:44). This would not be reached again in Europe until the Renaissance. In the meantime the Roman Catholic Church was strenuously putting down all opposition and developing its own religion. Thomas Aquinas, c 1226–1274, for example, pronounced that consecrated Eucharist bread and wine was miraculously transubstantiated into Jesus's body and blood. In 1229 the Inquisition based in Toulouse forbade the reading of the Bible by all laymen. In 1233 the Pope appointed 'Inquisitors', who were soon to gain a 'terrible reputation for their cruelty' (Gardner:303).

In 1209 Pope Innocent III declared a crusade against the 'heretical' Cathars. They were feared as spreaders of knowledge. Some 30,000 Roman Catholic knights and soldiers spent 35 years in the Languedoc. Tens of thousands of lives (Gardner:268) were taken. In the town of Beziers alone, for example, at least 15,000 men, women and children (Baigent, Blood:42) were slaughtered, many in their churches. Baigent considers the extermination to be the first case of 'genocide' in modern European history. The Templars had to watch it, although secretly (Baigent, Blood:70) sheltering many. By the end of the 'crusade' the Languedoc had been plunged back into the 'barbarity' (Baigent, Blood:44) that characterised the rest of Roman Catholic Europe.

### **Conclusions**

1. The Templars had religious tolerance; this happens to be one of the characteristics of the early non-Pauline Christianity.
2. The Templars had a close relationship with the Cathars of Southern France; a free and educated people who regarded Jesus as a man, not a god; to think that the Templars did likewise is not a big step to take.
3. The Roman Catholic Church, from 1202 to 1244, bloodily exterminated the Cathars; that the Templars secretly helped these where they could, re-enforces the previous point.
4. The religious tolerances of the Knight Templar Order and the Roman Catholic Church were in diametrical opposition.

### **Operative lodges in 13th-century Britain**

In England building was going on apace. In 1238, for example, it is recorded that the Vale Royal Abbey had a 'logia' (Brodsky, comment on Stevenson:58). This must be conservatively considered to be an operative lodge building. Cathedrals went up, starting with Exeter in 1280, and Cathedral building continued for an amazing five centuries. The Black Death, beginning in 1349, when one third of the population died, checked the impetus. Many of the buildings were in open country, and lodges were inevitable.

A mason had to travel from site to site. Vibert (40) thinks that secret grade-recognition proofs and periodic meetings were inevitable. Chafen (comment on Markham, Origins:198) thinks that operative lodges would have had to have 'non-operatives', such as treasurers, chaplains, bureaucrats and clerks.

In Scotland building continued as it had done, the Normans having enhanced it. It was made more difficult by less capital and a lack of freestone. Resulting buildings, such as those built of granite, were strong but lacking in free detail. Mason lodges, however, were well in place.

It is known that in the 13th-century operative lodges, well organised, most practical, their own loyal to their own, isolated, confirmed in secrets-keeping, were well in place all over Britain. There was absolutely no plan at any time that they were to evolve into an organisation capable of changing whole societies. But they had the practical, the hard core, the carrying form, characteristics.

The first step in the formation of Freemasonry had been taken.

### **Conclusions**

1. Thirteenth-century England was engaged in much building; this provided a firm base for the existence and development of operative lodges.
2. As masons had to travel it is considered that this made the having of secret grade-recognition signs a must; this is a basic feature of Freemasonry.
3. These operative lodges, it is thought, would need non-operatives, such as chaplains and clerks; the principle of non-operatives being part of an operative lodge appears established.
4. The existence of sound operative lodges in the 13th century onwards in England and Scotland, although in no way planned to become the physical base of a practicing philosophy and message of fundamental importance to all, were nevertheless in place; the first step in the formation of Freemasonry had occurred.

### **Palestine Lost**

In Palestine things kept going wrongly. Jerusalem fell in 1187. It was all gone by 1291. One consequence was that the Templars, as far as Roman Catholic Europe was concerned, appeared to have lost their reason for existence.

### **Conclusions**

1. Palestine was lost to Europe by 1291.
2. In the eyes of Europe it seemed that the Templars had lost their reason for being; they may have lost some status.

### **Catholicism and French greed—the Templars destroyed**

Phillippe IV (1293–1350) of France owed much money to the Templars. He was a most ambitious man but was broke; he coveted the great wealth of the Templars (Baigent, Blood:70,71). He owned the current Pope, Clement V, probably having had his two predecessors murdered, and Clement paid for. He decided that by a secret lightning strike he could capture all the Templars in France and so gain their wealth. France was the chief Templar base. He secretly struck at dawn on the fateful date of Friday 13 October 1307.

However, Sion knew. It warned the Templar leadership (Baigent, Blood:71,72). Most of the Templars were rounded up. The commanders, under Grand Master Jacques de Molay, may have thought that it could deal itself out; at any rate they displayed leadership and remained on site. Many Templars were subjected to ‘hideous torture’ (Baigent, Mes:53) to find excuses for the arrests.

Jacques de Molay was given special treatment. Knight and Lomas (Mes:128) claim that he was flogged, then crucified on a door, which was repeatedly slammed. The Holy Inquisitor, under instructions not to kill him, released him at the last moment. Knight (Mes:139–172) then concludes that he was placed on a bed and covered with a white initiation shroud. Due to natural lactic acid gas emissions, which cause photographic images—here a Dr Allan Mills (Knight, Mes:156–161, 235–241) is convincingly quoted—de Molay’s body was imaged onto the shroud. This same shroud, kept and later displayed became, under the Roman Church, the Shroud of Turin, the ‘Shroud of Jesus’.

The rest of Europe was shocked, and treated the Templars relatively lightly. But with their Grand Master and headquarters gone the Order was finished. But not quite. Knowing of the imminent strike all of the Templar wealth, treasure and documents kept at the great Paris Preceptory were secretly removed (Baigent, Temp:53) to a fleet of eighteen Templar ships at La Rochelle (Gardner: 271–2). It cannot be envisaged otherwise that the most precious documents, those from the Temple Mount, would have had top priority for this movement to a safe place. The La Rochelle fleet then disappeared from history. Everywhere wealth-loaded fleets disappeared. No ship of the great and famous Templar sea power was ever found or captured (Baigent, Blood:72). Phillippe never gained any of the coveted treasures.

### **Conclusions**

1. Phillippe IV of France owned the Pope but was broke, coveted the Templar wealth, and on Friday 13 October 1307, secretly struck those in France, which led to the Order’s extinguishment.
2. Sion must have known in advance; all the Templar treasures and, undoubtedly, the Temple Mount documents, were previously transferred to Templar ships, which disappeared.
3. The Templar Grand Master, Jacques de Molay, was severely tortured; it has been postulated that he was covered by a ritual shroud, which the Roman Catholic Church later exhibited as the Shroud of Turin or Jesus.
4. The rest of Europe was shocked, but treated the Templars lightly; nevertheless, from the point of view of their mission they were finished.

### **Beneficiary of the Templar destruction—Scotland**

The key fleet headed for Scotland (Baigent, Temp:65). This was the ideal refuge as it was remote from Papal Continental armies, it had a strong Templar infrastructure and the King, Robert the Bruce, 1306–1329, and his country had been excommunicated. The Papal Bull dissolving the Templars was never proclaimed there. Templars also went to Scotland from England.

The fleet landed on the east coast (Baigent, Temp:69–72), seemingly not far from the Templar station at Kilwinning. The Templars had previously built there a vast abbey, in 1140 (Knight, Mes:209). It seems likely that the Templars hid their treasures, records and documents in its vaults.

### **Conclusions**

1. The key Templar treasure fleet landed in Scotland, beyond the reach of the Pope; Scotland knew that it had received a great benefit.
2. It seems most likely that the postulated Temple Mount documents were hidden in a vault at Kilwinning Abbey.

### **England—Scotland's predator**

With England's Edward II impending invasion of Scotland this happened to be a time of great need for Bruce. He was doomed to lose the country; but the refugee Templars had brought with them great wealth, could get arms from Ireland, and could provide a magnificent heavy mobile fighting force. They decided to raise their banner with Bruce's. No doubt Templars both escaped from England and based in Scotland joined in.

Preparations were made for the coming battle. A strange story now arises, one for which there is no contemporary documentation. Nevertheless, the Duke of Antin, in Paris in 1741, stated that the nobles who had agreed to support Bruce (Ward:298) were made Freemasons at Kilwinning. James, Lord Steward of Scotland, was made their Grand Master. This was Antin's report. There is no documentary proof. But it needs noting.

### **Conclusions**

1. Scotland was doomed to fall to a great English army, but the Templars decided to support Scotland; this was no doubt a critical decision.
2. Legend has it that at Kilwinning the Templars made Scottish nobles supporting Bruce 'Freemasons'; this included the Royal Stewards/Stewarts, later the Stuarts.

### **1314—the great watershed—the Battle of Bannockburn**

It is more than possible that the French refugee and other Knight Templars assembled at the rallying centre of Kilwinning were aware that they might be wiped out by the far larger English army. These knights were burdened with great secrets: the nature of ancient Christianity, the whereabouts of the Tomb of Jesus, the Temple Mount documents, plus the hiding place of their treasure and documents, including the Temple Mount.

It seems reasonable to suppose that they decided to spread their knowledge before the coming battle. They would have selected suitable Scottish warrior nobles. The Scottish-based Deputy Grand Master would have had the power to make these Templars and, using the proven Templar ritual, would have had them initiated them into the low and medium degrees. If it had indeed existed, the 'living resurrection' or raising observance would have featured in the inducting phase. In the Masonic ceremony, of course, the dead are not 'resurrected'; neither would they have been with the Templars. The secrets would have been parcelled out according to rank. Celtic, Gnostic-type, Christianity, was then still a power in Scotland, so the revelations would not necessarily have been a shock.

It is possible to conjecture these ceremonies being carried out in all solemnity in an inner sanctum of Kilwinning Abbey, in the quiet and candlelit black of night. The oath of secrecy would have been awesomely put. The whole business must have made a huge impression. One capable of demanding repetition down through the generations.



Jackson (Beyond:61) notes that the 'Knight of the Rosy Cross' Order is said to have been known straight after Bannockburn. Many assert, he says, that it was the basis of the Scottish order of the Thistle. It was very little later, also, that some claim that the 'Royal Order of Scotland' was known. Mackey (768) relates that the Royal Order claims Kilwinning as its original chief seat of government.

And so it appears to this researcher that at that time some of the ceremony now incorporated into speculative Freemasonry first moved from their Templar owners to the wider realm of Scottish nobility.

Totally unplanned, with at least two and a half centuries yet to go, the speculative foundation of Freemasonry was laid.

The second step had been taken.

### ***Conclusions***

1. The Templars assembled at Kilwinning, faced with the likely prospect of being wiped out in the coming battle, could well have decided to make selected Scottish nobles Templars, so that they could pass on their great secrets.
2. If this is the case the Templars initiation ceremonies, including the resurrection or raising ceremony, would have been given to all, with higher ceremonies given to higher ranking nobles.
3. Other possible degrees delivered at this time include what are now known as 'Knight of the Rosy Cross' and 'The Royal Order of Scotland'.
4. The conferring of Templar degrees on Scottish nobles before the Battle of Bannockburn, Scotland, 1314, was the second step in the formation of Freemasonry.

### **24 June 1314**

From the Masonic perspective it can be no accident that the Battle of Bannockburn, Scotland, took place, in 1314, on 24 June, St John the Baptist's Day.

### ***Conclusions***

1. The mystery of why Scottish (and later English, for a time) Masonry is called St John's Masonry, and why St John the Baptist's Day is so important in Freemasonry, is solved—it commemorates the Scottish-Templar Bannockburn victory.
2. This solution adds weight to the claim that Freemasonry was born or at least given a start at the time of the Battle of Bannockburn.

### **1314—the Templars—their entrenchment in Scotland**

Henri de Saint Clair, a descendant of the Henri who accompanied de Bouillon on the First Crusade, was a Knights Templar commander (Gardner:294) at Bannockburn. That epic battle was decisive. It ended for 298 years English attempts to take Scotland. The Templars were made. Scottish tradition is that they flourished (Baigent, Blood:74) in Scotland, in modified form, veiled, for four centuries.

Some Roman Catholic control came back into Scotland. One result was a Papal order that all Templar property was to be handed to the Knights Hospitallers. A sham arrangement ensured that this did not happen (until a betrayal centuries later). On learning that their enemies had regained a foothold in Scotland, the Templars went underground (Knight, Key:300–1). Here is a further reason for the later local maintenance of Freemasonry as a solemn movement able to unknowingly help with Templar initiation.

### ***Conclusions***

1. At the Battle of Bannockburn in 1314, the Templars earned the sincere gratitude and respect of the Scots, and thereafter attained great influence.
2. With the re-appearance of some Papal presence in Scotland the Templars quietly merged into the great Scottish families.

### **Operative masonry in 14th-century England**

In England building continued, with church construction and the Perpendicular style, into the mid-16th century (Markham, *Origins*:138). The usual reasons for having 'non-operatives' in lodges continued, and Markham (*Origins*:138,9) thinks that as local communities were paying for their cherished building in stages their leading contributing persons would attend 'lodge' meetings for two-way communication reasons. Certainly other trades had their non-operatives, for example, as liverymen, known in the 1600s (Sharman, comment in Stevenson:74) to be in the London Worshipful Company of Glovers, founded in 1349.

John Wycliffe began translating the Vulgate Bible into English, the work being finished by his students in 1380. The Roman Church had all the copies it could find burnt, and Wycliffe's remains exhumed and burnt. Nevertheless some biblical knowledge began circulating amongst literate citizens.

Early evidence of organised operative masonry in England is provided by early constitutions, or the 'Old Charges'. The *Regius* of c 1390 and the *Cooke* c 1410 are the earliest known. They provide mainly mythical histories, details of mason grades and group organisation. This included large assemblies of a mainly annual basis.

However, before this, in 1356 (French:181) a code of regulations was drawn up for London Masons. In 1377 'The Fellowship of Masons' was founded, becoming in time the London Company of Masons. English lodges, of course, were already (French:185) in existence.

An 'immense' (Clarke, Ext:31) number of masons worked on Windsor Castle, beginning in 1360. Clarke is of the opinion (31) that a code of practice must have been in place. Upon the finish of the work itinerant masons would be likely to take it elsewhere. This could have begun the 'Old Charges' practice. Rules were certainly drawn up in 1370 (Clarke:31) for the 'Chapter of York Minster' at York.

### **Conclusions**

1. Well-organised operative masonry flourished in England in the 14th century.
2. Wycliffe's English-language Bible would have received great attention in England and Scotland; it must have added to the quest for knowledge and, probably in Scotland, the refining—not alteration—of Templar ritual.

### **Roman Catholicism and the power of print**

In 1440 printing came to Europe via Gutenberg. It was brought by a Protestant to Protestant Germany; Roman Catholic-controlled countries were out of the question.

The *Gutenberg Bible*, the world's first printed Bible, appeared in 1455. It was, of course, Roman Catholic policy to ban the Bible from the people. The priests doled out selected pieces, interpreting them as they saw fit, and could ascribe any Roman demand to the Bible.

Then came a swath of classical literature, new philosophy, new information and new science. The coming of the printing press began a nightmare (Andrews:407) for Roman Catholicism. It at once began to undermine the policy of maintaining rule by keeping the population ignorant.

### **Conclusions**

1. Printing opened the way for classical literature and liberal thinkers to reach large numbers.
2. Printing was perceived by Roman Catholicism as a threat to its power.

### **1446—Scotland and the Temple Mount documents—Roslyn Chapel Conclusions**

In Scotland it is apparent that the ancient Temple Mount records and Templar documents were moved from Kilwinning to the Roslyn Preceptory. With the subsequent undergrounding of the Templars the

documents would have shifted to the Saint Clair Roslyn Castle, as in Scotland the Saint Clairs, Barons of Roslyn, were the highest ranking (Gardner: 295) Scottish nobility. Certainly, in 1447 (Knight, Key:307) a fire, which greatly alarmed the incumbent Saint Clair, Earl William, caused four great trunks of documents to be moved from one of the Castle buildings.

It was in 1446 that Earl William Sinclair, a Saint Clair descendent, began the construction of Roslyn Chapel, now known as Rosslyn. Gathering some of Europe's finest craftsmen, he built the 'chapel' to the ground plan of Herod's Temple (Knight, Key:324). Lacking any idea of the appearance of the Temple, he apparently copied its—imaginary—picture from a Templar map of Jerusalem, a 'Heavenly Jerusalem' (Knight, Key:314) type of map. Although not a big building, four years were spent on the foundations (Knight, Key:307). Knight and Lomas (Key:307,8) are certain that the time was spent carving a secret vault system deep into the rock below the chapel.

Into these vaults would have gone the Temple Mount documents and various Templar records. Even the official guide book—quoted by Knight (Key:317)—speaks of stories of vaults, and that 'important artefacts' may be in them. They may indeed.

The 'chapel', which took 45 years to build, is typical of Templar Gnosticism. It was finished with no crosses, no crucifixion scene and no altar. It contains a wealth of carved detail, much of it symbolic, including Masonic (Knight, Mes:24, and Baigent, Temp:111). Baigent (Blood:190) adds that the chapel 'has long been associated with both Freemasonry and the Rose-Croix'. Some statuary has gone, and various carvings have been mutilated—Baigent says to destroy evidence—destroyed or badly worn.

### **Conclusions**

1. Beginning in 1446 William Saint Clair had built a magnificent 'chapel' at Roslyn, Scotland, bringing in fine masons from all over Europe.
2. Four years were spent on the 'foundations'; it is concluded that a secret vault was built.
3. In the mid-15th century the priceless Temple Mount documents were placed in a secret vault beneath Roslyn Chapel, Scotland.

### **Scottish operative masons—and nascent Freemasonry**

It is obvious that the designers and builders, particularly of the secret vault system, would have had to have been sworn to utter secrecy. The existing lodge system would have provided ready-made secret cells able to keep secrets. Knight and Lomas in their book *The Hiram Key* (312) realised this, and wrote: 'William St Clair was a brilliant and talented man and we believe that he devised the first degree of Craft Masonry and the Mark degree to give his operative masons a code of conduct and an involvement in the great secret of the living resurrection which was reserved for speculative masons.'

It appears to this researcher that the basic idea is right, although the degrees, other than the first, wrong. The material being 'reserved for speculative masons' has no follow-up, and is meaningless, unless to mean that Knight thinks that Saint Clair had worked out the whole system of speculative Masonry, but was not willing to use it on this occasion. This cannot be agreed to; for one thing, when would a better occasion arise? But the real answer is that his moves were to meet a pressing present need; he had no sweeping system in mind. And no speculative masonry was to allow itself a trace until 285 years later.

All that William Saint Clair would need to have done was use the lowest grade Templar ceremony, entrance initiation, with its no doubt strict obligation and oath. After all, if it is tolerable to accept that Templar degrees were passed on prior to Bannockburn, then Sir William was doing nothing out of place. What was new was the type of person receiving it; and one with a practical lodge system. If this did indeed occur then most probably the degrees used were suitably modified for the purpose.

The initiation degree had to be used at Roslyn. This would have been a lead-up to the Templar 'vault' degree, perhaps also delivered; only to those directly involved, of course. The finding of the Temple

Mount documents must have been committed to Templar ritual; it would have produced a concise 'Holy Royal Arch'; that is, a 'Jesus—King—Greatest' degree. Certainly Knight (Key:316) photographed a 1621 gravestone at Temple, the old and nearby chief Templar site, bearing a pick and shovel—Royal Arch symbols—as well as the usual Templar—Masonic skull and crossbones. The secrets to be kept would have been the existence of the vaults—and, for those directly engaged, the secret sealing within them of trunks of documents.

Roslyn Chapel, also, bears in Latin the inscription (Knight, Key:318) 'Wine Is Strong, A King Is Stronger, Women Are Even Stronger But Truth Conquers All.' This is a focal point of the Red Cross of Babylon degree, which is usually attached to the Holy Royal Arch; it seems that was also conferred at that time.

The ceremonies could well have been performed, late at night and dramatically, in Roslyn Castle's private chapel.

It is no hardship to envisage that those masons and lodges entrusted with the 'Templar or Roslyn degrees', so mind bending, and representing so much privilege, would have devoutly passed them down. These would have been at the heart of nascent Freemasonry.

At least one recognisable Masonic ceremony can be seen at Roslyn Chapel. Pointed out by Knight and Lomas (Mes:39) in 1997, it is an external carving. A provided photograph (148A) depicts a blindfolded man kneeling between two pillars. Around his neck is a cable tow, held by a kneeling conductor; the latter has a Templar cross on his chest. The depiction would have served as a perpetual reminder of the simple and bloodless fate awaiting any brother who broke his oath.

It is as certain as it is possible to be that here we see depicted a Templar—Masonic initiation ceremony; one performed on a non-Templar.

Degrees, astounding degrees, degrees of the greatest Chivalric Order the Earth has ever seen, had been conferred on ordinary men. Men who were members of mason lodges. Templary and operative masonry had been married. It was the first step to speculation for masons. Nascent Freemasonry had been, quite fortuitously, launched.

For Freemasonry's formation, the third step had been taken.

### ***Conclusions***

1. In the 15th century a certain few operative lodge masons building the Roslyn Chapel in Scotland, more particularly those engaged in the 'foundation' work, were given, by inheritors of the Order of the Temple, certain Templar-modified degrees and ceremonies; the Templar initiation ceremony and the Templar Secret Vault ceremony.
2. This induction of operative masons at Roslyn is concluded to be the factual genesis of nascent Freemasonry.
3. The Holy Royal Arch, translated Jesus—King—Greatest, as a Masonic degree may be traced to the building of Roslyn Chapel; also its attached Red Cross of Babylon.
4. These degrees, initiation, vault and Red Cross, represent a climatic time for operative masonry. They were undoubtedly kept by those few operative lodges involved in the Roslyn Chapel oath-taking; thereafter those lodges and, as no doubt Sion saw the value, probably other lodges as the years advanced.
5. Nascent Freemasonry was launched incidentally with the conferring of modified Templar degrees on stonemasons who were building a secret vault for Roslyn Chapel, Scotland, in 1446, and was, although unplanned and unrecognised as such, the third step in the formation of Freemasonry.

### **Operative masons in 15th-century England**

England was in a time when, due to the wool trade and commerce, great wealth was available. This encouraged building, and mason lodges begin to become clear in documents; for example the York Minster Ordinances (French:183) mentions them in 1352, 1370 and 1408–9. Internal records are missing, but there is a growing number of Old Charges. These had primitive procedures for operative mason grades.

There is proof of the London Masons' Company in 1472. Subsequent records show its dominance up to the Great Fire of London, 1666.

Meanwhile in Scotland operative lodges were now being incorporated with other trades, as the 1475 'Seal of Cause' (French:185) shows. However masons apparently managed to hold separate meetings.

### **Conclusions**

1. Much building occurred in 15th-century England, with evidence of operative lodges in being, the Old Charges of the time giving evidence of some sketchy ritual.
2. In Scotland mason lodges were incorporated with other trades, although it appears that at least some held separate meetings; those few holding the 'Templar or Roslyn' material could have suffered, however, some loss or garbling of ritual and secrets.

