Knights Templar

(Elsewhere, in an appendix in *Merging Agendas* and quite extensively in *The Third Temple: Rome*, I deal with the subject of Templarism in Freemasonry. Despite this, the subject actually interests me little. Freemasonry is an exercise in gross superstition and heathenism. We entertained it because it seems to be conventional thinking that the Knights Templar desired to rebuild Solomon's Temple on the Temple Mount in Jerusalem. Do those secret societies claiming historical descent from the Templars also harbor this desire? Be that as it may, I scarcely dealt with the historical Templars at all in those contexts because the reality of Templarism in modern secret societies claiming descent from the Templars actually has little to do with the historical Templars. The claims of modern fraternities are fabricated. They are fables. Here, we introduce the subject of the 14th-century Templars and consider certain features of that chivalric order, which were brought out in the indictment and trial of the Inquisition against them. There may be some incidental redundancy with my treatment elsewhere in the conclusion, but this is done succinctly in order to wrap up my opinion, which is also the deduction of authorities on the subject of the supposed connection between the 14th-century knights and the modern societies adopting their name.)

Chapter 1
Knights Templar

The prevalent opinion in modern scholarship is that the Templars, who were condemned for heresy in a 14th-century Inquisition and burned at the stake, were the victims of a wicked pope (Pope Clement V) and an avaricious king (King Philip IV of France). This may be correct.

> The statement that the Templars ever renounced the precepts of positive religion, either at that early period of their career or at any subsequent time, is a mere assumption, based on the charges made by the malevolence of a wicked King and a still more wicked Pope.

One could appreciate the objectivism of Albert Mackey, in his *The History of Freemasonry* Volume I (1898), were it not for the fact that he, too, paraded around like Simon Magus.

Charges against the Knights were fabricated, says modern scholarship. Occult historians, however, take issue with that assessment. Eliphas Levi, Helena Blavatsky, and Manly P. Hall, all experts in the occult, agree that the Templars were actually involved in anti-Christian occultism. There is not even a disavowal of the accusation of sodomy, which hung over the Knights. Naturally, they have their own reasons for vindicating the Templars, making occult martyrs of them, but does this invalidate their interpretation of history?

In *Isis Unveiled* (1877), Helena Blavatsky says this directly. "It is a mistake to state that the Order became only later anti-Catholic," she says.

> It was so from the beginning . . . . Present-day Templars can hardly claim descent from those who did not believe in Christ as God-man or as Savior of the World; who rejected the miracle of his birth and those performed by himself; who did not believe in transubstantiation, the saints, holy relics, or purgatory, etc. The Christ Jesus was, in their opinion, a false prophet but the man Jesus a brother . . . . They reverenced the doctrines of alchemy, astrology, magic, kabalistic talismans, and adhered to the teachings of their chiefs in the East. 'In the last century,' says Findel, 'when Freemasonry erroneously supposed herself the daughter of Templarism, great pains were taken to regard the Order of Knights Templar as innocent . . . pains were taken to repress the truth.'

Although the Templars may not have been guilty of all the crimes attributed to them, they seem to have been anti-Catholic.

Freemasons have gone to extraordinary pains to try to vindicate the Templars by blaming their indictment on the avarice of Phillip IV and Pope Clement V, but they have had an ulterior motive. On the one hand, they want to associate themselves with a chivalric tradition; and they naturally desire that heritage to be lofty and noble, morally impeccable. In short their motivation has been to associate themselves with and promote the Romantic notion of chivalry. On the other, more correctly, Freemasons desire to be aligned with the occult heritage of the Templars. They were martyrs of occultism, after all, and anti-Catholic, a position which Freemasons traditionally supported.

This is the position of the occultists. They nurse their own Romantic fantasy also and revere the Templars as heroes for another reason. To them the Templars were not martyred by a greedy tyrant who was murdering them to purloin their wealth. The Knights, rather, were martyred on behalf of freedom of conscience, they believe; martyrs of occult mysteries.

If Freemasonry originated from the Knights Templar perhaps that would explain some of the anti-Catholic rancor of their modern beginning in the Enlightenment. But is this really the case. Let's review some facts about the Templars and see where their teachings might have ended up, if they were perpetuated at

all, with Freemasons or elsewhere.

Of course, there is the possibility that the Knights Templar connection and their bearing on the Tribulation Temple is dead-end street altogether. I have little doubt that it is, but there is so much misinformation regarding the Templars, that, in any case, it is just one more thing that we encounter along the way that must be straightened out.