### **Knowledge comes to Europe**

Knowledge continued to migrate into uncouth Europe. In 1453 Constantinople fell to Islam. At once there was an influx of civilised refugees, bringing some of the knowledge and texts built up over the amazing thousand years of the Byzantium Empire. Then the Moslem invaders of Spain, there for 700 years, began to be pushed out, Ferdinand becoming the first 'nearly all Spanish territory' king in 1500. Again, refugees brought their knowledge, gained under moderate Islam, including much from the ancient Middle East which had been destroyed by the Church. Cabbalism, Judaic thought, Hermeticism, Neo-Platonism, Gnosticism, astrology and alchemy began to have a 'great' (Baigent:137) impact.

One of the Roman Church's moves to regain complete domination was, in 1486, to issue a Bull to suppress 'witchcraft'. It targeted the new knowledge carriers. Over the next 250–odd years about a million (Gardner:309) innocent men, women and children were murdered; strangled, drowned or burnt alive. Knowledge, however, continued to get through; inevitably it started to awake suppressed Europe.

### **Conclusions**

1. The fall of Byzantium and of the expulsion of Islam from Spain brought a flood of information into Catholic Europe.
2. The Roman Catholic Church tried to stamp out this knowledge and its carriers, one of the moves being, in 1486, to issue a bull on witchcraft, which held in some places for about 250-odd years, resulting in the murder of a million innocents.

### **Religious reform on the Continent**

In 1517 Martin Luther, a Catholic theologian, broke lose in Germany. He rejected Rome's total control; in this he was supported by the Teutonic Knights, an offshoot of the Knight Templars, which gave him hidden strength. He translated the Bible into German. Printing saw to its distribution. Where it could, the Roman Religion burnt Luther's books, but found it hard to get at him physically in Germany.

In the not-always-safe shelter of Switzerland, Calvin strove for freedom from Rome. In 1541 he wrote a book on Christianity free of priests. These stirrings reflected the ancient Judaic struggle to be free of Rome's physical yoke. Rome kept condemning and burning; the great astronomer, Galileo, 1564–1642, who was made by the Inquisition to recant his earth–sun findings, only escaped burning by his 'recanting'—and by his great fame—but he was held under arrest for the rest of his life.

A Scotsman, John Knox, learnt from Calvin. Narrowly escaping burning, he returned to Scotland and in 1559 began preaching Protestantism. From this emerged Presbyterianism, which includes elements of the ancient Celtic Church.

### **Conclusions**

1. In 1517 in Protestant Germany, Martin Luther produced, despite Rome's best eradication efforts, a Bible in German, printing ensuring a wide distribution.
2. In 1541 in Switzerland Calvin began writing Protestant books, which had great influence.
3. In 1559 John Knox, a Scotsman, began in Scotland preaching a Protestant religion free of priests.

### **England breaks with the Pope**

By 1600s the mood in England was positive. Phillip II of Spain's great Armada, a Roman Catholic drive to get England back as a slave state, had been defeated in 1588. Thereafter, although at times shakily, England stood free and was left alone.

In 1532 an English strong man, Henry VIII, 1491–1547, formally broke England from Papal authority. In 1536 he began suppressing the Roman monasteries. Fuelled by the intoxicating feel of freedom, a reform movement, although as yet small, was under way. Henry's actions stopped the great English church-building era. Other building continued, however. Knoop and Jones (Decline:153) note that fortification works expanded. Nevertheless there was, for a while, a building downturn.

After Henry's death in 1547 a young Edward VI followed for a few years; it was a time of chaos. He was followed by Mary I, Queen from 1553–1558, a Catholic. She restored Papal Supremacy to England. Markham (comment to Batham:36), wrote: 'Catholicism in England was branded with the stigma of terrifying intolerance. Very severe religious persecution on such a scale and within such a short time had never happened before in this country; nor did it happen again.'

Horrific burnings of a great number of 'heretics', including the saintly Bishop Cranmer 1489–1556, followed. Known as 'Bloody Mary', she and the Roman Catholics she'd brought back reminded the more civilised English of what they thought they had earlier escaped. England was repulsed.

### **Conclusions**

1. Although remaining a Catholic, in 1532 Henry VIII threw off from England the rule of the Pope; the break encouraged Protestant thought.
2. Henry VIII's suppression of monasteries in England in 1536 stopped the great English religious building era, although other building did occur, but on a lower scale; although no doubt diminished in number the English operative lodge system survived.
3. Mary I's restoration of Papal power in England resulted in a horrific 'cleansing' of 'heretics', one which so repulsed the more educated English that Roman Catholicism became associated with barbarity.

### **The Bloodline comes to Scottish royalty**

Marie de Guise married James V in 1538, so bringing the Jesus Bloodline to the House of Stuart. Doubtless Sion was involved, perhaps for two reasons. One, Scotland had always proved a safe and loyal haven, and therefore a suitable place to ensure that the Bloodline was perpetuated, in case of disaster on the Continent. Two, as a reward to Scotland. Either way, it would ensure that the Stuarts would from then on be used in the effort of trying get the Bloodline on more and more thrones.

Mary Stuart, 1542–1587, their child, became Mary Queen of Scots and, married to Lord Darnley, produced James, 1566–1625. On his mother's abdication James became James VI of Scotland in 1567, taking power in 1583. There can be little doubt that Sion saw to his education.

Knight Templary, no doubt well established in Scottish noble circles, with its knowledge being handed down, including on Christian Gnosticism, would have been given a boost.

In the meanwhile Scottish stonemason lodges managed some form of at least semi-separation from other trades between 1500 and 1520 (French, 185, thinking more). The Lodge of Edinburgh, for example, took on by itself the passing of its Fellow Crafts, thereby reverting to ancient custom.

### **Conclusions**

1. The marriage of Marie de Guise in 1538 to James V of Scotland brought the Jesus Bloodline to the Royal House of Stuart, the first to have it being James VI; the Stuarts had been entered in the lists for expanding their House to other kingdoms.
2. The infusion of the Jesus Bloodline into the Stuart Royal family would have given Templary a boost.
3. In the early 1500s Scottish operative lodges to some extent separated from other trades, there thus being more opportunity for concentration on ancient custom.

### **Scotland and nascent Masonry**

Jackson (comment to Cryer, Makings:155) notes that it was in 1525 that the Strassburg–printed book *Ptolemy's Geography* appeared, with an illustration of ‘a square and compasses with a G in the centre’.

In the period 1535–7, Miles Coverdale brought out an English Bible which used, for the first time, the separate names ‘Hiram Abif’. This is the only place, remarks Tydeman (193), that this occurs. Vibert (43) says that the Coverdale Bible was superseded by the Great Bible in 1539. Thus there opens a small window of time, and for a while thereafter, which could well indicate when those Scottish lodges working their Templar–Roslyn degrees modified or wrote down the so-called raising or ‘resurrection’ ritual. With the movement of masons from lodge to lodge—no matter if at a rate less than that in England—the degrees probably travelled as well.

### **Conclusion**

1. The Miles Coverdale Bible of 1535–7 uniquely uses the spelling ‘Hiram Abif’; as it was superseded in 1539 by The Great Bible a window of time opens for dating a Scottish redrafting, by those lodges holding the ‘Templar or Roslyn’ degrees, of the raising ceremony; probably around mid–16th century.

### **Sixteenth-century England**

Markham (Views: 95) records that Prof G R Elton, a Tudor specialist, wrote to him that ‘the second half of the 16th century has been described as an era of great rebuilding, not of churches but of houses and palaces, especially in towns, and the great houses of the slightly later period must have provided quite as much work for masons as did late medieval cathedrals’.

So the work was there, so there must have been mason lodges. Durr (89) says that from the 1580s the English operative masons had developed a ‘highly complex proto–trade union’. Throughout the Middle Ages the lodges were based on the work place.

This is indicated, also, by the appearance of Old Charges at this time, Clarke (Charges:76) writing that the earliest post-reformation one is about 1562, and mentioned assemblies. A Masons Company was incorporated at Newcastle (French:181) in 1581. The earliest English evidence of ritual (Carr, comment to Cryer, Makings) is an Old Charges of 1583. The lodge system at that time must have been primitive; French (184) writes that the Old Charges indicate no more than a single admission ceremony, and only one grade, probably Fellow.

### **Conclusions**

2. The second half of the 16th century was in England a time of great rebuilding.
3. Operative mason organisations were clearly present, with primitive grade inductions.

### **The Elizabethan Age**

The reign of Queen Elizabeth, 1558–1603, possibly for the first time, brought ‘complete academic freedom’ (Jackson, Ros:118), except for Roman Catholics. It was the golden age of the ‘English Renaissance’, and learning and brilliance flourished. Pope Pius V, enraged about the knowledge being spread to Europe, issued a Bull (Batham:19) denigrating Elizabeth and offering absolution to anyone who even attempted to assassinate her.

Over the English Channel on the Continent, freedom of conscience was non-existent. The Spanish persecution of non-Roman Catholics in the Netherlands brought terror from 1568 to 1579. The French Protestants became caught up in the ‘Wars of Religion’ from 1562 to 1598. During that time, despite promises to the contrary, a well-planned Roman Catholic surprise strike against French Huguenots took place on St Bartholomew’s Day, 24 August 1572. Three thousand men, women and children were slaughtered in Paris alone, and another 12,000 throughout France. A delighted (Gardner:36), Pope Gregory sent congratulations to the French Court. Such events, says Markham (comment to Batham:36), ‘perpetuated a deeply felt fear of Roman Catholicism’ amongst the English.

In summing up Masonry’s position by the new century; at 1600 England had a sound operative masonry base, but no hint of speculative Masonry. Scotland had an extraordinary extra—the Templar–Roslyn infusion.

### **Conclusions**

1. From about 1550 on was a time of great rebuilding in England, with evidence of the lodge system and of a primitive ritual; the English operative lodge system was in practical use.
2. Elizabeth I’s reign, 1558–1603, was marked by academic freedom, with the ‘English Renaissance’ resulting, so that some of the ideas and teachings of the ancients, including Christian Gnosticism and many other topics suppressed by Roman Catholicism, could diffuse, if only in the educated classes, throughout the British Isles.
3. By 1600 England had a sound operative masonry base, but no speculative Masonry of any type; Scotland’s masonry, at least some of it, had an extraordinary extra—the Templar–Roslyn infusion.

### **William Schaw—the emergence of Scottish Masonry**

In Scotland James VI, king from 1567 to 1625, in 1584 appointed William Schaw Master of Work and General Warden of the Masons. He issued Statutes or ordinances in 1598 and a second set in 1599. He wrote that they were a collection of all the good mason ordinances of the past, but that lodges in general should continue with their old statutes.

Schaw wanted some uniformity. He ruled that when taken an apprentice should be booked and, after showing his worth, ‘entered’ for at least seven years. Then he had to work as a mason for seven years, he was then eligible to be made a ‘brother and fellow in craft’ (Stevenson, Origins:35). As a fellow he could be a master, although there was no separate ceremony for this. Springett (50) writes that the Statutes ‘mark the arrival of the modern type of lodge’. Stevenson (Origins:36) finds that a new lodge concept then began, each operative lodge having its own district, jurisdiction and control, and it could co-ordinate with others.

Incorporation of mason lodges with other trades did not suit Scottish masons, but the Schaw Statutes brought a means to form separate lodges. These could meet away from the burghs, where the guild was demanded, even in ‘hills and open fields’. Following this, the lodge of Aitchisons’s Haven came into the open in 1599, its minutes of that year still existing. It was closely followed by the Lodge of Edinburgh (Mary’s Chapel).



## **Conclusion**

1. William Schaw, General Warden of the Masons of Scotland, in 1598 and 1599 issued Statutes which enabled lodges to ‘come out’; they did so, many exhibiting nascent Freemasonry.

### **Scotland—the escalation of nascent Masonry**

Like all of the other Scottish lodges then coming out under Schaw’s ‘territorial’ (Stevenson, *Origins*:37) rule, the Lodge of Edinburgh was operative, but it included some non-operatives. The Laird of Auchinleck, for example, was a member in 1600. By 1670 the ancient Lodge of Aberdeen listed its membership as  $\frac{1}{4}$  operatives and  $\frac{3}{4}$  non-operatives, most of the latter being nobles or high grade professionals (Stevenson, *Origins*:202,3). It seems probable that the latter were at least proto-speculatives, and able to conduct separate occasional lodges.

It is thought that the Stuart kings were Masons, seeing something of value to themselves in being so; perhaps it was another means of binding with the noble families. With the kings as nascent Masons, it is further thought, all those who wished to keep in with them followed suit; Masonry was a ‘keeping sweet’ tool.

It is also thought that some of the ‘non-operatives’, hearing whispers that Knight Templary was still alive in the great families, and wishing to enter it, knew that some mason lodges practised a form of low grade Templar degrees, and that if those undertaking them were found suitable, watching nobles would bring them into the coveted Templar fold. Hence, another reason for the attendance of gentry and professionals—hopeful candidates. Hence the occasional attendance of nobles—covert talent selectors.

It was precisely at this time that the rapid growth of towns in Scotland was robbing (French:184) the Scottish lodges of their monopoly. The strict old operatives began to fade out.

When they met formally, Scottish operative lodges certainly used ritual. ‘. . . it is true that by 1600 in Scotland the Craft had a very distinctive organisation based on the lodge, unique and elaborate symbolic rituals and secrets revolving around the “Mason Word”.’ (Stewart, comment to Markham, *Origins*:108)

James III, who ruled 1437–1460, is said to have conferred (Baigent, *Blood*:191) upon the Sinclairs, as they came to be known, the hereditary Grand Mastership of Scottish Masonry. They certainly had the same status in later times. Five Scottish lodges, obviously fired up, issued in 1600 or 1601 the first ‘St Clair Charter’, in support of the Lairds of Roslyn. It stated that these ‘hes ever bene patrons and protectors of ws and our privileges’ (Stevenson, *Origins*:52). The old St Clair memories must have been strong; perhaps they had been passed down as part of the spoken ritual. It is even just possible that these five lodges had received their ritual from the Roslyn Chapel times, or from later members who had inherited it from that time.

The same document rejected the offer of a Royal Warrant for the association (‘Order’), which would have included having King James VI as Grand Master. Again, the unique strength of the Saint Clair family is demonstrated. As an aside: had the five lodges held fire, Scotland would have had a Grand Mastership—and one provable above all doubt—at about 1661. The English position is open to thought.

‘H.M. King James VI and I admitted to Lodge Scoon and Perth’, in 1601 (GL Scotland Year Book:46). Jones (159) adds that a document records that he was ‘entered fellow mason and fellow craft’, and describes Scoon as ‘ane ancient frie Lodge for entering and passing within ourselves’.

Remember, this Scottish Mason event is 116 years before the English claim to have brought Freemasonry to light with their 1717 Grand Lodge.

It is fairly apparent that James used Schaw's new statutes to make his Mason-making public. It is conjectured that previous Stuarts had been nascent speculatives, but because of the system became so privately.

These Scottish free lodges became 'a major movement' (Knight, Key:300) during the reign of James VI. Macnulty (comment to Stevens, Confes:67) wrote that Scottish non-operatives of the 1600s should be thought of 'as early Freemasons', as is Ashmole in England.

### **Conclusions**

1. Scottish lodges like the Lodges of Edinburgh and Aberdeen included non-operatives; professionals, gentry and nobles: it is possible that some of these men hoped to become Knight Templars, and that by showing themselves engaging in Templar-Roslyn ceremonies, available in many operative lodges, they might be selected; the higher nobles probably did the selecting.
2. Some operative masons still revered the Sinclair family, to the extent in 1600 or 1601 of issuing the 'St Clair Charter' stating their support of them, and that at the great expense of rejecting the offer of a Royal Warrant and the King as a Grand Master; this proves that knew they had a big debt to the Saint Clairs—the Roslyn ceremonies are indicated.
3. King James VI of Scotland in 1601 at the lodge of Scoon and Perth, was 'entered fellow mason and fellow craft' in 'ane ancient frie Lodge for entering and passing within ourselves'; perhaps he was promoting both the Templars and nascent Masonry.
4. One result of the King openly becoming a Mason would have been a pressure on the nobility to copy him; here we find a tangible reason for the Scottish nobility's 'non-operative' showing in operative lodges.
5. Some gentry and professionals may have taken the operative modified Templars degrees in an effort to be accepted as latter-day Templars.
6. During James's reign, 1567–1625, it is known that these Scottish free lodges became a major movement; it is a most reasonable conclusion that nascent Masonry was practised by them.

### **James VI of Scotland—James I of England—the Bloodline comes to England**

In 1603 James VI of Scotland, with a Guise-Lorraine (Baigent, Temp:43) Bloodline, became James I of England. A Protestant, and with a reputation of being a humanist (Knight, Key:328), and politically and religiously tolerant, is it conceivable that amongst the Scottish nobles who accompanied him there were not 'frie masons'? It would be difficult indeed to think that significant elements of the Scottish-born Masonic system did not come with them to London; and in time filtering out.

The Scottish 'gift' would have included lodge ideas and, selectively, some of their information and secrets. Palmer (comment on Stevenson, Confes:72), says that a close examination should be made of the Scots who came as part of James's court, as many must have been active in Masonry. He also includes the court of King Charles I. Roman Catholics, of course, came close to blowing up James and the Parliament.

It is asserted that Scottish nascent speculative Freemasonry was laid upon the base of English operative masonry. It did not 'evolve' in or from English operative lodges; it was inserted into some of them. This is in complete agreement with the opinions of almost all current English Masonic writers; they reject the old 'transition' theory. The trouble for them is, in that case, where did speculative Masonry come from? Their second, and real, problem is that they will not accept—some apparently *innately* cannot accept—a Scottish origin.

Baigent (Temp:145) thinks that by the mid-1600s a form of the Scottish lodge system 'had filtered down to England'. Direct proof, of course, is lacking, but, for one, there is the very large growth of copies of the Old Charges, used by the English as a form of warrant. There is also the fact that known

English Freemasonry, that is, nascent Freemasonry, near to the Scottish border was Scottish in character.

It can be envisaged that James and his successors would have used Freemasonry to help smooth the way to the, without doubt strongly implanted, Bloodline mission of improving the lot of the ordinary human. Freemasonry can be seen as a subtle way of transferring the essence of their Templar and Masonic obligations into the apperceptions of the English Establishment. It would have also been a subtle way of ‘Stuartising’ the English nobility.

Sir Francis Bacon, 1661–1726, was a towering English figure of this time. He held high office under James I, and had many prominent Rosicrucian friends, including Robert Fludd, who helped produce the King James Bible of 1611. His friends included Voltaire and William Schaw, and some think (Knight, Key:311–12) that he was a Freemason. He advanced science and society. One of his books was a precursor of the later US Constitution. Sir Francis Bacon: his traditional status as a member of Freemasonry should not be ignored. He could have had an input to the newly arrived Scottish nascent Freemasonry.

### **Conclusions**

1. The fact that King James VI was an entered fellow mason and fellow craft in the ‘ancient frie Lodge’ of Scoon and Perth is a blazing beacon that there was—and is—more behind Scottish Masonry than most English have ever allowed. His membership must have been part of the King’s grooming, to be a leader helping to advance various aims of the arms of Sion.
2. It is asserted that Scottish nascent speculative Freemasonry was laid upon the base of English operative masonry. It did not ‘evolve’ from English operative lodges; it was inserted into some of them.
3. It is strongly thought that James I and his advisers thought that the use of nascent Freemasonry in England would help smooth the way to improving English society; and to accepting him.
1. Sir Francis Bacon could have had an input to the newly arrived Scottish nascent Freemasonry.

### **Rosicrucianism**

In 1614 *Fama Fraternitatis Rosae Crucis* or *The Discovery of the Fraternity of the Most Laudable Order of the Rosy Cross* appeared. It was the first of three pivotal ‘Rosicrucian’ books to emerge in Protestant Europe. A secret brotherhood was spoken of and a forecast of a new coming of age of enlightenment made, a ‘golden age’ for humanity. The message was hermetic and anti-Papist.

The central character, ‘Kristian Rozencreutz’, was said to be entombed. This was enshrined as ‘The Legend of the Tomb’, one much ‘revered’ (Jones:117) by Rosicrucians. With him in the vault were many secrets, so that, if after hundreds of years the light of knowledge should go out, it could help be rekindled with its reopening. It was indeed reopened once, it is here concluded, but sealed again. ‘Kristian’ was illustrated in Templar apparel.

Rosicrucianism needed no organisation, no secret cells; it was an idea, and a positive one. As such it spread itself. Its thinking was cross-border internationally minded. Rosicrucianism became the banner of Protestant Europe; even Martin Luther had a Rosy Cross incorporated (Gardner:308) in his seal. The movement grew as learned men, hermetic thinkers and alchemists flocked to associate themselves with it. The 17th century became the Age of Reason. Its ideals of fraternity, equality and liberty were destined to influence the American and French Revolutions.

The liberal drive of the Rosicrucian movement reverberates with the thinking passed down from ancient Christianity. The central detail of ‘Kristian Rozencreutz’ reads like an allegory of the entombment of Jesus together with records. It is likely that Sion—whose existence, recall, authentic contemporary documents confirm—ever anxious that its great secrets be preserved and passed on, was the author of Rosicrucianism. There can be little doubt; the symbolic focal point of it all, and Sion’s key sign and responsibility, was the rosy cross. It was even the very name used.

### ***Conclusions***

1. 1614 marked in Protestant Europe the beginning of the issue of Rosicrucian books, decrying the Papacy, and in allegorical fashion calling for a new drive for thinking and science, predicting a new, golden, age for mankind; this was a drive to get Europe a liberal society, only possible by outmanoeuvring the Roman Catholic Church.
2. The work said that, against the possible eradication of knowledge in Europe, there was a store of great knowledge entombed with a 'Kristian Rozencreutz', which is easily 'Christ of the Rosy Cross', in a secret vault; the supposition that this was a reference to the tomb of Jesus is a strong one.
3. Rosicrucianism sparked an explosion of learning in Europe; the proposition that Sion was behind it, that Sion was trying another way to get its aims carried out, cannot be ignored.

### **Roman Catholicism strikes—the Thirty Year's War**

In 1613 Frederick, Count of Palatine, married Elizabeth Stuart, daughter of James I. With the release of hermetic ideals into Europe Frederick wanted political and religious reform. He became the King of Bohemia in 1617. The new Rosicrucian movement swirled around his court.

A freedom of knowledge movement was the last thing Roman Catholicism wanted. Fearing for its great power the Roman Catholic Church in 1618 began the Thirty Years War in central Europe, the cruelest before the 20th century. It came close to exterminating Continental Protestantism.

Germany and central Europe were in ruins, and death stalked its peoples. Johann Andrea, thought by some (Baigent, Blood:145) to have been behind the Rosicrucian books, took charge of getting Protestant intellectuals out of the holocaust. He created a network of secret societies known as the 'Christian Unions' (Baigent, Blood:147). Their purpose was to 'preserve threatened knowledge', including recent scientific discoveries deemed heretical. Again, the hand of Sion can be postulated.

### ***Conclusions***

1. The advent of Rosicrucianism and the prospect of whole societies gaining the light of knowledge and the likely spread of Protestantism was too much for Roman Catholicism; following past policy it inflamed a war which saw great slaughter.
2. 'Christian Unions' were formed to get intellectuals secretly out of Europe; the opportunity to spread the idea of intellectual freedom elsewhere was enlarged.
3. The Thirty Years War may well have increased the postulated drive to strengthen and enlarge nascent Freemasonry, in a largely cellular, little record keeping and invisible form, in Great Britain.

### **Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement**

Just as Rosicrucianism appeared threatened, a secret organisation, the Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement, came into being, this time in France. Probably formed under the auspices of Gaston d'Orleans in 1627–29, who hoped to be French king (Baigent, Blood:179), its top men are still not known. Highly efficient, using secret cells and posing as Catholics, but believing in a decent, free, society, it infiltrated high positions and had partial control of the French government (Baigent, Blood:160–1) by the mid–17th century. Its organisation seems like a highly efficient form of early Freemasonry, but one operating in hostile territory. Above all, if Sion was its creator, as seems probable, it demonstrates the great power and drive of that organisation.

Baigent (Blood:179) thinks that the Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement was a facade of Sion. It is of note that one of its front-founders had a descended relative, Fenlon, who greatly influenced Ramsay's 'Oration' (Baigent, Temp:186) of 1736, thereby influencing Freemasonry's path.

### ***Conclusions***

1. With Rosicrucianism in Europe under threat simply due to exterminations, a new group, the Compagnie, secret and highly organised, with the aim of infiltrating Catholic France, came into

being; once more the hand of Sion was probably present, if so again showing its power, tenacity and versatility.

2. The probable power and ability of Sion, as indicated in Europe in the early and mid-17th century, underlines the proposition that it would have had little trouble guiding and assisting the growth of another of its arms, nascent Scottish and Scottish-Stuart Freemasonry in England.

### **Refugee Rosicrucians in England**

From the 1620s on, 'Christian Union' German refugees began arriving in England, also a haven for those fleeing the brutish Inquisition. Scholars, neo-scientists, philosophers and thinkers flocked in by the thousand. There is little doubt that Sion members were included. Under James I's tolerance they were free to do as they wished. There were, of course, many charlatans; but the great thrust was towards enlightenment.

These refugee Rosicrucians became linked (Gardner:312) with the precursor of the Royal Society, possibly formed in 1645, and also the Scottish nascent Freemasonry circulating in England. Known Masons in England at this time are pitifully small in number, but records (Gardner:147) show that some of the continental Rosicrucians became intimate friends of Robert Moray and Elias Ashmole.

Many learned men in England were enthused by the Rosicrucianism international vitality. Copies of its books were available in Latin. The first English-language edition of the Fama, however, had to wait until 1652. Overall, Baigent (Temp:145) thinks, Rosicrucians invigorated 'speculative' Freemasonry. One arm of Sion could well have been helping another.

### **Conclusions**

1. Refugee Continental Rosicrucians and similar from the 1620s on brought to England a fresh and invigorating spirit of border-crossing freedom and learning; the stage was being made easier for Freemasonry to develop and spread the message of a better society to British middle and lower classes.
2. Refugee Rosicrucians helped invigorate the nascent Royal Society and, it is almost certain, nascent Freemasonry; if so, Freemasonry's growth must have been boosted by this injection.

### **Charles I's liberalism comes up against English bigotry**

Charles I, of the Bloodline, coming to the English throne in 1625 found himself caught in social upheaval, with the Puritan movement challenging the marginally more tolerant Church of England. Although probably trying to make moves right for the realm, Charles managed to upset vested interests. Those interests later wrote the history most of whose latter-day products still condemn him.

Another view, however, is that Charles found the English parliament wrangling over territories and religions and clocking up a huge debt; in fact Charles managed to balance the national budget for the first time in centuries. However, the dogmatic Puritans were on the rise. The Anglican Church, up to then, had been 'positively antagonistic towards anyone who dared to question its doctrine' (Gardner:313). But the Puritans were worse. Rosicrucianism suffered under them—it had to go underground (Gardner:218,9). Following the European practice, leaders formed an 'Invisible College'.

Spain was threatening England again; to gain France's support in an unequal match Charles I married the French king's daughter. But she was a Catholic. English Puritanism was now in the ascendancy, and full of self-righteousness. It did not like Charles's liberalism, and the Catholic marriage gave it the rationalisation needed to move. In 1642, under the banner of their parliament, the highly bigoted Puritans accused Charles of many things and rose in arms. The bloody English Civil War followed. Defeating the Royalists in 1646, they gained absolute power. In 1649 they had the hapless Charles beheaded.

## **Conclusions**

1. The liberal views of Charles I were pitted against a new antagonist, Puritan bigotry; the wisdom of Sion having several arms in England, if indeed it did, including a nascent Freemasonry in England, was again shown.
2. Charles I badly misjudged the power of Puritanism when he decided to marry a Catholic; England paid for it by having a bloody civil war which suppressed liberalism, particularly religious; Charles paid for it with his head, and nascent Freemasonry may well have had to melt into secret cells.

## **Early and mid-17th-century Freemasonry in England**

The nascent Freemasonry which the Scots were doubtless practicing, and which almost certainly was brought to England, has merits often not understood. Consider: while men in Great Britain were being exhorted by Masonry to study the secrets of nature, in 1632 the Roman Church almost burnt a man who had studied them—Galileo—and put him in house arrest for the rest of his life.

The earliest known initiate in England, at Newcastle-on-Tyne, was Sir Robert Moray. A Scotsman, he was initiated by some travelling speculative occasional lodge extension of a Scottish lodge, The Lodge of Edinburgh. It was in 1641. He was Quartermaster General in the Army of Scotland. He was a renown Rosicrucian, a founder of the Royal Society, rose to high office and became an adviser to Charles II. This also the first known time a purely speculative group—an ‘occasional lodge’—is known to have acted; speculative Masonry had matured to the point where it did not have to operate in an operative lodge. Proto-Freemasonry was in being.

The Ashmole business has to be the most overworked English historic Masonic fragment by English Masonic promulgators. Suffice to notice that in 1646, at an up-country location, one Elias Ashmole, well positioned and educated, was made a ‘Free-Mason’. It was undoubtedly proto-Freemasonry. It seems that the making was not done by a permanently stationed full lodge but by a group of transients. Caught up in the English Civil War Ashmole nevertheless gained high postings.

Markham (comment on Stevenson, *Confes*:69) is of the opinion that, because of lodges known to be old possessing renditions of the Old Charges, in 17th-century England ‘occasional lodges’ were the exception rather than the rule. The point he misses here is that all occasional lodges would have worked from a base, the ‘regular’ lodge, which was validated by its possession of an Old Charges. But in those times of poor roads, poor communications, parochialism, war and threat of war, it would have been much easier—probably often necessary—to conduct Masonic inductions and grade-risings with small, detached, groups. All that would be necessary would be to have a copy on hand of the base lodge’s thaumaturgic material mandate, its Old Charges. This was certainly the Continental case, and Continental Masonry was Scottish; as was ‘English’ Masonry, as this thesis endeavours to demonstrate.

Following the defeat of the Royalists, Cromwell created a parliamentary republic or ‘Commonwealth’ in 1649. Cromwell made himself ‘Lord Protector’ in 1653, tantamount to kingship, and used terror to gain his way. Dying in 1658, the Stuart monarchy, in the person of Charles II, was later restored to the throne.

There is a school of thought, far from demonstrated, and on the face of it unlikely in the light of the gulf between Puritanism and liberalism, that this English republic was a first fruit of the Sion—Templar—Rosicrucian and Masonic message.

The use of entirely speculative occasional lodges, first recorded for a Scottish lodge, and in 1641, separated from the only known lodges with speculatives up till then, operative lodges, indicates that proto-Freemasonry was in being.

The fourth step had been taken.

## **Conclusions**

1. The earliest known initiation in England into some form of Freemasonry was in 1641; it can be argued that lack of previous records indicates that nascent Freemasonry, here claimed to have been brought to England by James I, was secretive—or its records lost during various catastrophes and deliberate burnings.
2. The earliest known initiation in England, of Sir Robert Moray in 1641, was of a Scotsman, and by an occasional lodge of a Scottish lodge; at the very least this demonstrates that Scottish proto-Freemasonry was in being, and that it operated in England
3. The first known initiation of an Englishman in England, and by an English occasional lodge, a proto-Masonic body, was of Elias Ashmole in the country in 1646; it is impossible to believe that he was really the first, but was just the first known:
  - (1) The full lodge and those who initiated him predated him, and even if some had been initiated by a Scottish lodge the probability is high that some must have been natively initiated.
  - (2) It is difficult indeed to believe that the lodge which initiated Ashmole was the only English lodge in being, or, indeed, that others had not predated it and those others.
  - (3) Ashmole was a great diarist, and by reason of his rare talents his diary survives; it is reasonable to think that almost all other initiated men did not keep a daily diary, or, if they did, it was long since lost.
4. In 17th-century England and Scotland, still trammelled by poor roads, poor communications, parochialism, war and the threat of war, no doubt together with a dearth of suitable large meeting places, the perfect practical way of dealing with such handicaps would be by occasional lodges—small, semi-detached groups—always having a mother, home or base lodge; all they would need was for one of their number to have present a copy of their lodge's Old Charges.
  - (1) Such groups, also, could have ever-varying membership, including being composed of members of different lodges; and here, of course, another need for secret signs, grips and tokens becomes apparent.
5. The use of entirely speculative occasional lodges, first recorded in 1641, and for a Scottish lodge, separated from the known lodges with speculatives up till then, operative lodges, discloses that proto-Freemasonry was in being; the fourth step in the formation of Freemasonry had been taken.

## **The Royal Society, Charles II and Freemasonry**

Organised about 1645, the Royal Society was the world's first science fellowship. Founded by Rosicrucian-type men, men of international thinking, at times it found that it had to be invisible. Its earlier years were always closely associated with speculative Masonry. The Society was chartered in 1660 by Charles II upon the Stuart Restoration.

Charles II, King from 1660 to 1685, reformed the Church of England. He tried hard to get the English Establishment to accept religious toleration, including of Jews and Roman Catholics. To help underline the latter he married a Catholic; Parliament seized upon this and disparaged him as a Roman Catholic.

Again, the old but continuous push via various movements, now openly and strongly including Freemasonry, can be strongly argued. It is of interest to note that in 1985 Jackson (129), studying the two groups, Rosicrucianism and Freemasonry, drew the conclusion that they 'had a common ancestry'.

Wren was an early member of the Royal Society. Baigent (Blood:148) comments that 'Virtually all the Royal Society's founder members were Freemasons'. He (Temp:145) is also of the opinion that Rosicrucianism, the Royal Society and Freemasonry not only overlapped, but were virtually 'indistinguishable' from one another. Newman (38) thinks that the Royal Society provided a 'ready-made fulcrum for the devising and fashioning of future Masonic prose, concept and development'.

It is at this heady time, with new philosophies and sciences bursting into flower, that the beginning of true speculative Freemasonry can be ascribed. The key authors must have been members of the Royal

Society. The Patron, if this inquiry's salencies are reasonably correct, had to be the newly restored king, Charles II. Masonry was part of his House's concerns. Freemasonry was by now obviously observed to be a good carrier of the Bloodline's better society message; plus good for the Stuart image.

Not only did Charles II charter the Royal Society in 1660, he may well have asked it to improve Masonry's better society message-proselyting abilities. It can be envisaged that this was completed, in a primitive but sufficient form, by about 1665. Now, the starting date for this? Recalling that Sir Christopher Wren was reputed to have been made Grand Master in 1667, let the final leap be made—Wren was almost certainly the inaugural Grand Master. 1667. So there it is.

There is not even a shred of documentary proof. Lots of little pieces, however, fit. Note, also, Freemasonry's emphasis on science and learning. It is of interest, too, to recall how after Charles had been deposed he and his court in France used Freemasonry, again upgraded, to promote brilliantly this time his own personal cause's message; that sort of thinking could not have sprung so well formed out of nowhere.

Under the encouragement of Charles II, it is suggested, the Royal Society upgraded Scottish proto-Masonry into extended philosophy, ritual and ceremony, still primitive but sufficient, to bring about true speculative Freemasonry. Finished about 1665 and organised by 1667, the most talented mason in England, Sir Christopher Wren, became the Order's first Grand Master.

Freemasonry's origin and forming: the fifth and final step had been taken.

### **Conclusions**

1. The Royal Society, founded much earlier but not chartered till 1660, encouraged by Charles II, was from the beginning associated with Rosicrucianism and Freemasonry; it is contended that the high placing and partnership here assigned to Freemasonry is further evidence of the high role assigned to it: that of helping to bring about a more free, just and equitable society.
2. Another role of Freemasonry, it is thought, was to help James I's acceptance by the English upper classes.
3. Under the encouragement of Charles II, it is suggested, the Royal Society upgraded Scottish proto-Masonry with extended philosophy, ritual and ceremony, still primitive but sufficient, into Freemasonry; finished about 1660 and organised by 1667, the most talented mason in England, Sir Christopher Wren, probably became the Order's first Grand Master.
4. It is probable that between 1660 and 1687 the Royal Society had an input into Scottish proto-Masonry, resulting in a sparse but accomplished speculative Freemasonry; the fifth and final step in the formation of Freemasonry had been taken.

### **Tomb recording**

It was about this time that Sion found a way to map precisely the Tomb of Jesus by using paintings. This was unknowingly uncovered by Baigent et al in *The Holy Blood* and proven in minute detail, beyond any possible doubt at all, by Andrews and Schellenberger in *The Tomb of God*. Nicholas Poussin, 1594–1665, for example painted a number of pictures of the 'Arcadian Shepherds' type, notably 'Les Bergers d'Arcadie', 1647, which gives glimpses of Mount Cardou, a mysterious tomb, plus a probable secret Sion sign, that of a pointing finger. The point is that the picture's composition is built on a hidden geometry. Some of the work of other contemporary painters, including David Teniers the younger, René d'Anjou and Il Guercino (ibid:225–283), also, indisputably, incorporates exactly the same hidden geometry. The mapping is done by geometrical lines and points, which are transferable from one artist to another; it is also found in two mysterious documents discovered much later at Rennes-le-Chateau.

Concomitantly, the point sign is much employed in higher Masonic degrees, as well as a Craft festive board sign. Whether or not this sign is hermetic and of Sion—and a study of paintings by such artists, and of photos of alleged recent Sion leaders and their surrounds, strongly indicates that it is—those



constitutions which now allow it to be used when non-Masons are present seems to demonstrate the distance they have travelled from the Landmarks Masons undoubtedly were given, and which they undoubtedly swore never to alter, so long ago.

### **Conclusions**

1. In the 17th-century Sion, or its equivalent, devised a geometrical mapping scheme which, upon translation, gives the precise site of the, at least deemed, tomb of Jesus, and had it employed in the composition of many famous paintings;
2. The pointing finger is almost certainly a Sion sign, one which must have almost certainly been given to Higher degree Masonry; its filtering down and degradation in current Masonry seems to be an example of the breaking of old oaths, as well as of innovation, by successive generations of Freemasons.

### **Later 17th-century English Freemasonry**

The first record of an 'Acception' or 'accepted' mason, non-operative, being received in the London Mason's Company occurs in 1650 (French:185). The Acception was a kind of club (French:187) formed under the aegis of the Company.

Dyer (22) is of the opinion that speculative Freemasonry was 'widely spread' in England in the middle 1600s. Cryer (comment to Stevenson, Conf: 65) wrote that 'it was clear' that there was a 'fully speculative' lodge at Chester at about 1660. In contrast, Batham (comment to Markham, Origins:147) states that there is no 'primary evidence' of the existence in England of a non-operative lodge earlier than the 18th century. Markham (Views:112) agrees, saying there is 'no trace' before the end of the century. What is a trace? Knight (Mes:46) finds of this Freemasonry—and it happens to be a characteristic of the whole Sion–Stuart liberalisation drive—that it appears to have been of a 'democratic and republican' nature.

The *Harleian* Old Charges of about 1670, probably from London (Dyer:140), gives articles related to apprentices, whereas previously only fellows and masters had been dealt with. With its references to 'several words and signs' there is a suggestion of more than one ceremony.

In 1665 the Great Plague ravaged London. Two thirds of the population fled and one fifth died. The operative masonry systems began to lose their grip. Then, in 1666, the Great Fire struck. Eighty percent of London was razed. An Act was passed in the following year to ensure that all new building be of stone. Regulations on masons were dropped. Masons flocked in, including from Europe. Forty years were needed to rebuild. Dawson (comment to Markham, Origins:159) thinks that lodges were set up to provide a venue for 'relaxation'.

The Act of Toleration of 1689 eased religious restrictions on foreigners and dissenters—but not on Roman Catholicism, the perceived cruel dictator waiting to regain power. This Act seems to have paved the way for the later new English speculative Grand Lodge to also display religious tolerance.

### **Conclusions**

1. There is argument as to whether or not a form of Freemasonry was present in later 17th-century England, but if this paper's developments are right, it was; Scottish formulated and Rosicrucian–Royal Society–Sion developed, it was helping the more modest levels of society to visualise, and assist in bringing about, the age-old aim of social liberalism.
2. The Great Plague of 1665 and the Great Fire of London, 1666, with all rebuilding to be done in stone, contributed to a breaking down of the strict old operative masons organisations, with foreign masons coming in; this could well have been a time favourable to speculative lodge development.

### **The London Company**

There were undoubtedly Mason Companies in London up to the downfall of the Church in 1530 (Markham, View:81). With a much older tradition of doing this, the Company's first extant record of non-operatives—three liverymen in 1663—is of 'making masons' for payment.

In the mid-16th century non-operatives began entering in numbers. There was a steep fee to pay. To cut through various possible reasons it is about certain that most were just directly self-seeking—being an accepted member of the Company was a 'passport to civic honours' (Jones:73). They gained the company's 'livery'. Liverymen were freemen of the city, and as such could vote for the Mayor and city officers. In those times enfranchisement was a rather rare and enviable status. Ashmole writes in his diary that he visited the Company's Acception Lodge in 1682—as a 'Senior fellow'—which must mean that he had been given a second degree earlier.

### **Conclusions**

1. The old London Company of Masons was now accepting non-operatives in numbers, these apparently joining to become liverymen, which gave them civic privileges; nevertheless a system of non-operative 'clubs', different from operative lodges with a few non-operatives, was growing, capable of providing a sound London base for some speculative lodges.

### **Ever-adapting Sion**

Sion appears to have kept increasing or changing its arms. Doubtlessly these were primarily concerned with the keeping of its monumental aims and secrets, until such time as they could be revealed—obviously always centuries ahead. They helped ensure that they would be transmitted on. The better society aim must have always been to the fore.

Without proceeding to validatory exhibits, examples of these strongly appear to include in France the *Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement*, c 1627 (Baigent, Blood:179), and *Heiron du Val d'Or*, c 1873 (Baigent, Blood:150), and in England the Gentlemen's Club of Spalding in the early 1700s (Baigent Blood:206).

### **Conclusion**

1. If the signs are correctly read, Baigent's examples of Sion groups are yet a further example of Sion's drive.

### **Seventeenth-century Scotland and Masonry**

Cromwell, 'Protector' of his English Commonwealth, invaded Scotland with puritanical savagery. In 1650 his troops looted and burned Roslyn Castle, with most of its ancient 'great library' (Brydon:4) being destroyed. For unknown reasons, however, Roslyn Chapel was unharmed. Perhaps it was because it bore none of the Roman Catholic motifs, and was, in its own way, an obvious great work of art. Perhaps, also, Sion was at work.

A record of the Lodge of Aberdeen, 1670, indicates that more than half its members were non-operatives (Lyon: 420), including earls, lairds and gentry. Although its early records were lost in a fire the lodge claims it was founded in 1541.

The *Edinburgh Register House MS*, bearing the date 1696, probably dates back to the 1660s (Jackson, Ros:129). It has brief rituals of the admission of apprentices and fellows, of 'passing' and of the Fellow Craft degree, two full degrees in all—Entered Apprentice, and Fellow Craft or Master. It includes an obligation on the VSL, secrets and a banquet afterwards. Poole (comment on Allan:155) remarks that the wording indicates 'the whole catechism, once operative, had passed to the non-operatives.

## **Conclusions**

1. The invading English Puritans in 1650 spared Roslyn Chapel from destruction while the adjacent castle was burnt; why? It could have been no accident; the simplest explanation which fits the thesis here being developed is that Sion, acutely aware of the momentous materials in the vaults, had indeed hidden power, which it used.
2. In 1670 half of the members of the Lodge of Aberdeen were non-operatives, including the nobility; according to the present analysis this indicates that keeping in with the Stuarts was, as ever, a strong drive, and that some of the middle ranks may have been looking towards Knight Templary.
3. The *Edinburgh Register House MS*, probably deriving from the 1660s, giving brief rituals of two degrees and familiar Masonic customs, and which some think to relate to a fully speculative lodge, and which could well be the case, indicates what was going on in at least one such lodge; ritual degree work was a key.

## **The advances of Scottish Masonry by the early 17th century**

Study of what seems to have emerged from this inquiry as the reasonable antecedents, origin and evolution of what is now known as Freemasonry suggests the following advances in Scotland.

The beginning was at Kilwinning in 1314, when Templar degrees were passed on to Scottish nobles.

There was non-operative Masonry. Here, men who were not architects, stone-cutters or builders joined lodges or similar groups of men who were. They would join for any number of reasons and a great number have been put forward in the literature. These include being the owner of the building or his agent, for commercial reasons, for convivial purposes, curiosity or for learning reasons.

Recent Scottish scholarship (refer particularly to Stevenson) has shown undoubted fusion between Scottish Freemasonry and operative lodges. The case made here is that the building of Roslyn Chapel saw the necessity of introducing the lowest grades, plus the Secret Vault, of the Templar degree system into certain operative masons; and perhaps whole lodges. If this is the case then it is certainly correct that the birthplace of speculative Freemasonry was Scotland.

Speculative Masonry did not, as it was once always thought, come about by a natural transition or evolution from an operative to a speculative stage. Rather, it was deliberately injected into operative masonry by another power. This was into what were doubtlessly at first a few specific lodges at Roslyn. It appears that once the speculative element had caught and held in certain lodges, its undoubtedly rather sparse nature could well have been from time to time upgraded.

The upgrading was probably by the greatest institution in Scotland, the Order of Knights Templar. The Order of Knights Templar was being religiously kept alive, not as a make-out group but by an unbroken line from Bannockburn. They had their great honour, their fight against their assailant, Roman Catholicism, and their great lands, as enormously powerful driving forces. This upgrading would have been for good reasons. After a while it would have been realised that the embryonic speculative Masonry was capable of spreading at least the morals of a better society to the commons. It would also have been seen as a useful first and testing stage for potential Templars.