Exculpatory

I have been rather heavy-handed toward Masonry. I have vilified Freemasons, some might say. But, even if one is heavy-handed, one must be even-handed. The language used in the study of Jewish mysticism, from a Christian perspective, could easily seem antisemitic, but I conclude by dispelling the error of "Jewish world conspiracy." I turn rather dramatically toward the possibility that Roman Catholicism lies at the heart of it. In a similar manner, I must now vindicate the Freemasons to some degree.

Not wholly, understand; but I will absolve them of ultimate culpability. We are studying the Apocalypse, after all. We should focus our vision. It is not called the *Revelation* for nothing. I believe you will concur that Freemasons don't appear to be the masterminds.

In expounding upon the "Templar" information, we will investigate Masonic claims of heritage from the Knights Templar, which was a Roman Catholic knighthood. Do these claims stand the test of scrutiny? What would this mean given the historical antagonism between the secret society of Freemasonry and the Roman Catholic Institution?

It is very confusing. Why would anti-Catholic Freemasons promote a romance of Catholic knighthood? And "God is not the author of confusion." To dispell the pall of darkness, we must begin by examining the history of the Templars, bringing its supposed connection up to the Enlightenment Period.

In the course of this investigation, toward the latter end in

particular, we will encounter groups which we have already discussed, Rosicrucians, the Illuminati, and so on. We will stitch them into the drama as we go, always keeping in view: one, the Roman Catholic Institution, and, two, the relevancy that this speculation has on the subject of the Third Temple.

The Order of Solomon's Temple

The Poor Fellow Soldiers of Christ were a Catholic military order founded in 1118 after the First Crusade. They were also called the *Poor Fellow Soldiers of the Temple of Solomon* or *Knights Templar*, for short, the *Temple Knights*. Official recognition by a papal bull of 1139 made them Knights in the Pope's Service.

Originally, there had been only nine Templars, feudal noblemen, as all knights of the era were, mostly Frenchmen. There numbers grew, however.

The Templars were one of the two foremost knightly orders of the Middle Ages, the other being the Knights Hospitaller, or the Hospitaller Order of St. John of Jerusalem. The two orders had a good-natured rivalry, competing with one another in valor and heroism. There was one significant difference, however. The Hospitallers, which were also called *Knights of Malta*, did not create a secret society.

In 1098, Jerusalem was conquered. Of course, the Templars had nothing to do with that. But immediately upon arriving in the Holy Land, they completely upstaged the Hospitallers by assuming residence on the Temple Mount, making it their headquarters.

Tim Harford, a columnist for the *Financial Times*, writing in a January 2017 article for *BBC News Online*, "The Warrior Monks Who Invented Banking," says, "The Templars dedicated themselves to the defense of Christian pilgrims to Jerusalem." This was because pilgrims could fall prey to robbers along the way to and within the Holy Land. These pilgrimages were big business: as penance, the pope required a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, so there was a constant migration. Hartford continues: "A

pilgrim could leave his cash at Temple Church in London, and withdraw it in Jerusalem. Instead of carrying money, he would carry a letter of credit." The Templars supposedly invented the "cheque," which marks the beginning of modern banking.

But was this really the case? In his February 2011 article "Doubtful that the Knights Templar Invented Bank Cheques After All" Tony McMahon writes for *TheTemplarKnight.com*:

> Essentially, the Templars were beaten to the first cheque by the Roman *praescriptione* and possibly even the Mauryan empire *adesha* three hundred years before in what is now India. The Sassanids, the late Roman empire's Persian foes, are also said to have used a form of cheque as are Muslim traders as early as the ninth century AD. All of which pre-dates the Templar period from 1118.

One can easily imagine that the Hospitallers could have been offended by the presumption of the Templars in making the Temple Mount their headquarters. After all, the Hospitallers had been involved in the First Crusade. They were victorious veterans. How much more when the Templars made it a center of money changing.

Moneychangers

Presumably, the Temple Mount was a nexus of Christian pilgrimage. The Church of the Holy Sepulcher is nearby as were other holy sites. And, probably, the Templars were exchanging money there. It was a great plaza or mall, after all, and could accomodate such activity.

Doubtless, this was all the more galling to the Hospitallers because the Templars had sworn a vow of chastity and poverty. However, their money-changing services may have justified to some degree their assumption of the Temple Mount. It was centrally located.