The other projected reason is that the Stuart Kings are postulated as members of nascent Masonry, as a useful family involvement; this was made clear after Schaw's Statutes, which saw James VI openly become a Mason. The noble families would naturally follow his lead. The operative and semi-operative lodges would have been creatures of the game.

In Templar courts the 'genuine' secrets would have been communicated, the higher only to a few. This would have and must still include, in probable rising order:

- a. The 'good society' message.
- b. Its ultimate source, Jesus.
- c. The information that Jesus was a man, not part of a godhead.

- d. The information that Jesus did not die on the cross and that there is no resurrection of the body.
- e. The existence of the Temple Mount documents and the Roslyn Chapel secret vault.
- f. The site of Jesus's tomb.

Stewart (comment to Stevenson Confes:73) writes that 'The persistent worry in my mind is that I cannot see how or why enlightened men would be attracted to, and retain an interest in mere builders' initiation ceremonies which is all that Dr Stevenson's purely Scottish evidence amounts to.'

The answer, it is thought, is twofold. First, it is postulated that the Stuarts had adopted Masonry as a good thing for the family fortunes; the gentry and nobles did the usual genuflecting and copied.

Secondly, it could be that some of the professionals, gentry and lower nobles, knowing of the existence of the Templar Order, and wishing to be admitted, were told that they would have to begin at the first step, an initiation. For some, perhaps, it was only available in operative or semi-operative lodges. Perhaps one had to prove oneself at a lower level first. This would explain why Stevenson found that large numbers of such upper class men only attended one or a few meetings of operative lodges, then left.

The answer to the question which vexes so many, then—Why did the nobility enter humble mason lodges? The upper classes were probably courting the King; and it may have been the first step to admission to the Scottish Order of Knight Templary.

### **Conclusions**

1. Study of what seems to have emerged as the reasonable antecedents, origin and evolution of what is now known as Freemasonry suggests that it was prefaced with Templars giving degrees to Scottish nobles before Bannockburn, low Templar degrees were given to Roslyn Chapel masons to seal their lips, then the operative lodges with those degrees were used as an entrance to Scottish Templary, which probably upgraded the lodge ceremonies.
2. The question 'Why did nobles and enlightened men join the relatively humble stonemason lodges, with sparse ritual?'; if this thesis is correct: to please Stuart kings and, perhaps, to obtain the lowest Templar degrees, which they hoped would qualify them for membership of latter-day Scottish Templary.
3. The English now say that their Freemasonry did not come from their operative lodges—in which case, it is to be asked, where did it come from?  
(1) The answer which has emerged in this examination must be considered to provide the Occam solution.

### **Late 17th-century Freemasonry in England**

It was in 1686 that Dr Robert Plot published his renowned *Natural History of Staffordshire*. In it he mentions Masonry, writing of persons of eminent status seeking 'Fellowship', as 'accepted' masons in operative lodges. He speaks of 'a meeting or lodg as they term in some places' (Pick:47), and of 'the Custom spread more or less all over the Nation'. There can be no doubt, therefore, that an early form of Freemasonry was spread over England.

It is 'widely acknowledge' (Baigent,Temp:176) that the 'higher' degrees came from France, having 'originated' in Jacobite Freemasonry. It is here contended that they had been in Britain all along; although doubtless many had been extended and polished in France. The beginning of the Scottish origin can be referred back to the Roslyn Chapel-building times, probably added to occasionally.

Altogether, as witnessed by Plot, there was a building enthusiasm for Masonry. The postulated Royal Society input, to make a truly speculative Freemasonry by about 1665, must have been taking a grip by now. Its diffusion from London, particularly in the face of the usual entrenched custom, must have

been slow. But it was probably sure. This must have been a growing phenomenon over the latter part of the 17th century.

### **Conclusions**

1. In 1686 Dr Plot wrote of eminent persons, called 'accepted' masons, being in operative lodges and holding meetings 'all over the Nation'; as this paper has evolved this is, far from being strange, merely a confirmation of all the developments noted or postulated so far. Why did they join?; it is suggested that one reason was for important-feeling locals to show allegiance to the House of Stuart, hoping thus for favours from the local Royal representative.
2. Traces of Higher degrees in Britain are thin, but it is widely thought that they originated in France, with the 'Jacobites'; this paper indicates that they originated in Scotland, and upon the Stuart exile taken to France and there enlarged and polished.
3. The expulsion of James II by the English establishment in 1687, and his exile in France, was to cause an enormous taking up of Masonry on the Continent.

### **Liberalism—its incompatibility with the English Establishment—the Stuarts ousted**

The new professional and mercantile classes in England, rising in the 1670s, encouraged religious diversity and freethinking.

Charles II, King of England 1685–1688, appears to have become a Roman Catholic. Whether this was a cover, as was often used earlier by Bloodline families, is now most difficult to determine. One factor, probably, was that his Scottish highland subjects were still Catholics. But overall it has to be recalled that the 'official' histories of the time are clouded by prejudice and ignorance.

However, one must think that the Sion message must have been emphatically made known to James. Gardner (32) claims that 'ordinary people' welcomed him, because of the religious liberty he brought. Indeed, Gardner (324) claims that James II was the 'most religiously tolerant king in the history of Britain'. He issued the written 'Declaration for Liberty of Conscience' 4 April 1687, proposing the ideal of religious tolerance for all. He declared, for example, that henceforth people were no longer forced to attend church every Sunday. They did not have to take communion, or 'conform' in any way. He wrote 'we do freely give them leave to meet and serve God after their own way and manner'. The Church of England, the current religious power, was, of course, outraged.

The English Parliament was 'infuriated' (Gardner:325) that James II had allowed tolerance of Presbyterians, Catholics, Jews, Quakers and others. This was the last straw to his having married a Catholic; in 1687 he was deposed. Seeking exile in France, James and his descendants hoped and planned for the regaining of the throne.

In 1688 William of Orange, whose wife was the daughter of James II, and both Protestants, was brought in. The Divine Right of Monarchs was abolished, and the Anglican Church became a subordinate part of the State. Parliament ruled; one way or another, the freer society seemed a little closer.

### **Conclusions**

1. The rise of the middle class in the last quarter of the 17th century, with many seeking to better themselves, must have made Masonry attractive, and reasonably popular.
2. Due to James II's bad reports it is difficult to gain a clear picture of his aims, but he offered and proclaimed complete religious freedom, which outraged powerful vested interests; this paper's developments indicate that the age-old Bloodline, guided by Sion, was at work.
3. William of Orange's taking of the English throne saw much power stripped from it, taken over by the Establishment's parliament.

### **Jacobite Freemasonry in France**

In France the Jacobites, as the Stuart supporters were known, made Freemasonry one of their arms, and developed it accordingly and well, particularly looking at the Higher degrees. Back in England the old Catholic, Anglican or Anglo-Catholic landowners sympathised with the Stuarts. Some have concluded that the English Masonry of the time continued to be that of the Stuart times, now referred to as Jacobean, although remaining 'studiously aloof' (Baigent,Temp:173) from politics.

Baigent quotes McLynn, *The Jacobites*, 40, saying 'There is no question but that the Jacobites had a crucial influence on the development of Freemasonry—to such an extent, indeed, that later witnesses went so far as to describe Freemasonry as a gigantic Jacobite conspiracy.' 'Abroad', notes Baigent (Temp:174) 'most of the Jacobite leaders . . . were not only Freemasons, but also instrumental in the dissemination of Freemasonry throughout Europe.'

### **Conclusions**

1. From 1687 on, the Jacobites in France developed Masonry as a tool for their cause; in this way Masonry received a boost.
2. The Jacobites spread Masonry over the Continent; the basic Masonic messages were able to reach more and more people.
3. In England the Scots had gone but London and urban Masonry remained Rosicrucian—Royal Society—developed Scottish; the basic 'better society' message must have continued.

### **Sir Christopher Wren**

Christopher Wren, 1632–1723, was once acknowledged by the English Grand Lodge as a Freemason, but that Grand Lodge's custom now is to remain silent or to deny it; he perhaps causes problems. Ward, 1921, of the older school, says that it is 'operative tradition that unquestionably he was a Freemason' (168). He also credits Dr James Anderson's statement of 1738: 'And after the rebellion was over—A.D. 1716—the few Lodges at London, finding themselves neglected by Christopher Wren, thought fit to cement under a Grand Master as the centre of union at harmony.'

The point here not touched was that in 1716 Wren was 85 years old. Anderson stated Wren was the Grand Master for nearly fifty years. Ward credits the Anderson statement on Wren's Freemasonry on the ground that if the rest of the recent founding history of the 1717 Grand Lodges is to be accepted, so must this. He also thinks that Anderson could not have gotten away with such a gross error, seeing that Wren had only then died recently. The 'nearly 50 year' timing has Wren being made Grand Master in 1667, perhaps being initiated about 1660; this puts his Masonry nicely between Ashmole and Plot.

Let thought be applied to what Wren was theoretically Grand Master of. Substance?—operative, semi-operative and speculative—the lot. Their affiliation?—about none. Area?—It is thought that the easiest position is the actual one; theoretically of all England, but in fact of the London region and its main tributaries, thereafter trailing off.

Ward (168) also records the London operative's position. The St Paul's Guild, from which they were derived, they claimed, was established in 1673. It gave a 'journey warrant' to a lodge of the fourth degree and began preparations for the rebuilding of St Paul's. Wren is said to have been made an 'Arch Guild Initiative' in 1649. There is no direct evidence of this operative information, but it is a fact that in 1710 Anderson became their Chaplain, and must have known. As the operative group was faltering he had suggested that it admit non-operatives. These, the operatives said, had included Desaguliers, Sayer and Payne. They met, they said, at the Goose and Gridiron.

Baigent (Temp:280), notes that John Arbury, a friend of Ashmole, wrote a memo that Wren was initiated into a degree at St Paul's on 18th May 1691. Pick (70) notes that the famed William Preston 'asserted' in 1772 that Wren attended the 'Original No.1' lodge, almost certainly connected with St

Paul's Cathedral. Preston added that Wren had presented the lodge with three candlesticks 'presented to this lodge by its worthy Master, Sir Christopher Wren'. Inscribed, they still exist.

Wren was a founder of the Royal Society and a prominent Rosicrucian. It can be assumed that he played a considerable role in forwarding Sion's aims. As England's leading architect and builder, and as control had to be kept over a mass of foreign masons, the developments in this study cry out that Wren would have been a Freemason; and a Grand Master. In the face of the evidence found—and there is more—deference to the present English Grand Lodge's diffidence about Wren could well be overcome.

But overall rides the deduction that the Rosicrucian–Royal Society formed Freemasonry, by enhancing Scottish proto-Masonry. And that Wren was probably its first Grand Master.

All things Scottish in England at that time were, and appear still to be, put down with the term 'Jacobite'. It is here asserted that Wren represented the last and best of the old Rosicrucian–enhanced Scottish Masonic tradition.

### ***Conclusions***

1. It is concluded the Sir Christopher Wren was a Freemason.
2. It is probable that Wren was the first Grand Master of the Charles II–Royal Society Masonry–Masonic aggregation.
3. The current English Grand Lodge position is to deny that Wren was a Mason, or shy away from the topic; this paper's work brings the conclusion that Wren is denied because:  
(1) The acknowledgment of Wren and his Grand Mastership would diminish the English Grand Lodge's current situation of being the first, the 'premier' Grand Lodge of the world.  
(2) It would bring closer that day when Scotland, not England, is acknowledged to be the source of Freemasonry.

### **The 1689 Jacobite uprising**

The first Jacobite uprising occurred in 1689, under Viscount Graham of Claverhouse of Scotland, known there (Gardner:327,8) as Grand Master (Baigent, Temp:165) of the Knights Templar in Scotland. Killed on the field of battle, Claverhouse was found to be wearing an ancient jewel, the 'Grand Cross of the Order of the Temple', dated from before 1307.

The rising was bloodily put down; for example, all of the MacDonald clan who could be found were slaughtered in 1692 at Glencoe, including pregnant women.

### ***Conclusion***

1. The ancient top Templar jewel worn by Claverhouse in 1698 is a powerful support of the theory that the Templar line was kept going in Scotland; it could have, at any time, for example, made sure that the current Masonic usages were correct.

### **Late 18th-century—early 19th-century—operative England**

Pick and Knight (51–2) record that the Alnwick operative lodge, of Northumberland, with a 1701 code of rules, Old Charges and extant minutes from 1703, has the only known records of a pre-1717 operative lodge. In 1708 the lodge describes the essential ceremonial dress as being of 'apron and common square'.

A lodge at Stalwell (now Industry 48), has records going back to only 1725 but with a much earlier traditional history. It gained a Grand Lodge warrant in 1735—and was still doing operative business 'nearly twenty years later'. It is 'the only instance of an English operative lodge serving in speculative form'.

### **Conclusions**

1. The Alnwick operative lodge of 1703 is the only known one in England prior to 1717; however, a trail can be picked up from far earlier.
2. The Stalwell, 1725, but with an older history, had in 1735 a mixed operative–speculative membership; this proves that such lodges, as noted by Plot, existed in England.

### **1714—the arrival of Hanoverianism**

Queen Anne, second daughter of James II, ascended to the throne in 1702. England used her to force the union of Scotland with England in 1707, of course to the Scottish disadvantage. Support for the Stuarts was strong in those areas most in need of the reforms they apparently offered, the poor and rural areas. In 1708 James Edward Stuart, son of James II, arrived in Scotland, but trepidation called off an invasion, which could have succeeded.

With no issue the Stuarts were ignored and the Hanoverian House was asked to England; becoming King in 1714, George I could not speak English. By the following year unconsulted Scotland was in revolt. Under the Earl of Mar, who is alleged to have followed Claverhouse (Baigent:172) as Templar Grand Master, a Jacobite march was made on London but, with success in sight, cold feet called it off.

### **Conclusion**

1. Following the lack of a direct heir to the English throne the Stuarts were ignored and a German prince brought in; the Hanoverians were left to become masters of England and unconsulted Scotland.

### **The Third Degree**

The known speculative development of the separate three degree system finds an early hint at Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland, in 1711. The old York system almost certainly had it early, a 1726 reference being made (Jones: 241) to it. The Swan and Rummer Lodge has a reference to a working (Jones:243) in 1727. Pritchard's *Masonry Dissected* (1730) showed a sophisticated system to the world in 1730. However, there are those who think that the third degree was used (Jones:238) in Ashmole's time.

The first record of a 'Hiram Abif' ritual content is in Anderson's *Constitutions* of 1723. A developed rendition occurred in the Pritchard exposure. There is debate as to whether it was split from the second or first or introduced; nobody knows. Only some Scottish Masons would have known that it was an allegory—if it was, and it seems to be—of de Molay's 'death' and the subsequent 'raising' of him from it.

The publication, in 1537, of the Miles Coverdale Bible, uses, uniquely, the spelling 'Hiram Abif'; as that text was superseded in 1539 by the Great Bible, it seems likely that that about this time the latter-day Templars veiled the name Jacques de Molay with Hiram Abif. It is about the mid–16th century, then, that the raising degree, in outline form, may have first entered a few lodges of nascent Freemasonry.

### **Conclusions**

1. The third degree comes to light early in the 18th century; it almost certainly incorporates the death of Hiram Abif, proposed here as an allegory of de Molay's near-death experience.
2. The third degree, or the raising part of it, may have been in outline form in some lodges in Scotland since the mid–16th century, perhaps coming to London, as earlier argued, with the later Stuarts.

### **English Freemasonry before 1717**

Clarke (Folk:27) concludes that English lodges before 1717 must have been 'roughly uniform in the precepts and their practice'. Brett (100) thinks that they had 'simple rites and customs', while Carr (Trans:435) finds that meetings were basically 'convivial'—feasting and drinking. It could be because



the 'true' lodge was a Scottish-based lodge, now something to steer clear of. So for many, club-like lodges would have been a problem-solving development.

Baigent (Temp:173) is of the opinion the latter part of the 1600s lodges 'proliferated', although the bottom line hard records are lacking. The projected 1667 development, of course, would account for this. Although apparently remaining popular in the country, London was a little different. The Gordon Riots in London, completely out of control, aimed at Parliament for perceivably going soft on Roman Catholicism, were the worst of the century; this was in 1778. As the 1700s dawned Freemasonry in London, which city marked all trends, dropped away drastically. This had to be a product of the political situation, with the 1715 bloody clash between Jacobite and Hanoverians doubtlessly bringing it to a head. Knight (Mes:53,4) indicates that Freemasonry, which had developed in a Stuart–Jacobean mould, and with loyalties there, was being relentlessly stalked and overtaken by the new Hanoverian reality. After 1715 it was dangerous to exhibit Jacobite associations.

### **Conclusions**

1. From this study the Clarke conclusion, that before 1717 English lodges must have been roughly uniform, must be generally correct; this, of course, is due to their almost certain derivation from the one source, Scottish Masonry.
2. The Carr conclusion, that pre–1717 English lodges were basically concerned with feasting and drinking, indicates a switching to the club lodge as urban Scottish-type lodges became isolated from political correctness.
3. The marked fall in the number of London lodges around the beginning of the 18th century is put down by many writers to their being of a Jacobean nature, thus becoming a dangerous affiliate; this only serves to make clearer the case for the Scottish origin of English Freemasonry.

### **York**

The history and legends of York Masonry are long, and in dispute. The first known Old Charges and, indeed, all the rest, mention Prince Edwin, whom they say gave the York stonemasons a charter, one which in effect formed a Grand Lodge. Edwin was the half-brother of Athelstan, who, incidentally, gave out more charters than any other English King. Cryer (Pan:72,73) quotes Vibert as stating that Yorkshire—apparently in the second half of the 17th century and well into the 18th—had many centres which 'adhered to the ancient customs of the Order, and revered its old traditions'. They worked old Higher degrees on top of the Craft, the fourth being the Royal Arch and the fifth the Red Cross of Babylon. Also included was a Masonic Knights Templar.

York is well to the north. In York, writes Cryer (Pan:75), 'there had been what is called a "Grand Lodge"' since 1705. It chartered many speculative lodges in the region. Apparently worried about what the 1717 London Grand Lodge was doing, it later added to its Grand Lodge credential, 'of All England'. Fort Newton, writing in 1918 (158), wonders if it could be described as a private lodge (in which case it acted similarly to Mother Kilwinning); he goes on to say that 'the Lodge minutes of York are the oldest in the country, and the relics of the craft now preserved in that city entitle it to be called the Mecca of Masonry'. It and the region practiced many old degrees, producing what some refer to as the 'York Rite'. It was basically a compression of degrees to seven. There was in the Scottish–Antients Masonic world, also, an extended version, which eventually listed 33 degrees—the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite.

Many military lodges adopted the seven-degree scheme, and some the more extensive one. Military lodges at that time—the last quarter of the 1700s—were overwhelmingly Scottish and Antients, but included some Grand Lodge of York lodges (the Moderns chartered only a few military lodges, and restricted membership to officers). They took the ceremonies to America. Present-day American Masons, in their millions, do not work a Moderns–English code; they work the 'York Rite' and the 'Scottish Rite'. This is something about which English writers are quiet.

## Conclusions

1. York has a mason tradition going back before the Norman Conquest; this gives it a feel of weight.
2. In the 1700s the York Lodge or Grand Lodge warranted many speculative lodges; this gives it the stamp of power.
3. York and its region preserved many old Higher degrees, some of which can be compressed into seven, thus forming the York Rite; this, together with the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite, were adopted by almost all military lodges, and taken to America: the foundation of the two American Rites, York and Scottish, is clear.

## 1717—a Grand Lodge for England

In 1716 a 'steering committee' type of meeting was held to plan the forming of a Grand Lodge. Ward (168) notes that the book *Multa Paucis*, of c 1764, states that six lodges were present. As, no doubt per tactics, on the obviously planned date of 24 June of 1717 the new Grand Lodge was established. It must be noticed that probably a very few in London knew the significance of the date—Bannockburn. It also shows to what basic levels the undoubted bringing of Freemasonry, or its early equivalent, to London by James I had fashioned English Freemasonry.

That but four of the original six lodges, that is, one third not supportive, brought into the plan were present at the launch is indicative of those troubled times. Although three of the lodges had members described as of 'humble origins' (Ward:100), one was composed of nobles and top gentry (Newman:33).

One conclusion for the presence of nobles is that, whilst most of the founders were ordinary, 'speculative', unaware, Freemasons, no doubt intending to go on fairly much as usual, the nobles were intent in seeing that the new governing body drop English Freemasonry's 'Jacobite' characteristics. These were always somewhat liberal, a trait not wanted by the Establishment, which lived off the backs of the poor. The nobles were doubtlessly present to ensure that the Hanoverian way of doing things was followed. This was to leave all the governing to the Establishment.

The members of newly directed lodges took great pains to be seen as loyal. They met in public places where they could be seen, they drank loud toasts to the King (Clarke, Charges:36), and they loudly sang loyal anthems. All this was audible within the building. Obviously a winner, it's still done!

Spurr (comment to Stevenson, Conf:60) notes the locutions which Anderson—originally a Scot—forcibly inserted into English Freemasonry when, after 1717, terms such as 'Entered Apprentices' for the English 'Apprentice', and for the English 'Fellow', 'Fellow of the Craft', or 'Fellow Craft' were made compulsory. Macnulty (comment to Stevenson, Conf:68) said quite frankly that all the Masonic idiom of England came from Scotland. Ward (Markham, Origins:145) added 'customs'.

James Anderson was 'staunchly Hanoverian' (Baigent, Temp:79), compiling, for example, the pro-Hanoverian book, *Royal Genealogies*. One has to wonder, then, if his minimising and putting down of the pre-1717 Masonic scene was politically motivated. What was Anderson leaving out and covering up? Does this explain the lateness of the appearance of the new body's *Constitutions*—when the story was straight? Certainly, his 1723 *Constitutions* precluded an approved member from being a 'Rebel against the State'. Compare this to the old 'speculative' practice of allowing political discussion.

Jones (166) notes that the Grand Lodge organised itself on guild lines—its government, the names of its officers, and its livery—'regalia'. Relating this to other information it seems evident that the Acception aspect of the London Company of Masons was now having a clear input into London Freemasonry.

The English speculative lodges, while the 'convivial' feature (Carr, Trans:438) continued throughout the century, were making some contribution to social aspects of the old better society approach. Consider the following comment by Stewart to Stevenson (Confes:77) regarding the content of

sermons commissioned by various lodges. These had a 'holistic view of the nature of society that featured an egalitarian, a nobility of aspiration, a remarkable degree of toleration, a quiet patriotism, an optimistic perspective on the malleability and perfectibility of human nature as well as a practical and humane disposition towards beneficence and charity.'

But democracy was another matter. The higher positions of the new Grand Lodge were soon taken over by the nobility, the first being the Duke of Montague in 1721. None were—and the case remains—democratically elected. In the new English Freemasonry the old social class breakdown crusade was lost. Lost. The Establishment and Hanoverianism had imposed their control.

### **Conclusions**

1. Six lodges attended the 1716 steering Committee to form an English Grand Lodge, but only four did so; there must have been those unwilling to ditch the old Scottish–Stuart lodge system.
2. That a new political base was being laid in 1717 is indicated by one of the four forming lodges being composed of nobles and high gentry.
3. In London on St John the Baptist's Day, 24 June 1717, the Grand Lodge of England was formed by four London lodges.
4. Lodges of the new Grand Lodge were careful that their patriotism was made loud and clear; the old Scottish system was being replaced by an English one. England, it is concluded, began to lose the Landmarks.
5. The new Grand Lodge designed itself on guild lines, more particularly those of the London Company of Masons; this indicates the extent to which London Masonry had been, probably increasingly, controlled by that body.
6. The constitutions of the new Grand Lodge demanded allegiance to the House of Hanover; again, Scottish Masonry was on the way out: going far to neuter the nascent English Freemasonry.
7. Although the ordinary English lodges found change, a general sense of trying to make society a little better remained; English Freemason lodges still had some part to play in social reform.
8. The new Grand Lodge abandoned democratic ways and made its positions by appointment, and got Crown Princes to be Grand Masters; old goals were lost.

### **The 18th century—the great outreach of Scottish Freemasonry**

The Jacobites brought about the dissemination of Freemasonry throughout Europe (Baigent, Temp:174); in fact, it exploded through the Continent. In this it resembles the great initial rush to be in with the Knights Templar, and then the flocking to Rosicrucianism; all had something to offer which was perceived to of value: all, it is contended, were also the product of Sion. This Freemasonry was, writes Bullock (81), 'intimately intertwined with the major issues of the eighteenth century, with hermeticism, the Enlightenment, and the rise of democracy'. Bullock (86) quotes Jacob (*Living Enlightenment: Freemasonry and Politics in the Eighteenth Century*) as writing that Masonry 'was the most avowedly constitutional and aggressively civic' of all 'the new enclaves of sociability'.

The first solid evidence of a lodge in France is in 1725 (Baigent, Blood:149); they were 'proliferating' (Baigent, Blood:154) by 1729. This provides an indication of the type of lodges which were operating in France before then. The Jacobites undoubtedly, as is widely written, took Freemasonry from the British Isles, principally Scotland, with them when James II went into exile in 1688. Higher degrees were worked, this increasing as Bonnie Prince Charlie's attempt at the throne in 1745 grew nearer.

It is apparent that those high degrees, grades or orders would have been carried out in a formal setting. Lodges must have existed. Certainly nobles flocked to be Freemasons. These speculative lodges must have taken on the Jacobite 'detached group' or occasional system, and the secrecy needed by plotters. Its use can be seen at the first known Masonic ceremony in Australia, with a group of French Masons on the French ship 'Le Naturaliste' in 1802. Captain Anthony Fenn Kemp was regularly initiated into the three Craft degrees This was by a group which his certificate says was not 'regularly assembled,

but perfectly constituted' (Sharp:163–4). Such a group is known as a 'triangle', and still exists in some French constitutions.

Freemasonry was beginning to have an effect. In Bavaria, Spain and Austria, where it was sparked from France, it provided a 'focus of resistance' (Baigent, Temp:192) to authoritarian regimes. It voiced alternatives.

### **Conclusions**

1. The Stuarts, it is argued, took the full array of old Scottish Masonry to France, and that these were reproduced there.
2. French nobles flocked into the Scottish Masonry; it can be viewed that Scottish Masonry held something of real importance.
3. In France in the early 18th century the Jacobites were spreading their Masonry throughout Europe, this highlighting freedom and enlightenment; the Jesus-derived ideals, it is argued, continued to be a high concern.

### **The first half of the 18th century—England and Freemasonry**

British society, now virtually ruled since 1715, and particularly since 1721, by a 'prime minister' (Walpole), so excited Voltaire than in 1732 he held it up as a model of civilisation for all Europe. It had, however, many shortcomings. John Wilkes, 1727–1797, the member of parliament who was imprisoned for his democratic views, in 1763 wrote that previously 'there was no freedom of speech or opinion' (Gardner:334). But although the winds of change, set blowing earlier, could be dampened they could not be stopped. It was enough to bring some improvements. This relative freedom of thought from Roman and Monarchical dictates brought its rewards. One was the Industrial Revolution. Kay's flying shuttle of 1733 heralded it. By mid-century a self-made middle class was growing. Some of these were imbued with a strong desire to improve themselves (Barnett:18) also on educational, moral and spiritual planes, and took up Freemasonry. The same Industrial Revolution, however, was producing a new English under-class, badly exploited; English Freemasonry did not reach here.

English Freemasonry has been given credit by some English writers (eg Baigent, Temp:181) for greatly influencing prominent reformers of the 18th century; for example Hume, Voltaire, Diderot, Montequier and Rousseau in France. However, France was entirely dominated by the Scottish–Rosicrucian–Royal Society–Jacobean and Antients type of Freemasonry. Not English.

It was Scottish Masonry which first went to the world and, by far, had the widest spread. This was through military lodges, American colonies—which later reached out themselves—and far places generally.

Meanwhile, the new 1717 Grand Lodge, writes Knight (Key:350), in 'trying to formalise itself', began to 'lose its way'. What actually occurred, it is argued, was that English Freemasonry, at the power level, rejected the great Masonic aims, particularly those on freedom and democracy.

### **Conclusions**

1. The second quarter of the 18th century saw the strong reinforcement of the English middle class; many, wishing to enhance themselves, took up Freemasonry.
2. English Freemasonry has been given credit for inspiring many great French philosophers. This is not the case; the dominant Masonry in France was the Scottish–Jacobean–Antients type.
3. It was Scottish Masonry which went to the wider world, including by military lodges.
4. It is thought by some that the English Grand Lodge began to 'lose its way'; according to the picture here being glimpsed this is not so—the English Grand Lodge had deliberately dumped the old ideals.

### **Roman Catholic opposition**

In 1737 Cardinal Fleury found that an 'extraordinary number of high-ranking nobles' (Baigent, Temp:190) were Freemasons. The following year Pope Clement XII issued a Bull condemning Freemasonry and pronouncing Freemasons to be 'enemies of the Roman Church'. Baigent (Blood:192). In 1962 a previously secret letter by that Pope was found and published, which states that Freemasonry is marked by the 'denial of Jesus's divinity'. Further, it stated that the same 'masterminds' (Baigent, Blood:192) who had been behind the Lutheran heresy were behind Freemasonry. It is, of course, obvious that the Vatican would have been well aware of Sion and its works. Being aware is one thing; identifying for removal members of intensely secret, small and non-linked cells is another.

It is contended that the Vatican would have been well aware, also, of the true status of Jesus. A further Bull, in 1740, pronounced that any Freemason detected in the Papal States would be punished by death. This was in 1740. The overall effect was to subdue Jacobite-type Freemasonry in Roman Catholic countries, at least at the overt level.

### **Conclusions**

1. In 1737 the Vatican condemned Freemasonry and pronounced it to be an enemy of 'the Roman Church'; untouchable in Scotland and England, now that Freemasonry had moved to the Continent Roman Catholicism, fearing that it would help undermine it, condemned it.
2. Where the Vatican had total control it condemned to death anyone found to be a Freemason:
  - (1) This indicates the true power of Jacobean Masonry.
  - (2) This indicates that Roman Catholicism had undergone only a surface 'reformation', the drive to murder those capable of undermining its great vested interests remained.

### **The Baron von Hund experience**

A glimpse into the postulated Higher-degree Freemasonry deriving from Scottish sources can be gained from the Baron von Hund experience. While in Paris, in 1742, he was initiated over a period of time into a high form of Freemasonry by Alexander Seaton—Baigent (Temp:197) proves this by reference to an old letter—who was, as Alexander Montgomery, the tenth Earl of Eglinton. Other highly placed Jacobites were present. The initiation degrees included Rosicrucian-type material.

A basic tenet which von Hund took from Paris was that at the time of the French strike on the Templars some escaped and went to Scotland; here, the Knights determined to continue the Order. This they did through the veil of Masonry. The detail is different but the outline is not.

Baron von Hund was given an exact, as concluded by Baigent, list of Knight Templar Grand Masters, which exactly match present Sion documents, and as such is the only other one in existence. Von Hund's initiators never got back to him; they may have been killed or dispersed in the subsequent failed Bonnie Prince Charlie battles. Von Hund felt obliged to spread the rite, which called for a total oath of obedience to the unknown superiors. It proves to be an early form of the Scottish Rite, and includes the three 'Craft' degrees, a form of Knights Templar, and other material, and came to be called the 'Rite of Strict Observance'.

Charles Edward Stuart, 1720–1788, of Anglican Protestant faith, a grandson of James II, in 1745 led a Scottish army into England to regain the throne. Badly advised, his army was defeated amid great slaughter at the Battle of Culloden in 1746. This ended the Jacobite military challenge for the throne. After the defeat Jacobite impetus to Continental Freemasonry ceased.

### **Conclusions**

1. In 1742 Baron von Hund was initiated into Jacobean Masonry by a small group; this shows that:
  - (1) The detached or occasional system was a long-term feature of Scottish Masonry.
  - (2) The Jacobites were actively using Masonry to help spread their aims and messages.

2. Left alone when the Jacobite campaign failed in Scotland, von Hund tried to pass on his, no doubt, responsibilities; From this, it is argued, it can be learnt:
  - (1) Those receiving the degrees took an oath to pass them on, as thought suitable.
  - (2) The 'Rite of Strict Observance'—note the command not to innovate—gives us a window into what are probably lower grades, if somewhat garbled, of Templary; this includes:
    - a. An account of Templars fleeing to Scotland at the time of the French strike.
    - b. The Jacobites had added to their degrees Rosicrucian-type material, indicating that this was a favoured source.
3. With the military defeat of the Jacobites in 1746 the drive went out of their Masonic efforts; but Scottish–Jacobean Masonry was already spreading itself, and would in time overspread the globe.

### **Scottish Freemasonry fights back in England—the Antients**

In 1751 the 'Antients' Grand Lodge was formed in England; it was said to have been in organised existence since 1739. It seems probable that, as the 'Antients' movement embraced the old Scottish–Royal Society enhanced, now denigrated as 'Jacobin' Freemasonry, it had to have a low or no profile while the Stuarts threatened the Hanoverians. But the 1745 Jacobin defeat put an end to all that.

It appears that when it was clear that Jacobinism was a finished force the Antients made themselves visible. Becoming invisible for a duration is a proven Sion tactic. Proclaiming their existence some years later, they never mentioned Jacobinism, but just got on and practiced and spread the old Freemasonry. They said that they kept to the old—which can only mean 1600s—Freemasonry. The 1717 Grand Lodge, however, which a letter in an 1727 issue of the *Daily Journal* (Jackson, Ros:121) had referred to as 'Moderns', had not.

English writers, including Jones (193) describe the names dubbed on the two Grand Bodies as 'most unfortunate and most misleading'. However, this investigation, if accepted, finds that the contemporary dubbers were accurate; the Antients were using the old and pre-1717 forms, to which the Moderns, then very recent, had made radical changes.

The activists are said to have been mainly immigrant Irish. The movement reached into lower classes and enjoyed 'immediate success' (Barnett:18). It was not a breakaway group from the 1717 Grand Lodge and was not antagonistic towards it. However, as is the case with all well-vested interests, the Grand Lodge of England—now popularly dubbed the 'Moderns'—saw the Antients as a threat. And so the attack on the Antients began.

It angered the 1717 Grand Lodge that the Grand Lodges of Scotland and Ireland pronounced it as aberrant, and recognised the Antients. That body was also much concerned that the majority (Jones:211) of its own members preferred the Antients workings, and wanted Higher degrees.

In the American British Colonies the Antients-type Freemasonry, complemented by Rosicrucianism, reached beyond conventional bounds and directed the rebellion now known as the American Revolution, 1773–83. Key men included George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams and Charles Thompson—all Freemasons. Its design was to free the colonies from the still oppressive—especially for a free-living people—conduct of the old power-corrupted House of Hanover. George Washington brilliantly put the position of Freemasonry in 1792, at the anniversary of his fortieth year of membership. Freemasonry was 'founded on the immutable laws of truth and justice'. His brilliant summary was 'The grand object of Masonry is to promote the happiness of the human race'.

Of pertinence: by the end of the 18th century, even outside of the Antients tradition, many Masons had 'appropriated the Templars' as their 'antecedents' (Baigent, Blood: 76).

## **Conclusions**

1. With the building Jacobean threat to the Hanoverian throne those lodges still practising Scottish-derived work seem to have become 'invisible'.
2. With the Jacobean military threat extinguished, 1745, the old-type lodges assessed that it was safe to emerge; and established their own Grand Lodge.
3. The contemporary dubbed terms 'Antients' and 'Moderns' describe, in the first case that type of Masonry practised under Scottish auspices, and pre-1717, whilst the Moderns were inventing a then new form of Masonry; the terms are accurate.
4. The two other Grand Lodges pronounced the Moderns Grand Lodge as irregular; as those two were working to the old rituals this tells us that the Moderns had indeed made drastic changes; by the practiced Landmarks the 1717 Grand Lodge was irregular.  
(1) The fact that the English cover up or gloss over this happening must indicate that they, too, knew that their teachings and system were irregular; if it was then the case, then it must still be so.
5. The Moderns brushed aside the fact that the majority of their members wanted to practise the old Higher degrees; this indicates that the Moderns' autocratic hierarchy:  
(1) Was out of touch with its people.  
(2) Did as it wished, against the will of its people.  
(3) Did not care about its people.
6. The Moderns attacked the Antients; they saw them as a real threat to their Hanoverian and autocratic system, not to mention their monopoly.
7. In the English American colonies the Scottish-Antients Freemasonry was doing its work of promoting freedom and justice; the American Revolution was Scottish Masonry driven.
8. In the later 18th century it was found that most Masons thought that Freemasonry had come from the Knights Templar; no doubt few had proof, but where there's a continuous insistence there must be a reason.

## **1813—an unnatural Union**

Following the advent of the French Revolution, 1789–1799, in 1799 the 'United Kingdom' passed the first Unlawful Societies Act. This could have crippled the Moderns, but it is contended that their Hanoverian connection—and particularly their position of countering the 'enemy' type of Freemasonry, now embodied in the Antients—saved them.

For the Antients the situation was the opposite. Expounder of the equality of man, dominator of world Masonry, known to be behind the American Revolution and known to be in the opening round of the French Revolution, their ideas of social freedom were a fundamental menace to the vested interest hold on the English, Welsh, Scottish and Irish peoples. There was a real danger (Knight, Mes:58) of their being declared illegal. It is put that this is the real reason the Antients succumbed to the Moderns.

The term 'Freemason'? The Union was about 'Antient, Free and Accepted Masons'. Antient—from the Antients. Free—from the 17th-century usage, to cover both operatives and speculatives; they were all 'free', that is, fully qualified and privilege-entitled (nothing to do with freestone). Accepted—from the few guilds; in this case the London Company of Masons: non-operative, but accepted as masons by it. Their use at that time would have reflected their meaning to those involved at that time; they would have known.

To wind up the Antients the Royal Princes were called in. The Duke of Kent became Grand Master of the Antients and the Duke of Sussex Grand Master of the Moderns. On 27 December 1813 the two Grand Lodges met and united. Theoretically.

The Second Article of the Act of Union is famous—at least the first part is. For some reason the second half of the statement is almost invariably omitted.

Pure Ancient Masonry consists of three degrees, and no more, viz, those of the Entered Apprentice, the Fellow Craft, and the Master Mason, including the Supreme Order of the Holy Royal Arch. But this Article is not intended to prevent any Lodge or Chapter from holding a meeting in any of the degrees of the Orders of Chivalry, according to the constitutions of the said Order.

There were numerous chivalric degrees and the Antients doubtlessly thought they could keep all the rest, such as the Mark, by claiming them as preparatory or step degrees to the Chivalry Orders, as in Scotland.

### **Conclusions**

1. The 1799 Unlawful Societies Act posed no threat to the Moderns:
  - (1) The Moderns backed the Royal House and it backed them.
  - (2) All those who counted knew that the overseas revolutions were Scottish–Jacobite–Antients Masonry inspired, and had not proceeded out of the Moderns.
  - (3) The Moderns Grand Lodge showed no sign of wanting to change England’s class-ridden status quo.
2. The 1799 Unlawful Societies Act showed every likelihood of debarring the Antients.
  - (1) With people like the Irish and the lower classes in their membership, they were automatically suspect.
  - (2) Antients-type Masonry was known to be behind the overseas revolutions.
  - (3) The Antients were known to teach social justice and liberty.
3. Under threat of closure the Antients decided that they had to try their hand with the Moderns.
4. The term ‘Freemason’—the Union was about ‘Antient, Free and Accepted Masons’. Antient—from the Antients. Free—from the 17th-century usage, to cover both operatives and speculatives; they were all ‘free’, that is, fully qualified and privilege-entitled (nothing to do with freestone). Accepted—from the few guilds; in this case the London Company of Masons: non-operative, but accepted as masons by it.
5. The Antients thought that they had protected their Higher degrees with an inclusion clause in the Articles of Union.

### **The Modern’s—their closeness to destroying the Higher degrees**

How wrong the Antients were. Sussex took over. He immediately strove to have the Higher degrees—the Jacobite–Antients degrees—erased (Knight, Mes:60) from English Masonry. A ‘wholesale destruction’ (Knight, Mes:67) took place. The Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite, telling of the Freemasonry’s Templar and Scottish background was ‘gutted’ and mangled, and almost all the degrees removed, to be ‘conferred’ by name alone. Even the name ‘Scottish’ was eventually censored out, as late as 1909. Those Australian Rose Croix Chapters still remaining loyal to the English Constitution are, even today, forbidden to work, even as exemplifications, the ‘intermediate’ degrees.

The ordinary Masons did not like the about-face orders from above. Cryer (Pan:75) writes: ‘referring to something which is still often overlooked by my contemporaries. It is the fact that already in the period of at least 1725 to 1740 there was a groundswell of dissatisfaction with the development of the newer forms of Craft Masonry.’

It seems to this observer that many of Cryer’s contemporaries are well aware of such issues, but in the interests of self-preservation avoid them. The Hanoverians, of course, were merely continuing their unvarying course of denying (Knight, Mes:67) their Scottish source and, more particularly, that Masonry’s drive for social reform.

### **Conclusions**

1. Upon gaining the upper hand over the Antients the Moderns effectively barred all Higher degree work.
2. Following 1813 the Moderns effectively defused and mangled the more—to their constituents—dangerous Higher degrees.



3. It is concluded here that the Moderns had now achieved their perceived aim of stamping out direct–social–reform Masonry in England.

### **Union Freemasonry and 19th-century English Society**

In 1801 England had a population of 9 million and poor Scotland 1½ million. It is of value to examine English society as the 19th century advanced, as faced by English Freemasonry, now under the control of the Moderns. The Industrial Revolution was in full swing. Checkland (247) reports of England's factories:

. . . the bad ventilation, high temperatures, long hours, and, especially, the speeding of the machines to increase the worker's tempo. These conditions inevitably meant that the effective working life was reduced, with diseases, especially tuberculosis, thriving in exhausted bodies, causing employers or their managers to discard burnt-out adults and rely increasingly on children and youngsters. At the other end of their lives, as infants, the workers suffered damage as young mothers exhausted themselves in the mills and so failed in the care and feeding of their children.

Plumb (89) writes that 'Discipline in the factories—especially for children, was harsh, frequently cruel.' The workers had 'nothing to hope for'. They were 'haunted by the fear of unemployment and starvation. Disease, poverty, fear, malnutrition, this was the common lot of our ancestors.'

Where necessary, and it often was, children were put to work as soon as possible, although eventually limited to 12 hours a day; not enforced. Blake's 'Dark Satanic Mills' were everywhere.

The conditions in the mines and pits in the 1840s was particularly 'frightening' (Checkland:248). There, women and children, stripped almost naked because of the heat, worked their appalling hours in appalling, dangerous, conditions. A contemporary report illustrated 'conditions that demonstrated even more starkly the new depths of human degradation now possible, where the owners accepted no responsibility for their workers'.

For the aristocracy (Plumb:85) it was 'a golden age of power, privilege, and increased wealth'. Parliament opposed moves to put in place rules, or even police the few older ones. An Act of 1844 lowered the age of entry to factories from 9 to 8; this was not repealed until 1875. A new middle class sprang from this mass foundation of human misery. A heightened (Plumb:85) class-consciousness emerged.

And what was the new English Freemasonry doing all this time? The Moderns? Its aristocrats and gentry were getting richer, and it was getting Princes of the Realm, even the Prince of Wales, as its glittering Grand Masters. The new middle class nicely filled the ranks. In time, under trumpeted Royal patronage, public charities appeared, great show pieces like a hospital for the poor. But the Jesus message for a decent society, perpetuated by Scottish–Stuart–Antients Masonry, surgically removed, was not there for the members to conceive of, to take in, to act upon. In the century of it being most needed, English Freemasonry failed.

### **Conclusions**

1. The 19th century saw in England a callous exploitation of the masses, one involving real, continuing, and shocking human degradation.
2. Nineteenth-century English Freemasonry, where the Moderns early bested the Antients, did nothing to address the cause of human misery all around it; rather, it rode on it.

### **National revolutions and Freemasonry**

Was Freemasonry up to the task of improving the lot of the common man, woman and child?

That George Washington and the American Revolution were Masonically inspired, with the ideals of liberty and egalitarianism to the forefront, is beyond dispute. The 1775–1783 Revolution was

Masonically led and its codes, particularly the great Declaration of Independence, were Masonically written. Its citizens never looked back. The subject is shunned or diminished by English Masonic writers. In the light of the thesis here advanced—let alone the circumstance that England lost—this is completely understandable. That the Masonry involved was Scottish-derived and not English is hardly ever dwelt on.

That the French Revolution was begun in 1789 by French nobles, a central core of whom were Freemasons or suspected to be, is also known. The fact that opportunists hijacked the Revolution is another matter. The Masonry involved was Scottish-Jacobean, a fact the English rarely mention. The fact that English Masonic writers usually deny any Masonic involvement in this contention no longer needs explaining.

The expulsion of the occupying Turks from Greece was another Masonic undertaking. Ask any Greek—‘every Greek child learns in their History lesson the prime and important role of the “Friendly Society” in achieving their Motherland’s Freedom’ (Place:17). Diaspora Greeks, members of French and other lodges, formed ‘Friendly Societies’; members of these ‘prepared and organised the Revolution of 1821’ (Souvaliotis:18). General Kolokotronis, Ipsilantis and Kapodistrias, the great leaders, were all intense Freemasons (Place:17,16). The Masonry involved was French and European, all Scottish-derived.

General Lafayette, 1757–1834, an outstanding Freemason, was a leader in the American Revolution and the French; for the latter he wrote ‘The Declaration of the Rights of Man’. Lafayette was expelled from the French revolution for advocating a Bloodline prince for the vacant French throne; which tells a lot. He was later a close adviser to the Greeks. English Masonry does not dwell on the Scottish-derived French Masonry’s great contribution to the civilised world, the effecting of the Greek Revolution.