In his article for *BBC*, Harford continues:

> The Knights Templar did much more than transferring money across long distances. As William Goetzmann describes in his book *Money Changes Everything*, they provided a range of recognisably modern financial services. If you wanted to buy a nice island off the west coast of France - as King Henry III of England did in the 1200s with the island of Oleron, north-west of Bordeaux - the Templars could broker the deal. Henry III paid £200 a year for five years to the Temple in London, then when his men took possession of the island, the Templars made sure that the seller got paid. And in the 1200s, the Crown Jewels were kept at the Temple as security on a loan, the Templars operating as a very high-end pawn broker.

This is very meaningful in determining how the Templars functioned in the pope's government. They became financial officers throughout Europe and the Mediterranean.

Chapter 2
Occult Bankers

In his 1999 *Rulers of Evil*, Tupper Saussy writes:

> The Templars invented modern banking by applying an oriental invention to their commerce. Agents of the Chinese emperor Kao-tsung, inventor of paper currency called *fei-chi'en*, "flying money," sought trade with the middle east during the period of Templar occupation. Kao-tsung's was the first government on earth to enforce circulation of drafts as legal tender for debts.
>
> As their list of properties lengthened with donations from Italy, Austria, Germany, Hungary, and the Holy Land, the Templars built hundreds of great stone castles. Wealthy travelers lodged in these castles because of their unmatched security. Convinced they were building a new world, the Templars called each other *frère maçon* ("brother mason"). Later, this term would be anglicized into "Freemason."
>
> By 1300, presiding over the world economy from their Paris office, the Templars had become an international power unto themselves. Engaged in diplomacy at the highest levels of state from the Holy Land westward, they set the tastes, the goals, the morality, the rules of the civilized world. Kings did their bidding . . .

In the 1842 book *The History of the Knights Templars, the Temple Church, and the Temple*, Charles Addison, an apologist for the Templars, says, "The Knights Templars first established

the chief house of their order in England in Southampton . . . . It was called the New Temple, to distinguish it from the original establishment." Essentially, this edifice was a castle.

They traveled back and forth between the Holy Land, this Temple and others in France and elsewhere, between the time of their founding in 1118, the end of the Crusades in 1291, and the time of their dissolution and trial in 1307, growing increasingly wealthier.

Pagan Temples

When anyone comes into an ostensibly Christian country and constructs a building called a "Temple" in the center of town, alarm bells should go off. Immediately, this is problematic. The word "Temple" is code language for "idolatry."

Of course, Mormons also prominently construct idolatrous Temples. Mormonism was admittedly founded by Joseph Smith as a Freemasonic religion.

The popes and kings did not object at first because the Templars were their money managers, their bankers and financiers, and they were renowned for charitable works. The Templars purported to be exactly what Freemasons now desire to be, knightly heros renowned for good works, egregiously wealthy, with an impeccable reputation. But, as with Freemasonry, shadows lurk behind the Romantic image of these heroic knights.

Addison notes that the peasantry in England were not impressed with the Templars because they saw no evidence of their purported charitable acts. And they were suspicious because the Templar met in secret. This was well known if not notorious.

As a reward for their service, the popes gave the Templars land from which they functioned as international bankers. Proof that they were bankers can be seen in a vignette from Addison's history.

Upon returning from a victorious campaign in Wales, King Edward, finding himself unable to pay his soldiers, called for the Treasurer of the New Temple. On pretense of seeing his Moth-

er's jewels which were kept there, he confiscated ten thousand pounds. But he was not really robbing the Templars as it might seem. It was his money. His son, Edward II, on his accession to the throne, did the same thing.

The New Temple was based on the same principle as temples in the ancient pagan world. Pagan temples served as banks. This was the case in Rome as well. The Temple of Juno was the mint, and the Temple of Saturn was the Treasury.

The Templars also presumably governed much of Europe and the Mediterranean world. History makes much ado about the collapse of the Roman Empire, but did the empire really collapse? The pope continued to rule as emperor, and kings and knights constituted his civil government. Knights in particular seem to have been financial officers.

The Roman Republic was comprised mainly of two classes of citizens, Patricians and Plebians, the aristocrasy and the commoners. During the transition to Empire, a second class of nobles developed, the Equestrians. Social class in Rome was predicated by one thing, money. Equestrians were the merchant class who had achieved a certain level of wealth. More and more they began to figure in the government of the Roman Empire. Septimius Severus was the first Equestrian emperor. Soon the Senators were not numerous enough to administer the Empire, and Equestrians were appointed. Rome also began to allow for a system of upward mobility. Successful Roman soldiers, upon retirement would be settled on the frontier, given tracts of land, sufficiently raising them to the status of Equestrian. There they would constitute the local government and Latinize the area, so to speak. The Equestrians became a dynastic nobility, the knights of the Dark Ages.