Then there is South America. The thrust to unlock Spain’s grip came from Masonry. The South American republics are the result. Simon Bolivar the Liberator, 1783–1830, the great South American Freemason and great striver for independence, took his lead from George Washington. Bolivar personally lead the struggles to liberate Venezuela, 1821; Colombia and Equador, 1822; Peru, 1834; and Bolivia, 1825. The South American Masonry was American, derived from Scottish-Antients Masonry.

The freeing of Italy, 1860 on, from Roman Catholic-associated despotism, in particular the Papal States, was Masonically impelled, with the renowned Freemason Garibaldi, 1807–1882, in the lead. The one, important, region he could not capture was Rome, including the Vatican. If he had, it can be envisaged that subsequent world history would have been much different.

What is not so well known is that the Philippine 1898 rebellion against Spain was a product of, and driven by, Freemasons. As the Philippine Masonic Journal, *Cabletow* (1), records, ‘the man and the mason who spearheaded the declaration of independence’ was WBro Emilio ‘Colon’ Famy Aguinaldo. In the same edition Barnez (34), current Grand Master of the Philippines, writes of ‘our Mason Brothers’ who ‘initiated the Philippines Liberation Movement’. Filipino Masonry is American, which is Scottish derived.

It is significant that not one such revolution has an English Masonic background. It is of interest that English Masonic writers tend to shy well clear of the area, except to assert that Freemasonry had nothing to do with the French Revolution. This position, one above the ruck, is associated with the splendid precept that genuine—‘regular’—Freemasonry has never had any truck with politics, especially moves to upset a country’s governmental status quo. Apart from America, which is a special case (as everybody knows about it), the English leadership appears, at least on the face of it, to have a position much as follows. ‘It seem that at some well-past times, and in some quite foreign places, forms of a simplistic Masonry—or their members—which or who would nowadays doubtlessly be pronounced irregular, did get entangled with odd rebellions’.

### **Conclusions**

1. The American Revolution, 1775–1783, which freed the east coast of America from the English, is acknowledged worldwide as to have been Masonically driven; it was not by the English form, however, but the Scottish–Antients.
2. The French Revolution, 1789–1799, had a Masonic start, but was quickly taken over by others; the Masonry involved was Scottish–Jacobean.
3. The Greek expulsion of the Turks, beginning in 1821, was Masonically driven; and by Scottish-derived Masonry.
4. The freeing of South America from Spain, beginning in 1821, was Masonically led; and by Scottish-derived Masonry.
5. The freeing of Italy, beginning in 1860, from the hold of the Roman Catholic Church was Masonically led; and by Scottish-derived Masonry.
6. The freeing of the Philippines, beginning in 1898, was Masonically led, and by Scottish-derived Masonry.
7. It is concluded that Freemasonry, which proved able to inspire the writing of great Constitutions and Declarations of the Rights of Man, was not only able to but actively did improve the lot of great masses of people.
8. It is a conclusion of this thesis that English Freemasonry had been deliberately rendered incapable of inspiring significant social reform.

### **Saunière, Rennes-le-Chateau and Reality**

In 1891 François Béranger Saunière, curé at the tiny village of Rennes-le-Chateau, Southern France, found something which gave him enormous wealth. This was two parchments hidden beneath his church's Visigoth altar (Baigent, Blood:25). Baigent, Leigh and Lincoln, co-authors of *The Holy Blood and the Holy Grail* and *The Messianic Legacy*, were unable to determine what it was, but it is now obvious that Saunière, using the clues that he had assembled, had discovered—or verified—the truth about Jesus.

He also learned of the location of Jesus's tomb. This was nearby; information and photos make that clear. Just to drive this nail home; Andrews and Schellenberger, who painstakingly solved the mystery, discovered that Saunière had built a tower—the Tower of Magdala—on a corner of his villa. From it Mount Cardou (183) can be observed.

It is most likely that Saunière was paid by the Bloodline for his silence and cooperation. It appears that Saunière and his nearby fellow priests, all born in the area, had early picked up elements of Cathar thought, and of Rosicrucianism (Andrews:416). It seems Saunière confided in two of them. Red roses are to be found in their personal designing and robes; their commitment in this direction may well have protected them from the powerful Bloodline.

They had without doubt to be extremely careful not to tip off their employers, the Roman Catholic Church. In the end, however, all died early, mysterious, deaths.

### **Conclusions**

1. A curé, François Béranger Saunière, a local and probably a covert Rosicrucian, found at his Rennes-le-Chateau church old parchments which held the hidden geometry which located the site of the tomb of Jesus; it was probably the Bloodline which backed him with wealth for his cooperation.
2. Saunière had a tower built from which he could observe Mount Cardou; if this inquiry is right he was almost certainly fascinated by being able to daily look upon the site of Jesus's tomb.
3. Saunière apparently confided in two other priest, all employees of the Vatican; all died early, unnatural deaths.

### **1894—beneath the Temple Mount**

In 1894 a British army contingent, led by Lt Charles Wilson, probed beneath Jerusalem's Temple Mount (Knight, Mes:21,2). Coming upon tunnels they found a Templar sword, a spur, the remains of a lance and a small Templar cross.

The entire undertaking is well documented. The items found can now be viewed in the Templar Archives of Scotland.

Muslim prohibition now excludes any exploration of the Temple Mount's interior.

### **Conclusion**

1. A 1894 a British army detachment discovered Templar items in tunnels deep in Jerusalem's Temple Mount; this is proof that the Templars did indeed delve into that Mount.

### **Long-term time bomb—the Nag Hammadi Scrolls**

In 1945 the ancient cache of Christian Gnostic scrolls and books hidden at Nag Hammadi, Egypt, were found. It was not until 1977, however, that their translated contents appeared in English. Baigent (Mes:22) points out that theological colleges have had to at least mention them.

Baigent, Leigh and Lincoln think that 'ecclesiastics have become eminently sophisticated and erudite'. 'Yet this knowledge has not been passed on to the laity. In consequences a gulf has opened between ecclesiastics and their congregations.'

They conclude that the historical material from the time of Jesus himself and just after, found in the second half of the 20th century, is 'being withheld' from Christian congregations. This is together with results of modern theological research. One result is that ordinary parishioners are disbelieving, shocked or 'traumatised' (Baigent, Mes:23), when they read of products of modern discovery and research as related by writers like Baigent, Knight and Andrews, and Thiering.

### **Conclusion**

1. The Nag Hammadi Scroll information, as well as that of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the results of recent refined theological research, is being withheld from or not discussed with Christian Church laity; again, it seems that the only sensible conclusion is that vested interests are at work.

### **Sion Today**

The Baigent team managed to meet in France, a few times before 1882, the self-revealed then Grand Master of the Prieuré de Sion, Pierre Plantard de Saint-Clair, a Bloodline descendent. For some unknown reason Sion had decided to show itself a little, as it has done from time to time. Sion acknowledged that it has many agents and people in powerful positions; names or positions were never mentioned

It seemed to the Baigent team, from documents released by Sion agents, that the old goals remain. The Jesus Bloodline, steeped in centuries of liberal and democratic teachings, should attain the thrones (Baigent, Blood:106) of Europe. Society should be improved for the good of the masses; for some time one endeavour to this end has been to encourage European nations to join together in various ways. This linking would minimise warfare, local exploitation and the like. The long aim here is to help bring about a 'United States of Europe' (Baigent, Mes:416).

### **Conclusions**

1. Sion definitely existed and still exists.
2. Sion is concerned to get the Bloodline of Jesus onto European thrones, thinking that it will help ensure better societies for all.
3. Sion is currently endeavouring to help unite Europe.

## Freemasonry Today

The number of 'regular' Grand Lodges, at least according to the sources used by the American publisher Pantagraph for its *1998 List of Lodges Masonic*, is 141. This student is not sure, but calculates that about 130 are Scottish derived, and about 11 English. These numbers could be wrong. There are, too, numerous Grand Lodges which for one reason or the other are deemed 'irregular', principally by the 'premier' Grand Lodge, with its own set of criteria. Many Grand Lodges are beginning to ignore England in this.

The insanity this situation can bring about dawned on many Australian Masons a few years ago when the Western Australian Constitution set up a conference for all the Jurisdictions in its area, the lower Indian Ocean and Pacific region. The Grand Lodge of England then came down heavily, saying that as it had recently banned one of the Jurisdictions invited, other Constitutions could not sit down with it. If the conference went ahead, excommunication was bandied about. The repulsiveness of it all grows when it is realised that it was a conference, not a meeting in open lodge, and the drive was to find ways for jurisdictions in the region to co-operate—but, above all, this was a Masonic endeavour, one meeting the great Masonic ideals of freedom, equality and fraternity. Western Australia was forced to cancel. The air was blue, and not a Masonic shade. This needs thinking about.

For the obvious reason that world Freemasonry teaches freedom and a better society it is always been banned straight away by totalitarian regimes, from the Papal States in Italy to Communist China. Hitler banned it. The Soviet Union banned it from its 'Evil Empire'; upon its collapse, Freemasonry returned. Freedom-loving countries, such as the United States and Holland, love it.

There are those Grand Lodges which are judged to be way out of court. These include Co-Masonry, the Order of Women Freemasons, and Prince Hall ('Black') Masonry, with the latter just starting to be 'recognised'.

England seems to be in the lead in the banning business. What doubt can there be that the sooner the women jurisdictions are given equality of status, which is a fundamental tenet of Masonry—and decency—the better? It has to come. Perhaps America will take the lead. England would hardly dare put America on its excommunicated list.

Further, there are all the Further or Higher Orders, such as the Holy Royal Arch; Jackson (Beyond:passim) recognises 17 in England alone. These cover a great range of topics, and offer relief for those who grow bored with Craft Masonry. Then there are many Orders for women, most American invented, and two, again American, for teenagers. It is significant that American (Scottish-Antients) Masonry fashioned the male Order around Jacques de Molay.

## Conclusions

1. The physical spread of Freemasonry around the globe is impressive.
2. Scottish derived Freemasonry comprises, it is thought, about 92% of the world's Freemasonry, with English about 8%.
3. Some Masonic Jurisdictions are judged 'irregular', and not communicated with; England is in the lead with such pronouncements, which are now starting to be ignored by others.
4. Totalitarian regimes ban Freemasonry; this is a striking endorsement of its message of freedom.
5. Some forms of Freemasonry are judged to be way out of line, such as Prince Hall and Co-Masonry; the tide is turning for Prince Hall, but women have yet to find a champion.
6. There is an ongoing but steadily weakening effort of English Freemasonry to control world Freemasonry, essentially by trying to control Masonic history and information, and by pronouncing bans on those groupings principally seen as dangerous to itself or its social class principles.
7. The many Higher Orders indicate a felt need for such Masonry.

8. The many invented Orders for women indicate the need felt by some women for a part in Masonry; it should help speed the introduction of women into the mainstream.

### **PART III—PUTTING IT ALL TOGETHER**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

It is now time to attempt to put together all that which has been concluded. As stated in the introduction, if this inquiry was to bring into the scholarly world new conceptions, conceptions thus available for general thinking about and prodding, then it would have to use also the power of intellect. So some of those conclusions are based on deductions, inferences and the like, rather than on, unfortunately unfindable, hard, cold data.

One small indication of the model's value is to see if it hangs together nicely; if it makes sense. Another test will be to see if old, unsolved, mysteries and puzzles about Freemasonry, and odd, unconnected 'facts', fall into place in the new model.

But first, a review of the running conclusions.

#### ***A REVIEW OF THE RUNNING CONCLUSIONS—THE FIRST PART***

##### **CONCLUSIONS FROM THE OPENING BACKGROUND**

This background has generated conclusions. Many of the findings are without doubt subject to serious contention. However, they open the way for a critical prodding of the 'past' as written by each segment's time and faction victors.

##### ***Politics and religion***

1. Discoveries of telling archaeological evidence, particularly of ancient documents, together with modern theological research, indicate that Jesus was a man, had an enlightened, egalitarian, message for the world, that he survived his crucifixion, and that he fathered children.
2. The body of Jesus was apparently entombed in a mountainside in a rugged region of Southern France.
3. In the first millennium Southern France became a sanctuary for the postulated Jesus Bloodline families and their supposed knowledge, including that of the true nature of Jesus, the existence of direct descendants of his, and the repository of wealth and religious documents in the Temple Mount.
4. The Priory of Sion seems to have become a major player in European affairs.
5. The Templars appear to have found themselves in possession of documentary proof that original Christianity was of the Jerusalem Church type.
6. Putting the Temple Mount documentary proof together with what was already known, it is contended that through the Bloodline families, Sion and the Templars, the Templars thought that the Roman Catholic religion was not only a false form of Christianity, but one without scruples, including wholesale slaughter, when it came to protecting its interests.
7. It is concluded that Sion and the Templars found themselves in possession of great and dangerous information; information which would have to be kept for a long time.

##### ***Building***

1. In pre-Norman England, King Athelstan, c 895–939, and his son presided over a complex building programme which almost certainly included Mason organisations.
2. There is now archaeological evidence of the use of sophisticated building techniques in England for hundreds of years before the Norman Conquest of 1066.
3. After their conquest, the Normans at once commenced an ambitious building programme.

### ***Operative lodges***

1. There is no known record of operative lodges in England at this time, although the level of building being accomplished infers that they had to be in place.
- (1) The first Old Charges, if correct, feature the holding of mason assemblies in Athelstan's time; this infers organisation.

### ***Freemasonry***

1. No trace.

## ***A REVIEW OF THE RUNNING CONCLUSIONS—THE FINAL PART***

### **CONCLUSIONS—THOSE OF THE MAIN BODY**

It appears that a number of conclusions of some significance have occurred. The study managed to go its own way. It generated entirely unexpected results; some which one personally would rather had not seen the light of day. But they have.

Many of the findings are without doubt subject to serious contention. However, they help open the way for a critical prodding of the 'past' as written by each segment's time and faction victors. And a look at the future.

## **POLITICS AND RELIGION**

### ***The tomb of Jesus Conclusions***

2. The Templars immediately took control of the Mount Cardou region, putting up an extraordinary number of buildings; the inference is that they were protecting the tomb of Jesus.
3. The Templar buildings pointed to the site of Jesus's tomb; again, the inference is there.
4. It is probable that the Templars re-entombed the remains of Jesus, and possibly with copies of the postulated Temple Mount documents.

### ***Religious tolerance Conclusions***

1. The Templars had religious tolerance; this happens to be one of the characteristics of the early non-Pauline Christianity.
2. The Templars had a close relationship with the Cathars of Southern France; a free and educated people who regarded Jesus as a man, not a god; to think that the Templars did likewise is not a big step to take.
3. The Roman Catholic Church, from 1202 to 1244, bloodily exterminated the Cathars; that the Templars secretly helped these where they could, re-enforces the previous point.
4. The religious tolerances of the Knight Templar Order and the Roman Catholic Church were in diametrical opposition.

### ***Palestine Lost Conclusions***

1. Palestine was lost to Europe by 1291.
2. In the eyes of Europe it seemed that the Templars had lost their reason for being; they may have lost some status.

### ***Beneficiary of the Templar destruction—Scotland Conclusions***

1. The key Templar treasure fleet landed in Scotland, beyond the reach of the Pope; Scotland knew that it had received a great benefit.
2. It seems most likely that the postulated Temple Mount documents were hidden in a vault at Kilwinning Abbey.

### ***England—Scotland's predator Conclusions***

1. Scotland was doomed to fall to a great English army, but the Templars decided to support Scotland; this was no doubt a critical decision.
2. Legend has it that at Kilwinning the Templars made Scottish nobles supporting Bruce 'Freemasons'; this included the Royal Stewards/Stewarts, later the Stuarts.

### ***The great watershed—the Battle of Bannockburn Conclusions***

1. The Templars assembled at Kilwinning, faced with the likely prospect of being wiped out in the coming battle, could well have decided to make selected Scottish nobles Templars, so that they could pass on their great secrets.
2. If this is the case the Templars initiation ceremonies, including the resurrection or raising ceremony, would have been given to all, with higher ceremonies given to higher ranking nobles.
  1. Other possible degrees delivered at this time include what are now known as 'Knight of the Rosy Cross' and 'The Royal Order of Scotland'.
  2. The conferring of Templar degrees on Scottish nobles was the second step towards Freemasonry.

### ***Roman Catholicism and the power of print Conclusions***

1. Printing opened the way for classical literature and liberal thinkers to reach large numbers.
2. Printing was perceived by Roman Catholicism as a threat to its power.

### ***Knowledge comes to Europe Conclusions***

1. The fall of Byzantium and of the expulsion of Islam from Spain brought a flood of information into Catholic Europe.
2. The Roman Catholic Church tried to stamp out this knowledge and its carriers, one of the moves being, in 1486, to issue a bull on Witchcraft, which held in some places for about 250 odd years, resulting in the murder of a million innocents.

### ***Religious reform on the Continent Conclusions***

1. In 1517 in Protestant Germany, Martin Luther produced, despite Rome's best eradication efforts, a Bible in German, printing ensuring a wide distribution.
2. In 1541 in Switzerland, Calvin began writing Protestant books, which had great influence.
3. In 1559 John Knox, a Scotsman, began in Scotland preaching a Protestant religion free of priests.

### ***England breaks with the Pope Conclusions***

1. Although remaining a Catholic, in 1532 Henry VIII threw off from England the rule of the Pope; the break encouraged Protestant thought.
2. Henry VIII's suppression of monasteries in England in 1536 stopped the great English religious building era, although other building did occur, but on a lower scale; although no doubt diminished in number the English operative lodge system survived.
3. Mary I's restoration of Papal power in England resulted in a horrific 'cleansing' of 'heretics', one which so repulsed the more educated English that Roman Catholicism became associated with barbarity.

### ***The Bloodline comes to Scottish royalty Conclusions***

1. The marriage of Marie de Guise in 1538 to James V of Scotland brought the Jesus Bloodline to the Royal House of Stuart, the first to have it being James VI; the Stuarts had been entered in the lists for expanding their House to other kingdoms.
2. The infusion of the Jesus Bloodline into the Stuart Royal family would have given Templary a boost.
3. In the early 1500s Scottish operative lodges to some extent separated from other trades, there thus being more opportunity for concentration on ancient custom.



### ***Sixteenth-century England Conclusions***

1. The second half of the 16th century was in England a time of great rebuilding.
2. Operative Mason organisations were clearly present, with primitive grade inductions.

### ***The Elizabethan Age Conclusions***

1. From about 1550 on was a time of great rebuilding in England, with evidence of the lodge system and of a primitive ritual; the English operative lodge system was in practical use.
2. Elizabeth I's reign, 1558–1603, was marked by academic freedom, with the 'English Renaissance' resulting, so that some of the ideas and teachings of the ancients, including Christian Gnosticism and many other topics suppressed by Roman Catholicism, could diffuse, if only in the educated classes, throughout the British Isles.
3. By 1600 England had a sound operative Masonry base, but no speculative Masonry of any type; Scotland's masonry, at least some of it, had an extraordinary extra—the Templar–Roslyn infusion.

### ***James VI of Scotland—James I of England—the Bloodline comes to England Conclusions***

1. The fact that King James VI was an entered fellow mason and fellow craft in the 'ancient frie Lodge' of Scoon and Perth is a blazing beacon that there was—and is—more behind Scottish Masonry than the English have ever allowed. His membership must have been part of the King's grooming, to be a leader helping to advance various aims of the arms of Sion.
2. It is asserted that Scottish nascent speculative Freemasonry was laid upon the base of English operative Masonry. It did not 'evolve' from English operative lodges; it was inserted into some of them.
3. It is strongly thought that James I and his advisers thought that the use of nascent Freemasonry in England would help smooth the way to improving English society; and to accepting him.
4. Sir Francis Bacon could have had an input to the newly arrived Scottish nascent Freemasonry.

### ***Rosicrucianism Conclusions***

1. 1614 marked in Protestant Europe the beginning of the issue of Rosicrucian books, decrying the Papacy, and in allegorical fashion calling for a new drive for thinking and science, predicting a new, golden, age for mankind; this was a drive to get Europe a liberal society, only possible by outmanoeuvring the Roman Catholic Church.
2. The work said that, against the possible eradication of knowledge in Europe, there was a store of great knowledge entombed with a 'Kristian Rozencreutz', which is easily 'Christ of the Rosy Cross', in a secret vault; the supposition that this was a reference to the tomb of Jesus is a strong one.
3. Rosicrucianism sparked an explosion of learning in Europe; the proposition that Sion was behind it, that Sion was trying another way to get its aims carried out, cannot be ignored.

### ***Roman Catholicism strikes—the Thirty Year's War Conclusions***

1. The advent of Rosicrucianism and the prospect of whole societies gaining the light of knowledge and the likely spread of Protestantism was too much for Roman Catholicism; following past policy it inflamed a war which saw great slaughter.
2. 'Christian Unions' were formed to get intellectuals secretly out of Europe; the opportunity to spread the idea of intellectual freedom elsewhere was enlarged.
3. The Thirty Years War may well have increased the postulated drive to strengthen and enlarge nascent Freemasonry, in a largely cellular, little record keeping and invisible form, in Great Britain.

### ***Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement Conclusions***

1. With Rosicrucianism in Europe under threat simply due to exterminations, a new group, the Compagnie, secret and highly organised, with the aim of infiltrating Catholic France, came into being; once more the hand of Sion was probably present, if so again showing its power, tenacity and versatility.

2. The probable power and ability of Sion, as indicated in Europe in the early and mid-17th century, underlines the proposition that it would have had little trouble guiding and assisting the growth of another of its arms, nascent Scottish and Scottish-Stuart Freemasonry in England.

#### ***Refugee Rosicrucians in England Conclusions***

1. Refugee Continental Rosicrucians and similar, from the 1620s on, brought to England a fresh and invigorating spirit of border-crossing freedom and learning; the stage was being made easier for Freemasonry to develop and spread the message of a better society to British middle and lower classes.
2. Refugee Rosicrucians helped invigorate the nascent Royal Society and, it is almost certain, nascent Freemasonry; if so, Freemasonry's growth must have been boosted by this injection.

#### ***Charles I's liberalism comes up against English bigotry Conclusions***

1. The liberal views of Charles I were pitted against a new antagonist, Puritan bigotry; the wisdom of Sion having several arms in England, if indeed it did, including a nascent Freemasonry in England, was again shown.
2. Charles I badly misjudged the power of Puritanism when he decided to marry a Catholic; England paid for it by having a bloody civil war which suppressed liberalism, particularly religious, Charles paid for it with his head, and nascent Freemasonry may well have had to melt into secret cells.