The Templars were very powerful. They governed Palestine, the principality of Antioch, the principality of Tripoli, Apulia and Sicily, Upper and Central Italy, Portugal, Castile and Leon, Aragon, and estates in Germany, Hungary, Greece, France, and England, says Addison. Much of the job description of governors in the Roman Empire had been receipt of revenue. They were glorified tax collectors. Presumably, the Templars were fiscal of-

ficers, often responsible for a wide variety of other tasks.

The chief officer of the Templars was the Grand Master. In the East their various officials were called "Priors." The office itself was called a "Priory," as in the Priory of Sion, the Rosicrucian order, which was invented later in homage to this system. It was patterned to some degree on the Knights Templar. *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Sion* seems to have been hatched by the French Priory of Sion. Notice that Priories were part of a knightly order loyal to the pope.

With the conquest of Jerusalem in the mid-13th century and the fall of Acre in 1291, the crusades were over. The apologist Addison says . . .

> With the loss of all the Christian territory in Palestine had expired in Christendom every serious hope and expectation of recovering and retaining the Holy City. The services of the Templars were consequently no longer required, and men began to regard with an eye of envy and of covetousness their vast wealth and immense possessions . . . . The Templars, moreover, towards the close of their career, became unpopular with the European sovereigns and their nobles. The revenues of the former were somewhat diminished through the immunities conceded to the Templars by their predecessors, and the paternal estates of the latter had been diminished by the grant of many thousand manors, lordships, and fair estates to the order by their pious and enthusiastic ancestors.

Another thing that galled them was that the pope had exempted them from taxation. It was about this time that rumors started to circulate.

In 1307, the Templars in France were arrested by King Philip IV of France on charge of heresy. Prior to this, he had persuaded Pope Clement V to move the papal capital to Avignon, resulting in the Avignon Papacy. It was notorious for its profligacy. In view of this, conventional thinking is apologetic for the Templars. Philip IV and Pope Clement V were motivated wholly by fear and avarice, goes the thinking. But our objective is to sort through historical propaganda.

In a letter to Edward II of England, Pope Clement says that

he had been hearing rumors for a long time, but he had been unwilling to impugn the integrity of the Templars. Whether this was true, we do not know. Whether Philip completely trumped up the charges we do not know, either. It seems that he paid an informant for the initial accusation and elicited another by torturing one of the Templars, whom he had already imprisoned.

At length many of the Templars would confess under torture. Most of them, however, disavowed their confessions afterward.

What constituted the charges of heresy? What were the accusations?

The character of the wide array of offenses of which they were accused is identical with the repertoire of Celtic and Germanic witchcraft in the Middle Ages. Purportedly, they practiced alchemy, magic, Kabbalism, and the like. They also supposedly denied Christ by trampling and spitting on the cross and performing the "Kiss of Shame," which was kissing the Devil's posterior.

Gnosticism

Occultists believe that the Templars did indeed practice strange rites. They agree with Philip IV and Pope Clement V that the Templars were involved in occultism, but they do not agree with the punishment. The Templars did not deserve to be condemned by the Inquisition, burned at the stake. Of course, it depends upon your point of view. Heresy is viewed by occultists as a badge of honor. The Templars were martyrs, they think. Not martyrs of virtue and chivalry, but victims of a wicked Pope and a greedy tyrant. Thus Freemasons would romantically paint them, maryrs of what they consider the true faith, martyrs of the occult.

In *The Secrets of Freemasonry: Revealing the Supressed Tradition* (2006), author Robert Lomas, paraphrasing Arthur Edward Waite, says that the Templars were Johannites, that is, a Gnostic sect, who considered the Gospels allegorical, and drew from Jewish traditions and the Talmud. They believed that Jesus had been

initiated by Egyptian Priests of Osiris and that he was the incarnation of Horus. The Grand Pontiffs of this Church of the Secret Tradition were called by the title "The Christ." When Hughes de Payens became Grand Master of the Templars he was intitated into the mysteries of this secret Church and became the next "Christ Designate." From the beginning the Templars were the Wardens of the Secret Tradition, and their designs were hidden in profound mystery, although externally they were unimpeachably orthodox. Some believe that, when the Templars were decimated, the Masonic Temple of Sion continued their traditions.

"The Knights of the Morning were Essenes, healers, sons of the Prophets and of Melchizedek, king of a supernatural Salem," says author Henry Corbin, in the book *Temple & Contemplation* (1981):

> Their brothers in Jerusalem were apparently a kind of *militia hermetica*, who dedicated part of their quest to the realm of Nature. Their connection with the Templars stems from the fact that they shared the same vision of the *Imago Templi*. We have said that beneath the solemn appearance of defending the Holy Sepulcher, the Knights Templar pursued a secret objective, which was none other than the rebuilding of the Temple of Jerusalem. This was also the purpose of the Thebaid Solitaries . . . . Thus were all the Knights of the Temple, whose secret purpose was to have been achieved amidst the architectural splendor of a restored Jerusalem and of a sanctuary renewed under the aegis of a gnostic Christianity. . . . The intention to rebuild the Temple of Jerusalem was common both to the Knights Templar and to the mystical brotherhoods variously designated as the Brothers of the Thebaid Desert, the Knights of the Morning, and of Palestine, and so on. To both of them is ascribed the secret intention of establishing, with the new Temple, a gnostic Church of the Elect . . .

Traitors

The Templars were also indicted for sodomy, a vice which some of them denied more vehemently than the other accusa-

tions.

In the paper "Brotherhood Of Vice: Sodomy, Islam, and the Knights Templar," Mark Steckler says that a hagiographic document called *The Passion of Saint Pelagius*, which was written in 962, was the first of a series of documents associating Islam with sodomy. Throughout the crusades such thinking in Europe was commonplace.

The Ottoman Turks were known to practice homosexuality. Janissaries were boys captured in conquest who were subjected to homosexual abuse to break their will whereupon they would become soldiers in the Sultan's army. Vlad Dracula, for example, the King of Wallachia, and his brother Radu were both captured and subjected to this torture. Radu became the favorite of the Sultan Mehmed II, but Dracula escaped and spent his life in revenge, fighting the Turkish invasion. During WWI, British officer T. E. Lawrence, Lawrence of Arabia, a homosexual himself, preferred the company of Arabs because homosexuality among them was socially acceptable.

Although the Koran clearly condemns same-sex relations, we must remember that most people in those days were probably illiterate and, as in Medieval Christian culture, many Turks and Arabs may not have known the precepts of their own religion.

Being accused of sodomy was, therefore, in addition to the moral offense, considered treason. It was tantamount to being a Muslim agent. Doubtless, the fact that the Templars had not corresponded with Europe much during the nine years they spent on the Temple Mount, from 1118 to 1127, was used as circumstantial evidence against them. They had been very secretive during that time, living in the shadow of the Dome of the Rock, a famous Islamic mosque.

Conventional thinking nowadays is that Philip IV and Pope Clement V were motivated by fear and avarice to haul the Templars before the Inquisition. Clement V is considered by modern historians to be little less than a puppet of Philip IV. But is this correct? Realistically, did the Pope not vastly profit by the service of the Templars?

Chapter 3
Baphomet

Modern scholarship vindicates the Templars of wrong-doing and ascribes their condemnation to the basest of motivations: fear, envy, and greed. It is an approach informed by the cynicism of the Enlightenment. Without doubt, burning them at the stake was extreme. But when did popes start burning good Catholics, anyway?

The word of Pope Clement V means nothing, it seems. He was a bald-faced liar when he describes the rumours which had been spread abroad in France against the Templars, and his unwillingness to believe them. I quote from his 1311 Council of Vienne statement.

> . . . because it was not likely, nor did seem credible, that such religious men, who particularly often shed their blood for the name of Christ, and were thought very frequently to expose their persons to danger of death for his sake; and who often showed many and great signs of devotion, as well in the divine offices as in fasting and other observances, should be so unmindful of their salvation as to perpetrate such things; we were unwilling to give ear to the insinuations and impeachments against them, being taught so to do by the example of the same Lord of ours, and the writings of canonical doctrine. But afterwards, our most dear son in Christ, Philip, the illustrious king of the French, to whom the same crimes had been made known, not from motives of avarice, (since he does not design to apply or to appropriate to himself any portion of the estates of the Templars, nay, has washed his hands of them!) but inflamed with zeal for the orthodox faith, following the renowned

> footsteps of his ancestors, getting what information he properly could upon the premises, gave us much instruction in the matter by his messengers and letters.