#### ***The Royal Society, Charles II and Freemasonry Conclusions***

1. The Royal Society, founded much earlier but not chartered till 1660, encouraged by Charles II, was from the beginning associated with Rosicrucianism and Freemasonry; it is contended that the high placing and partnership here assigned to Freemasonry is further evidence of the high role assigned to it: that of helping to bring about a more free, just and equitable society.
2. Another role of Freemasonry, it is thought, was to help James I's acceptance by the English upper classes.
3. Under the encouragement of Charles II, it is suggested, the Royal Society upgraded Scottish proto-Masonry with extended philosophy, ritual and ceremony, still primitive but sufficient, into Freemasonry; finished about 1660 and organised by 1667, the most talented mason in England, Sir Christopher Wren, probably became the Order's first Grand Master.
4. It is probable that between 1660 and 1687 the Royal Society had an input into Scottish proto-Masonry, resulting in a sparse but accomplished speculative Freemasonry; the fifth and final step in the formation of Freemasonry had been taken.

#### ***Tomb recording Conclusions***

1. In the 17th-century Sion, or its equivalent, devised a geometrical mapping scheme which, upon translation, gives the precise site of the, at least deemed, tomb of Jesus, and had it employed in the composition of many famous paintings;
2. The pointing finger is almost certainly a Sion sign, one which must have almost certainly been given to Higher degree Masonry; its filtering down and degradation in current Masonry seems to be an example of the breaking of old oaths, as well as of innovation, by successive generations of Freemasons.

#### ***Ever-adapting Sion Conclusion***

1. If the signs are correctly read, Baigent's examples of Sion groups are yet a further example of Sion's drive.

#### ***Scotland Conclusions***

1. The invading English Puritans in 1650 spared Roslyn Chapel from destruction while the adjacent castle was burnt; why? It could have been no accident; the simplest explanation which fits the thesis here being developed is that Sion, acutely aware of the momentous materials in the vaults, had indeed hidden power, which it used.

2. In 1670 half of the members of the Lodge of Aberdeen were non-operatives, including the nobility; according to the present analysis this indicates that keeping in with the Stuarts was, as ever, a strong drive, and that some of the middle ranks may have been looking towards Knight Templary.
3. The *Edinburgh Register House MS*, probably deriving from the 1660s, giving brief rituals of two degrees and familiar Masonic customs, and which some think to relate to a fully speculative lodge, and which could well be the case, indicates what was going on in at least one such lodge; ritual degree work was a key.

#### ***Liberalism—its incompatibility with the English Establishment—the Stuarts ousted Conclusions***

1. The rise of the middle class in the last quarter of the 17th century, with many seeking to better themselves, must have made Masonry attractive, and reasonably popular.
2. Due to James II's bad reports, it is difficult to gain a clear picture of his aims, but he offered and proclaimed complete religious freedom, which outraged powerful vested interests; this paper's developments indicate that the age-old Bloodline, guided by Sion, was at work.
3. William of Orange's taking of the English throne saw much power stripped from it, taken over by the Establishment's parliament.

#### ***The 1689 Jacobite uprising Conclusion***

1. The ancient top Templar jewel worn by Claverhouse in 1698 is a powerful support of the theory that the Templar line was kept going in Scotland; it could have, at any time, for example, made sure that the current Masonic usages were correct.

#### ***1714—the arrival of Hanoverianism Conclusion***

1. Following the lack of a direct heir to the English throne the Stuarts were ignored and a German prince brought in; the Hanoverians were left to become masters of England and unconsulted Scotland.

#### ***Union Freemasonry and 19th-century English Society Conclusions***

1. The 19th century saw in England a callous exploitation of the masses, one involving real, continuing, and shocking human degradation.
2. Nineteenth-century English Freemasonry, where the Moderns early bested the Antients, did nothing to address the cause of human misery all around it; rather, it rode on it.

#### ***Saunière, Rennes-le-Chateau and Reality Conclusions***

1. A curé, François Béranger Saunière, a local and probably a covert Rosicrucian, found at his Rennes-le-Chateau church old parchments which held the hidden geometry which located the site of the tomb of Jesus; it was probably the Bloodline which backed him with wealth for his cooperation.
2. Saunière had a tower built from which he could observe Mount Cardou; if this inquiry is right he was almost certainly fascinated by being able to daily look upon the site of Jesus's tomb.
3. Saunière apparently confided in two other priest, all employees of the Vatican; all died early, unnatural deaths.

#### ***Long-term time bomb—the Nag Hammadi Scrolls Conclusion***

1. The Nag Hammadi Scroll information, as well as that of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the results of recent refined theological research, is being withheld from or not discussed with Christian Church laity; again, it seems that the only sensible conclusion is that vested interests are at work.

#### ***Sion Today Conclusions***

1. Sion definitely existed and still exists.
2. Sion is concerned to get the Bloodline of Jesus onto European thrones, thinking that it will help ensure better societies for all.
3. Sion is currently endeavouring to help unite Europe.

## **BUILDING**

Note: it was found that at this stage the building category integrated into the others.

## **OPERATIVE LODGE**

### ***Operative lodges in 13th-century England Conclusions***

1. Thirteenth-century England was engaged in much building; this provided a firm base for the existence and development of operative lodges.
2. As masons had to travel, it is considered that this made the having of secret grade-recognition signs a must; this is a basic feature of Freemasonry.
3. These operative lodges, it is thought, would need non-operatives, such as chaplains and clerks; the principle of non-operatives being part of an operative lodge appears established.
4. The existence of sound operative lodges in the 13th century onwards in England and Scotland, although in no way planned to become the physical base of a practicing philosophy and message of fundamental importance to all, were nevertheless in place; the first step in the formation of Freemasonry had occurred.

### ***Operative masonry in 14th-century England Conclusions***

1. Well organised operative masonry flourished in England in the 14th century.
2. Wycliffe's English-language Bible would have received great attention in England and Scotland; it must have added to the quest for knowledge and, probably in Scotland, the refining—not alteration—of Templar ritual.

### ***Operative masons in 15th-century England Conclusions***

1. Much building occurred in 15th-century England, with evidence of operative lodges in being, the Old Charges of the time giving evidence of some sketchy ritual.
2. In Scotland, mason lodges were incorporated with other trades, although it appears that at least some held separate meetings; those few holding the 'Templar or Roslyn' material could have suffered, however, some loss or garbling of ritual and secrets.

### ***Scottish operative masons—and nascent Freemasonry Conclusions***

1. In the 15th century a certain few operative lodge masons building the Roslyn Chapel in Scotland, more particularly those engaged in the 'foundation' work, were given, by inheritors of the Order of the Temple, certain Templar modified degrees and ceremonies; the Templar initiation ceremony and the Templar Secret Vault ceremony.
2. This induction of operative masons at Roslyn is concluded to be the factual genesis of nascent speculative Freemasonry.
3. The Holy Royal Arch, translated Jesus–King–Greatest, as a Masonic degree may be traced to the building of Roslyn Chapel; also its attached Red Cross of Babylon.
4. These degrees, initiation, vault and Red Cross, represent a climatic time for operative masonry. They were undoubtedly kept by those few operative lodges involved in the Roslyn Chapel oath-taking; thereafter those lodges and, as no doubt Sion saw the value, probably other lodges as the years advanced.
5. Nascent Freemasonry was launched incidentally with the conferring of modified Templar degrees on stonemasons who were building a secret vault for Roslyn Chapel, Scotland, in 1446, and was, although unplanned and unrecognised as such, the third step in the formation of Freemasonry.

### ***Late 18th-century—early 19th-century—operative England Conclusions***

1. The Alnwick operative lodge of 1703 is the only known one in England prior to 1717; however, a trail can be picked up from far earlier.
2. The Stalwell, 1725, but with an older history, had in 1735 a mixed operative–speculative membership; this proves that such lodges, as noted by Plot, existed in England.

## **KNIGHTS TEMPLAR**

### ***The Knights Templar Conclusions***

1. In a matter of months the Templars jumped from obscurity and near poverty to the toast of Europe; they must have gained a great asset.
2. Europe flooded the Templars with gifts and land; this indicates that they had indeed found or proven matters of extraordinary consequence.
3. Following their apparently stupendous finds, the Templars became great players in many fields in both Europe and the Middle East.
4. Reconstruction indicates that after its success Sion withdrew from the Templars, which it then used as its armed service, and melted into the shadows.
5. The Templars almost certainly developed strange rituals, including a resurrection or raising one.
6. Henri de Saint Clair, a Scottish noble, a member of the First Crusade, was associated with the Templar find.
7. The Templars became great builders, including of the Notre Dame cathedrals; they formed or obtained their own strict building squads.
8. The Templars adopted a red cross pattée; it is construed that, rather than representing the crucifixion it was a symbolic marker of the site of the tomb of Jesus.
9. The Templar's cross was red, it is thought, because of its old association with goodness and Jewish royalty, while the rose was also used to mark Jesus and secrecy; if all this symbology is correctly interpreted, then its combined use by the Templars can hardly be a coincidence.

### ***Templars—the Builders Conclusions***

1. The Templars built very extensively, and right over Europe; they had an intimate relationship with building groups, including logia.
2. One of the Templar building groups was named the 'Children of Solomon'.

### ***Catholicism and French greed—the Templars destroyed Conclusions***

1. Phillippe IV of France owned the Pope but was broke, coveted the Templar wealth, and on Friday 13 October 1307, secretly struck those in France, which led to the Order's extinguishment.
2. Sion must have known in advance; all the Templar treasures and, undoubtedly, the Temple Mount documents, were previously transferred to Templar ships, which disappeared.
3. The Templar Grand Master, Jacques de Molay, was severely tortured; it has been postulated that he was covered by a ritual shroud, which the Roman Catholic Church later exhibited as the Shroud of Turin or Jesus.
4. The rest of Europe was shocked, but treated the Templars lightly; nevertheless, from the point of view of their mission they were finished.

### ***Beneficiary of the Templar destruction—Scotland Conclusions***

1. The key Templar treasure fleet landed in Scotland, beyond the reach of the Pope; Scotland knew that it had received a great benefit.
2. It seems most likely that the postulated Temple Mount documents were hidden in a vault at Kilwinning Abbey.

### ***1314—the Templars—their entrenchment in Scotland Conclusions***

1. At the Battle of Bannockburn in 1314 the Templars earned the sincere gratitude and respect of the Scots, and thereafter attained great influence.
2. With the re-appearance of some Papal presence in Scotland the Templars quietly merged into the great Scottish families.

### ***1446—Scotland and the Temple Mount documents—Roslyn Chapel Conclusions***

1. Beginning in 1446 William Saint Clair had built a magnificent 'chapel' at Roslyn, Scotland, bringing in fine masons from all over Europe.
2. Four years were spent on the 'foundations'; it is concluded that a secret vault was built.
3. In the mid-15th century the priceless Temple Mount documents were placed in a secret vault beneath Roslyn Chapel, Scotland.

### ***1894—beneath the Temple Mount Conclusion***

1. A 1894 a British army detachment discovered Templar items in tunnels deep in Jerusalem's Temple Mount; this is proof that the Templars did indeed delve into that Mount.

## **FREEMASONRY**

### ***Operative lodges in 13th-century Britain Conclusions***

1. Thirteenth-century England was engaged in much building; this provided a firm base for the existence and development of operative lodges.
2. As masons had to travel it is considered that this made the having of secret grade-recognition signs a must; this is a basic feature of Freemasonry.
3. These operative lodges, it is thought, would need non-operatives, such as chaplains and clerks; the principle of non-operatives being part of an operative lodge appears established.
4. The existence of sound operative lodges in the 13th century onwards in England and Scotland, although in no way planned to become the physical base of a practicing philosophy and message of fundamental importance to all, were nevertheless in place; the first step in the formation of Freemasonry had occurred.

### ***1314—the great watershed—the Battle of Bannockburn Conclusions***

1. The Templars assembled at Kilwinning, faced with the likely prospect of being wiped out in the coming battle, could well have decided to make selected Scottish nobles Templars, so that they could pass on their great secrets.
2. If this is the case the Templars initiation ceremonies, including the resurrection or raising ceremony, would have been given to all, with higher ceremonies given to higher ranking nobles.
3. Other possible degrees delivered at this time include what are now known as 'Knight of the Rosy Cross' and 'The Royal Order of Scotland'.
4. The conferring of Templar degrees on Scottish nobles before the Battle of Bannockburn, Scotland, 1314, was the second step in the formation of Freemasonry.

### ***24 June 1314 Conclusions***

1. The mystery of why Scottish (and later English, for a time) Masonry is called St John's Masonry, and why St John the Baptist's Day is so important in Freemasonry, is solved—it commemorates the Scottish-Templar Bannockburn victory.
2. This solution adds dimension to the claim that Freemasonry was born or at least given a start at the time of the Battle of Bannockburn.

### ***1446—Scotland and the Temple Mount documents—Roslyn Chapel Conclusions***

1. Beginning in 1446, William Saint Clair had built a magnificent 'chapel' at Roslyn, Scotland, bringing in fine masons from all over Europe.
2. Four years were spent on the 'foundations'; it is concluded that a secret vault was built.
3. In the mid-15th century the priceless Temple Mount documents were placed in a secret vault beneath Roslyn Chapel, Scotland.

### ***Scottish operative masons—and nascent Freemasonry Conclusions***

1. In the 15th century a certain few operative lodge masons building the Roslyn Chapel in Scotland, more particularly those engaged in the 'foundation' work, were given, by inheritors of the Order of the Temple, certain Templar modified degrees and ceremonies; the Templar initiation ceremony and the Templar Secret Vault ceremony.
2. This induction of operative masons at Roslyn is concluded to be the factual genesis of nascent speculative Freemasonry.
3. The Holy Royal Arch, translated Jesus-King-Greatest, as a Masonic degree may be traced to the building of Roslyn Chapel; also its attached Red Cross of Babylon.
4. These degrees, initiation, vault and Red Cross, represent a climatic time for operative masonry. They were undoubtedly kept by those few operative lodges involved in the Roslyn Chapel oath-

taking; thereafter those lodges and, as no doubt Sion saw the value, probably other lodges as the years advanced.

5. Nascent Freemasonry was launched incidentally with the conferring of modified Templar degrees on stonemasons who were building a secret vault for Roslyn Chapel, Scotland, in 1446, and was, although unplanned and unrecognised as such, the third step in the formation of Freemasonry.

#### ***William Schaw—the emergence of Scottish Masonry Conclusion***

1. William Schaw, General Warden of the Masons of Scotland, in 1598 and 1599 issued Statutes which enabled lodges to ‘come out’; they did so, many exhibiting nascent Freemasonry.

#### ***James VI of Scotland—James I of England—the Bloodline comes to England Conclusions***

1. The fact that King James VI was an entered fellow mason and fellow craft in the ‘ancient frie Lodge’ of Scoon and Perth is a blazing beacon that there was—and is—more behind Scottish Masonry than most English have ever allowed. His membership must have been part of the King’s grooming, to be a leader helping to advance various aims of the arms of Sion.
2. It is asserted that Scottish nascent speculative Freemasonry was laid upon the base of English operative masonry. It did not ‘evolve’ from English operative lodges, it was inserted into some of them.
3. It is strongly thought that James I and his advisers thought that the use of nascent Freemasonry in England would help smooth the way to improving English society; and to accepting him.
4. Sir Francis Bacon could have had an input to the newly arrived Scottish nascent Freemasonry.

#### ***Seventeenth-century Scotland and Masonry Conclusions***

1. The invading English Puritans in 1650 spared Roslyn Chapel from destruction while the adjacent castle was burnt; why? It could have been no accident; the simplest explanation which fits the thesis here being developed is that Sion, acutely aware of the momentous materials in the vaults, had indeed hidden power, which it used.
2. In 1670 half of the members of the Lodge of Aberdeen were non-operatives, including the nobility; according to the present analysis this indicates that keeping in with the Stuarts was, as ever, a strong drive, and that some of the middle ranks may have been looking towards Knight Templary.
3. The *Edinburgh Register House MS*, probably deriving from the 1660s, giving brief rituals of two degrees and familiar Masonic customs, and which some think to relate to a fully speculative lodge, and which could well be the case, indicates what was going on in at least one such lodge; ritual degree work was a key.

#### ***Scotland—the escalation of nascent Masonry Conclusions***

1. Scottish lodges like the lodges of Edinburgh and Aberdeen included non-operatives; professionals, gentry and nobles: it is possible that some of these men hoped to become Knight Templars, and that by showing themselves engaging in Templar–Roslyn ceremonies, available in many operative lodges, they might be selected; the higher nobles probably did the selecting.
2. Some operative masons still revered the Sinclair family, to the extent in 1600 or 1601 of issuing the ‘St Clair Charter’ stating their support of them, and that at the great expense of rejecting the offer of a Royal Warrant and the King as a Grand Master; this proves that knew they had a big debt to the Saint Clairs: the Roslyn ceremonies are indicated.
3. King James VI of Scotland in 1601 at the lodge of Scoon and Perth, was ‘entered fellow mason and fellow craft’ in ‘ane ancient frie Lodge for entering and passing within ourselves’; perhaps he was promoting both the Templars and nascent Masonry.
4. One result of the King openly becoming a Mason would have been a pressure on the nobility to copy him; here we find a tangible reason for the Scottish nobility’s ‘non-operative’ showing in operative lodges.
5. Some gentry and professionals may have taken the operative modified Templars degrees in an effort to be accepted as latter-day Templars.
6. During James’s reign, 1567–1625, it is known that these Scottish free lodges became a major movement; it is a most reasonable conclusion that nascent Masonry was practised by them.

### ***Early and mid-17th-century Freemasonry in England Conclusions***

1. The earliest known initiation in England into some form of Freemasonry was in 1641; it can be argued that lack of previous records indicates that nascent Freemasonry, here claimed to have been brought to England by James I, was secretive—or its records lost during various catastrophes and deliberate burnings.
2. The earliest known initiation in England, of Sir Robert Moray in 1641, was of a Scotsman, and by an occasional lodge of a Scottish lodge; at the very least this demonstrates that Scottish proto-Freemasonry was in being, and that it operated in England.
3. The first known initiation of an Englishman in England, and by an English occasional lodge, a proto-Masonic body, was of Elias Ashmole in the country in 1646; it is impossible to believe that he was really the first, but was just the first known:
  - (1) The full lodge and those who initiated him predated him, and even if some had been initiated by a Scottish lodge, the probability is high that some must have been natively initiated.
  - (2) It is difficult indeed to believe that the lodge which initiated Ashmole was the only English lodge in being, or, indeed, that others had not predated it and those others.
  - (3) Ashmole was a great diarist, and by reason of his rare talents his diary survives; it is reasonable to think that almost all other initiated men did not keep a daily diary, or, if they did, it was long since lost.
4. In 17th-century England and Scotland, still trammelled by poor roads, poor communications, parochialism, war and the threat of war, no doubt together with a dearth of suitable large meeting places, the perfect practical way of dealing with such handicaps would be by occasional lodges—small, semi-detached groups—always having a mother, home or base lodge; all they would need was for one of their number to have present a copy of their lodge's Old Charges.
  - (1) Such groups, also, could have ever-varying membership, including being composed of members of different lodges; and here, of course, another need for secret signs, grips and tokens becomes apparent.
5. The use of entirely speculative occasional lodges, first recorded in 1641, and for a Scottish lodge, separated from the known lodges with speculatives up till then, operative lodges, discloses that proto-Freemasonry was in being; the fourth step in the formation of Freemasonry had been taken.

### ***The Royal Society, Charles II and Freemasonry Conclusions***

1. The Royal Society, founded much earlier but not chartered till 1660, encouraged by Charles II, was from the beginning associated with Rosicrucianism and Freemasonry; it is contended that the high placing and partnership here assigned to Freemasonry is further evidence of the high role assigned to it: that of helping to bring about a more free, just and equitable society.
2. Another role of Freemasonry, it is thought, was to help James I's acceptance by the English upper classes.
3. Under the encouragement of Charles II, it is suggested, the Royal Society upgraded Scottish proto-Masonry with extended philosophy, ritual and ceremony, still primitive but sufficient, into Freemasonry; finished about 1660 and organised by 1667, the most talented mason in England, Sir Christopher Wren, probably became the Order's first Grand Master.
4. It is probable that between 1660 and 1687 the Royal Society had an input into Scottish proto-Masonry, resulting in a sparse but accomplished speculative Freemasonry; the fifth and final step in the formation of Freemasonry had been taken.

### ***Later 17th-century English Freemasonry Conclusions***

1. There is argument as to whether or not a form of Freemasonry was present in later 17th-century England, but if this paper's developments are right, it was; Scottish formulated and Rosicrucian—Royal Society—Sion developed, it was helping the more modest levels of society to visualise, and assist in bringing about, the age-old aim of social liberalism.
2. The Great Plague of 1665 and the Great Fire of London, 1666, with all rebuilding to be done in stone, contributed to a breaking down of the strict old operative masons organisations, with



foreign masons coming in; this could well have been a time favourable to speculative lodge development.

### ***The London Company Conclusion***

1. The old London Company of Masons was now accepting non-operatives in numbers, these apparently joining to become liverymen, which gave them civic privileges; nevertheless a system of non-operative 'clubs', different from operative lodges with a few non-operatives, was growing, capable of providing a sound London base for some speculative lodges.

### ***The advances of Scottish Masonry by the early 17th century Conclusions***

1. Study of what seems to have emerged as the reasonable antecedents, origin and evolution of what is now known as Freemasonry suggests that it was prefaced with Templars giving degrees to Scottish nobles before Bannockburn, low Templar degrees were given to Roslyn Chapel masons to seal their lips, then the operative lodges with those degrees were used as an entrance to Scottish Templary, which probably upgraded the lodge ceremonies.
2. The question 'Why did nobles and enlightened men join the relatively humble stonemason lodges, with sparse ritual?'; if this thesis is correct—to please Stuart kings and, perhaps, to obtain the lowest Templar degrees, which they hoped would qualify them for membership of latter-day Scottish Templary.
3. The English now say that their Freemasonry did not come from their operative lodges—in which case, it is to be asked, where did it come from?
4. The answer which has emerged in this examination must be considered to provide the Occam solution.

### ***Late 17th-century Freemasonry in England Conclusions***

1. In 1686 Dr Plot wrote of eminent persons, called 'accepted' masons, being in operative lodges and holding meetings 'all over the Nation'; as this paper has evolved this is, far from being strange, merely a confirmation of all the developments noted or postulated so far.
2. Why did they join?; it is suggested that one reason was for important-feeling locals to show allegiance to the House of Stuart, hoping thus for favours from the local Royal representative.
3. Traces of Higher degrees in Britain are thin, but it is widely thought that they originated in France, with the 'Jacobites'; this paper indicates that they originated in Scotland, and upon the Stuart exile taken to France and there enlarged and polished.
4. The expulsion of James II by the English Establishment in 1687, and his exile in France, was to cause an enormous taking up of Masonry on the Continent.

### ***Jacobite Freemasonry in France Conclusions***

1. From 1687 on, the Jacobites in France developed Masonry as a tool for their cause; in this way Masonry received a boost.
2. The Jacobites spread Masonry over the Continent; the basic Masonic messages were able to reach more and more people.
3. In England the Scots had gone, but London and urban Masonry remained Rosicrucian—Royal Society—developed Scottish; the basic 'better society' message must have continued.

### ***Sir Christopher Wren Conclusions***

1. It is concluded the Sir Christopher Wren was a Freemason.
2. It is probable that Wren was the first Grand Master of the Charles II—Royal Society Masonry—Masonic aggregation.
3. The current English Grand Lodge position is to deny that Wren was a Mason, or shy away from the topic; this paper's work brings the conclusion that Wren is denied because:
  - (1) The acknowledgment of Wren and his Grand Mastership would diminish the English Grand Lodge's current situation of being the first, the 'premier' Grand lodge of the world.
  - (2) It would bring closer that day when Scotland, not England, is acknowledged to be the source of Freemasonry.

### ***The Third Degree Conclusions***

1. The third degree comes to light early in the 18th century; it almost certainly incorporates the death of Hiram Abif, proposed here as an allegory of de Molay's near-death experience.
2. The third degree, or the raising part of it, may have been in outline form in some lodges in Scotland since the mid-16th century, perhaps coming to London, as earlier argued, with the later Stuarts.

### ***Late 18th-century—early 19th-century—operative England Conclusions***

1. The Alnwick operative lodge of 1703 is the only known one in England prior to 1717; however, a trail can be picked up from far earlier.
2. The Stalwell, 1725, but with an older history, had in 1735 a mixed operative–speculative membership; this proves that such lodges, as noted by Plot, existed in England.

### ***English Freemasonry before 1717 Conclusions***

1. From this study the Clarke conclusion, that before 1717 English lodges must have been roughly uniform, must be generally correct; this, of course, is due to their almost certain derivation from the one source, Scottish Masonry.
2. The Carr conclusion, that pre-1717 English lodges were basically concerned with feasting and drinking, indicates a switching to the club lodge as urban Scottish-type lodges became isolated from political correctness.
3. The marked fall in the number of London lodges around the beginning of the 18th century is put down by many writers to their being of a Jacobean nature, thus becoming a dangerous affiliate; this only serves to make clearer the case for the Scottish origin of English Freemasonry.

### ***York Conclusions***

1. York has a mason tradition going back before the Norman Conquest; this gives it a feel of weight.
2. In the 1700s the York Lodge or Grand Lodge warranted many speculative lodges; this gives it the stamp of power.
3. York and its region preserved many old Higher degrees, some of which can be compressed into seven, thus forming the York Rite; this, together with the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite, were adopted by almost all military lodges, and taken to America: the foundation of the two American Rites, York and Scottish, is clear.

### ***The 18th-century—the great outreach of Scottish Freemasonry Conclusions***

1. The Stuarts, it is argued, took the full array of Scottish Masonry to France, and that they were there enhanced.
2. French nobles flocked into the Scottish Masonry; Scottish Masonry held something of real importance.
3. In France in the early 18th century the Jacobites were spreading their Masonry throughout Europe, this highlighting freedom and enlightenment; the Jesus-derived ideals, it is argued, continued to be a high concern.

### ***1717—a Grand Lodge for England Conclusions***

1. Six lodges attended the 1716 steering Committee to form an English Grand Lodge, but only four did so; there must have been those unwilling to ditch the old Scottish–Stuart lodge system.
2. That a new political base was being laid in 1717 is indicated by one of the four forming lodges being composed of nobles and high gentry.
3. Lodges of the new Grand Lodge were careful that their patriotism was made loud and clear; the old Scottish system was being replaced by an English one. England, it is concluded, began to lose the Landmarks.
4. The new Grand Lodge designed itself on guild lines, more particularly those of the London Company of Masons; this indicates the extent to which London Masonry had been, probably increasingly, subject to that body.

5. The constitutions of the new Grand Lodge demanded allegiance to the House of Hanover; again, Scottish Masonry was on the way out: going far to neuter English Freemasonry.
6. Although the ordinary English lodges found change, a general sense of trying to make society a little better remained; English Freemason lodges still had some part to play in social reform.
7. The new Grand Lodge abandoned democratic ways and made its positions by appointment, and got Crown Princes to be Grand Masters; old goals were lost.

#### ***The first half of the 18th century—England and Freemasonry Conclusions***

1. The second quarter of the 18th century saw the strong reinforcement of the English middle class; many, wishing to enhance themselves, took up Freemasonry.
2. English Freemasonry has been given credit for inspiring many great French philosophers; this is not the case—the dominant Masonry in France was the Scottish–Jacobean–Antients type.
3. It was Scottish Masonry which went to the wider world, including by military lodges.
4. It is thought by some that the English Grand Lodge began to ‘lose its way’; according to the picture here being glimpsed, this is not so—the English Grand Lodge had deliberately dumped the old ideals.

#### ***Roman Catholic opposition Conclusions***

1. In 1737 the Vatican condemned Freemasonry and pronounced to be an enemy of ‘the Roman Church’; untouchable in Scotland and England, now that Freemasonry had moved to the Continent Roman Catholicism, fearing that it would help undermine it, condemned it.
2. Where the Vatican had total control it condemned to death anyone found to be a Freemason.
  - (1) This indicates the true power of Jacobean Masonry.
  - (2) This indicates that Roman Catholicism had undergone only a surface ‘reformation’, the drive to murder those capable of undermining its great vested interests remained.

#### ***The Baron von Hund experience Conclusions***

1. In 1742 Baron von Hund was initiated into Jacobean Masonry by a small group; this shows that:
  - (1) The detached or occasional system was a long-term feature of Scottish Masonry.
  - (2) The Jacobites were actively using Masonry to help spread their aims and messages.
2. Left alone when the Jacobite campaign failed in Scotland, von Hund tried to pass on his, no doubt, responsibilities; From this, it is argued, it can be learnt:
  - (1) Those receiving the degrees took an oath to pass them on, as thought suitable.
  - (2) The ‘Rite of Strict Observance’—note the command not to innovate—gives us a window into what are probably lower grades, if somewhat garbled, of Templary; this includes:
    - a. An account of Templars fleeing to Scotland at the time of the French strike.
    - b. The Jacobites had added to their degrees Rosicrucian-type material, indicating that this was a favoured source.
3. With the military defeat of the Jacobites in 1746, the drive went out of their Masonic efforts; but Scottish–Jacobean Masonry was already spreading itself, and would in time overspread the globe.

#### ***Scottish Freemasonry fights back in England—the Antients Conclusions***

1. With the building Jacobean threat to the Hanoverian throne those lodges still practising Scottish-derived work seem to have become ‘invisible’.
2. With the Jacobean military threat extinguished, 1745, the old-type lodges assessed that it was safe to emerge; and established their own Grand Lodge.
3. The contemporary dubbed terms ‘Antients’ and ‘Moderns’ describe, in the first case that type of Masonry practised under Scottish auspices, and pre–1717, whilst the Moderns were inventing a then new form of Masonry; the terms are accurate.
4. The two other Grand Lodges pronounced the Moderns Grand Lodge as irregular; as those two were working to the old rituals, this tells us that the Moderns had indeed made drastic changes; by the practiced Landmarks the 1717 Grand Lodge was irregular.

- (1) The fact that the English cover up or gloss over this happening must indicate that they, too, knew that their teachings and system were irregular; if it was then the case, then it must still be so.
5. The Moderns brushed aside the fact that the majority of their members wanted to practise the old Higher degrees; this indicates that the Moderns' autocratic hierarchy:
  - (1) Was out of touch with its people.
  - (2) Did as it wished, against the will of its people.
  - (3) Did not care about its people.
6. The Moderns attacked the Antients; they saw them as a real threat to their Hanoverian and autocratic system, not to mention their monopoly.
7. In the English American colonies the Scottish–Antients Freemasonry was doing its work of promoting freedom and justice; the American Revolution was Scottish Masonry driven.
8. In the later 18th century it was found that most Masons thought that Freemasonry had come from the Knights Templar; no doubt few had proof, but where there's a continuous insistence there is a reason.

### ***1813—an unnatural Union Conclusions***

1. The 1799 Unlawful Societies Act posed no threat to the Moderns.
  - (1) The Moderns backed the Royal House and it backed them.
  - (2) All those who counted knew that the overseas revolutions were Scottish–Jacobite–Antients Masonry inspired, and had not proceeded out of the Moderns.
  - (3) The Moderns Grand Lodge showed no sign of wanting to change England's class-ridden status quo.
2. The 1799 Unlawful Societies Act showed every likelihood of debarring the Antients.
  - (1) With people like the Irish and the lower classes in their membership, they were automatically suspect.
  - (2) Antients-type Masonry was known to be behind the overseas revolutions.
  - (3) The Antients were known to teach social justice and liberty.
3. Under threat of closure the Antients decided that they had to try their hand with the Moderns.
4. The term 'Freemason'—the Union was about 'Antient, Free and Accepted Masons'. Antient—from the Antients. Free—from the 17th-century usage, to cover both operatives and speculatives; they were all 'free', that is, fully qualified and privilege-entitled (nothing to do with freestone). Accepted—from the few guilds; in this case the London Company of Masons: non-operative, but accepted as masons by it.
5. The Antients thought that they had protected their Higher degrees with an inclusion clause in the Articles of Union.

### ***The Modern's—their closeness to destroying the Higher degrees Conclusions***

1. Upon gaining the upper hand over the Antients, the Moderns effectively barred all Higher degree work.
2. Following 1813 the Moderns effectively defused and mangled the more—to their constituents—dangerous Higher degrees.
3. It is concluded here that the Moderns had now achieved their perceived aim of stamping out direct–social–reform Masonry in England.

### ***Union Freemasonry and 19th-century English Society Conclusions***

1. The 19th century saw in England a callous exploitation of the masses, one involving real, continuing, and shocking human degradation.
2. Nineteenth-century English Freemasonry, where the Moderns early bested the Antients, did nothing to address the cause of human misery all around it; rather, it rode on it.

### ***National revolutions and Freemasonry Conclusions***

1. The American Revolution, 1775–1783, which freed the east coast of America from the English, is acknowledged worldwide as to have been Masonically driven; it was not by the English form, however, but the Scottish–Antients.

2. The French Revolution, 1789–1799, had a Masonic start, but was quickly taken over by others; the Masonry involved was Scottish–Jacobean.
3. The Greek expulsion of the Turks, beginning in 1821, was Masonically driven; and by Scottish-derived Masonry.
4. The freeing of South America from Spain, beginning in 1821, was Masonically led; and by Scottish-derived Masonry.
5. The freeing of Italy, beginning in 1860, from a Roman Catholic Church hold was Masonically led; and by Scottish-derived Masonry.
6. The freeing of the Philippines, beginning in 1898, was Masonically led, and by Scottish-derived Masonry.
7. It is concluded that Freemasonry, which proved able to inspire the writing of great Constitutions and Declarations of the Rights of Man, was not only able to, but actively did, improve the lot of great masses of people.
8. It is a conclusion of this thesis that English Freemasonry had been deliberately rendered incapable of inspiring significant social reform.

### **CONCLUSIONS**

From this point on, the analysis and construction will be done on the premise that in general the earlier reached conclusions are correct.

**Sub Aim 1:** To determine the vital occurrences and decisions in the formation of Freemasonry.

1. The existence of sound operative lodges in the 13th century onwards in England and Scotland, although in no way planned to become the physical base of a practicing philosophy and message of fundamental importance to all, were nevertheless in place; the first step in the formation of Freemasonry had occurred.
2. The conferring of Templar degrees on Scottish nobles before the Battle of Bannockburn, Scotland, 1314, was the second step in the formation of Freemasonry.
3. Nascent Freemasonry was launched incidentally with the conferring of modified Templar degrees on stonemasons who were building a secret vault for Roslyn Chapel, Scotland, in 1446, and was, although unplanned and unrecognised as such, the third step in the formation of Freemasonry.
4. The use of entirely speculative occasional lodges, first recorded in 1641, and for a Scottish lodge, separated from the known lodges with speculatives up till then, operative lodges, discloses that proto-Freemasonry was in being; the fourth step in the formation of Freemasonry had been taken.
5. It is probable that between 1660 and 1657 the Royal Society had an input into Scottish proto-Masonry, resulting in a sparse but accomplished speculative Freemasonry; the fifth and final step in the formation of Freemasonry had been taken.

**Sub Aim 2:** To determine the salient occurrences and decisions in Freemasonry's development.

1. The first Grand Mastership, by Sir Christopher Wren, beginning in 1667, of an aggregation of English operative and speculative Masonry.
2. The expulsion of James II by the English Establishment in 1687, and his exile in France, caused the Jacobites to develop Masonry as a tool for their cause; in this way Masonry received an upgrading, and enormous popularity on the Continent.
3. The shaking out of the third degree by Jacobean Masonry.
4. The ousting of the Stuarts by the English Establishment, and the bringing in of the Hanoverians, called for a reworking of Freemasonry from the liberal Stuart lines to autocratic Establishment–Hanoverian lines; in London on St John the Baptist's Day, 24 June 1717, the Grand Lodge of England was formed by four London lodges.
5. The complete separation of speculative Masonry from operative, in the first third of the 18th century.
6. The upgrading of the Higher degrees by the Jacobites, in France, until 1745.
7. The great spread of Scottish–Antients–Jacobean Freemasonry over the world, to produce about 92% of the world's Freemasonry.

8. The severe opposition of Freemasonry by the Roman Catholic Church, which began in the open in 1737, with the issuing in 1740 of a Papal Bull condemning any Freemason found in the Papal States to death.
9. Following the dissipation of the Jacobean threat to the English throne in 1745, the formation in 1751 of the Antients Grand Lodge of England, to preserve old English Freemasonry, which was Scottish–Stuart derived.
10. The force of Scottish–Jacobean–Antients Freemasonry in leading revolutions around the world, to free great masses of people for a better life, beginning with the American Revolution of 1775.
11. The union of the Antients Grand Lodge, otherwise under threat of extinction, with the Moderns Grand Lodge, in 1813.
12. The deliberate destruction by the Moderns, after 1813, of the liberal social principles of the Antients.
13. The failure of English Freemasonry to address the callous exploitation of the English masses by 19th-century upper class English society, one involving real, continuing, and shocking human degradation; rather, it rode on it.
14. The formation of organisations in England, in the second half of the 18th century, to foster the remnants of the Higher degrees.
15. The development of outreaching forms of world Freemasonry, for example Prince Hall (black), Co-Masonry (men and women) and the Order of Women Freemasonry.
16. An ongoing but steadily weakening effort of English Freemasonry to control world Freemasonry, essentially by trying to control Masonic history and information, and by pronouncing bans on those groupings principally seen as dangerous to itself or its social class principles.

### **Aim**

To determine the origin of Freemasonry.

### **Conclusion**

Freemasonry originated with the building of Roslyn Chapel, Scotland, 1446, by the fusion of modified low-grade Knights Templar degrees with routine ceremonies conducted at operative mason lodge formal meetings.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. It is recommended that the ‘non-recognition’ of a Masonic Grand lodge be done principally on moral grounds.
2. It is recommended that, rather than play ‘follow the leader’, each Grand Lodge makes its own thorough examination of a Masonic Grand Lodge before declaring it banned.
3. It is recommended that Prince Hall Freemasonry be recognised by all Jurisdictions without further ado.
4. It is recommended that serious thought and conferencing be devoted to recognising the Order of Women Freemasons.
5. It is recommended that serious thought and conferencing be given to recognising Co-Masonry.
6. It is recommended that an international group be established to determine the original and true landmarks and aims of Freemasonry, and publish widely.
7. It is recommended that an international lodge of Masonic research be established as soon as possible, with the aims of presenting Masonry with a world perspective, and of becoming the world’s premier lodge of research.

### **Bibliography**

ALLAN, J: ‘The Edinburgh Register House MS’, in *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, Vol 43, London, 1932.  
 ANDREWS, R & SCHELLENBERGER, P: *The Tomb of God*, Little, Brown, London, 1996.  
 BAIGENT, M, et al: *The Holy Blood and the Holy Grail*, Corgi Paperback, London, 1983.  
 BAIGENT, M, et al: *The Messianic Legacy*, Corgi Paperback, London, 1990.  
 BAIGENT, M & LEIGH, R: *The Temple and the Lodge*, Jonathan Cape, London, 1989.  
 BARNETT, A: ‘1751–1813: Sixty-Two Years of Masonic Dissent’, in *Transactions of Phoenix Lodge No. 30 GLNF*, Vol 8, 1977, Herblay.

- BANEZ, L.: 'Grand Master's Message on the Occasion of the Unveiling of the Bust of Bro./Col. Vicente A. Prado', in *The Cabletow*, Vol 74 No 5, Jan–Feb 1998, Manila, 1998.
- BATHAM, C: 'The Origin of Freemasonry (A New Theory)', in *AQC* Vol 106, London, 1994.
- BOSCOW, H: 'The Birth of Freemasonry', in *AQC* Vol 95, London, 1983.
- BRETT, G: 'King Solomon in the Middle Ages', in *The Collected Prestonian Lectures 1961–1974*, Lewis, London, 1975.
- BRYDON, R: *The Guilds the Masons and the Rosy Cross*, Roslyn Chapel Trust, Roslyn, 1994.
- BUDD, D: 'The Background to the Building of the Great French Gothic Cathedrals', in *Transactions of Phoenix Lodge No. 30 GLNF*, Vol 16, 1985, Herblay.
- BULLOCK, S: 'Initiating the Enlightenment?: Recent Scholarship Into European Freemasonry', John Hopkins Uni Press, Internet, 1996.
- CARR, H: 'An Examination of the Early Masonic Catechisms', in *AQC* Vol 88, London, 1970.
- CARR, H: 'The Transition From Operative to Speculative Freemasonry', in *The Collected Prestonian Lectures 1925–1960*, Quatuor Coronati Lodge, London, 1965.
- CARR, H: 'The Three Phases of Masonic History', in *AQC* Vol 826, London, 1964.
- CHECKLAND, S: *The Rise of Industrial Society In England 1815–1885*, Longman Paperback, London, 1971.
- CLARKE, H: 'Folklore Into Masonry', in *The Collected Prestonian Lectures 1961–1974*, Lewis, London, 1975.
- CLARKE, J: 'External Influences on the Evolution of English Masonry', in *Transactions of the Manchester Association for Masonic Research*, Vol 59, 1966.
- CLARKE, J: 'The Old Charges', *AQC* Vol 95, London, 1982.
- CRYER, N: *The Arch and the Rainbow*, Lewis, Addlestone, 1996.
- CRYER, N: 'The Making of Our Ritual in the 17th Century', Leister.
- CRYER, N: 'The Grand Lodge of York and the York Rite—a fresh appraisal', in *A Masonic Panorama*, Australian Masonic Research Council, Melbourne, 1995.
- DURR, A: 'Ritual of Association and the Organisation of the Common People', in *AQC* Vol 100, London, 1988.
- DYER, C: 'Some Thoughts on the Origin of Speculative Masonry', in *AQC* Vol 95, London, 1983.
- EDWARDS, L: 'The Story of the Fourth Temple', in *AQC* Vol 69, London, 1957.
- FRENCH, G: 'Guilds Versus Lodges', in *AQC* Vol 95, London, 1983.
- GARDNER, L: *Bloodline of the Holy Grail*, Element, Shaftsbury, 1996.
- Grand Lodge of Scotland: *Year Book*, GLScot, Edinburgh, 1997.
- Grand Lodge of the Philippines: *The Cabletow*, Vol 74 No 5, Jan–Feb 1998, Manila, 1998.
- IVISON, P: *The Knights Templar*, Ian Allen, Addlestone, 1997.
- JACKSON, K: *Beyond the Craft*, Lewis, London, 1982.
- JACKSON, K: 'Rosicrucianism And Its Effects on Craft Masonry', in *AQC* Vol 95, London, 1983.
- JONES, B: *Freemasons' Guide And Compendium*, Harrap, London, 1982.
- KENNEDY, W: 'Freemasonry: A Possible Origin', in *AQC* Vol 107, London, 1995.
- KNIGHT, C & LOMAS, R: *The Hiram Key*, Century, London, 1996.
- KNIGHT, C & LOMAS, R: *The Second Messiah*, Century, London, 1997.
- KNOOP, D & JONES, G: 'The Decline of the Mason Architect in England', *AQC* Vol 97, London, 1985.
- KNOOP, D & JONES, G: 'The Evolution of Masonic Organisation', in *AQC* Vol 45, London, 1935.
- KNOOP, D & JONES, G: 'The Sixteenth Century Mason', in *AQC* Vol 47, London, 1937.
- List of Lodges Masonic*, 1998, Pantagraph, Bloomington, Illinois, 1998.
- LYON, D: *History of The Lodge of Edinburgh . . . Embracing an Account of the Rise and Progress of Freemasonry in Scotland*, Edinburgh, 1873.
- MACKEY, A: *Encyclopedia of Freemasonry*, McLure, Philadelphia, 1917.
- MARKHAM, A: 'Characteristics and Origins in Early Freemasonry', in *AQC* Vol 100, London, 1988.
- MARKHAM, A: 'Further views on the Origins of Freemasonry in England', in *AQC* Vol 103, London, 1991.
- MONTGOMERY, J: *A Critical and Evangelical Commentary on the Book of Kings*, Clark, Edinburgh, 1967.
- NEWMAN, A: 'Politics And Freemasonry in the Eighteenth Century', in *AQC* Vol 104, London, 1992.

NEWTON, J Fort: *The Builders*, Allen & Unwin, London, 1918.  
 PICK, F & KNIGHT, N: *The Pocket History of Freemasonry*, Muller, London, 7th Ed, 1983.  
 PLACE, E: 'Historical or Political?', in *Pythagoras* 2/1995, Grand Lodge of Greece, Athens, 1995.  
 PLUMB, J: *England in the Eighteenth Century*, Pelican, Harmondsworth, 1974.  
 SHARP, A: 'Australia's Oldest Masonic Document A Factual Interpretation', in *AQC* Vol 104, London, 1992.  
 STEVENSON, D: 'Confessions of a Cowan: A Non-Mason and Early Masonic History', in *AQC* Vol 107, London, 1995.  
 STEVENSON, D: *The Origins of Freemasonry*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988.  
 SOUVALIOTIS, I: 'A Concise History of the Grand Lodge of Greece', in *Pythagoras* 3/1996, Athens, 1996.  
 THIERING, B: *Jesus of the Apocalypse*, Doubleday, Sydney, 1995.  
 THIERING, B: *Jesus the Man*, Doubleday, Sydney, 1993.  
 TYDEMAN, R: 'Masters and Master Masons A Theory of the Third Degree', in *AQC* Vol 84, 1971.  
 VIBERT, L: 'The Development of the Trigradal System', in *The Collected Prestonian Lectures 1925–1960*, Quatuor Coronati Lodge, London, 1965.  
 WARD, F: 'In the Beginning was the Word', in *Transactions of Manchester Association For Masonic Research*, Oldeham, 1971.  
 WARD, J: *Freemasonry and the Ancient Gods*, Simpkin, London, 1926.  
 Copyright © Adelaide South Australia 1998 by George Woolmer, OAM, FNHSSA; MEd, GradDip(Ed Admin), GradDip(DistEd), GradDip(CurricDev), GradDipEdStudAbEd, BEd, BA, DipT(Sec), RDA; GLib, DipMasEd.