The Pontiff then gives a long account of the various confessions made in France and of the absolution granted to those Templars as were contrite and penitent.

Certainly, everyone does not agree. Among those who believe the Pope, however, are two esoteric philosophers of the 19th and 20th centuries. Eliphas Levi, the most highly regarded occultist of the 19th century; and Manly P. Hall, the Masonic historian; both experts in the occult, agree that the Templars were involved in witchcraft.

In a 2004 article "The Knights Templar" from the website *Historical Satanism* author Vexen Crabtree says . . .

> Eliphas Levi . . . says that the Templars were anti-Christian and anti-Papal from their foundation and merely became more blasé and open about it as they grew strong and arrogant.

In his book *The History of Magic* (1860), Eliphas Levi himself explains.

> . . . a rich and dissolute Order, initiated into the mysterious doctrines of the Kabalah, seemed ready to turn on legitimate authority, on the conservative principles of the hierarchy, menacing the entire world with a gigantic revolution. The Templars, whose history is understood so little, were the terrible conspirators in question, and it is time at length to reveal the secret of their fall.

He goes on to excorate them for five pages because they so flagrantly exposed themselves to papal authority, not in the Inquisition but beforehand, by their negligence. Secrecy and discretion had always been the modus operandi of the mysteries, and they failed.

In England the local people complained to King Edward II about the secrecy of the Templars. How they gathered in their castle in the wee hours and locked the doors. But how secret

could they be? It seems everyone knew about their conclaves.

Albert Pike, in *Morals and Dogma* (1871), even calls them "stupid," in much the same vein that Levi censured them.

In his book *Rosicrucian and Masonic Origins* (1929), Manly P. Hall says . . .

> Was Jacques de Molay burned by the Holy Inquisition merely because he wore the red cross of the Templar? What were those secrets to which he was true even in death? Did his companion Knights perish with him merely because they had amassed a fortune and exercised an unusual degree of temporal power? To the thoughtless, these may constitute ample grounds, but to those who can pierce the film of the specious and the superficial, they are assuredly insufficient. It was not the physical power of the Templars but the knowledge which they had brought with them from the East that the church feared. The Templars had discovered part of the Great Arcanum; they had become wise in those mysteries which had been celebrated in Mecca thousands of years before the advent of Mohammed; they had read a few pages from the dread book of the Anthropos, and for this knowledge they were doomed to die.

Mummified Head

But what is the relevance of these insights for our prophetic study of the Third Temple as pictured in Revelation 11, you may ask? Well, we must discover what became of the Templars' occult secrets because the Freemasons are accused of harboring many of them. As we shall see this is not particularly true. In the end they seem to serve as role models for Satanic conspiracies more than anything else.

But there is one famous accusation against the Templars which I have not mentioned yet. In addition to other charges brought against them, the Templars were also accused of utilizing in their occult practices an object called *Baphomet*.

In the disquisitions, several Templars admitted to using the curious object but others were perplexed. They said that they had

never heard of "Baphomet" before. Perhaps this can be explained by the involvement of only some of the Templars in the practice.

What was Baphomet? Well, the inquisitors had a hard time getting to the bottom of it. It was a head.

"A head, you say?"

Yes, a head. Of a bearded man, supposedly.

"A real head? That is to say, a decapitated head?"

No one seems to know.

"Or was it a sculpted head?"

Again, the inquisitors did not get to the bottom if it. However, this much we know: the word "Baphomet" was inscribed upon it.

Etymological Clues

King Philip IV of France, Pope Clement V, their administration, and the magistrates genuinely seem to be at a loss. Eventually, they came to the conclusion that *Baphometus*, as the word was pronounced in Latin, was a corruption of *Mahomet*, which was the Latin transliteration of the Arabic *Mohammad*, the Prophet of Islam.

This has been conventional thinking since then, as a *Wikipedia* article states:

> Modern scholars agree that the name of Baphomet was an Old French corruption of the name *Muhammad*, with the interpretation being that some of the Templars, through their long military occupation of the Outremer, had begun incorporating Islamic ideas into their belief system, and that this was seen and documented by the Inquisitors as heresy." [. . .] Medieval Christians believed that Muslims were idolatrous and worshipped Muhammad as a god, with *mahomet* becoming *mammet* in English, meaning "an idol or false god." This idol-worship is attributed to Muslims in several *chansons de geste*.

There is only one problem with this explanation. The Templars insisted that they did not worship the head.

I said that the investigators and court "came to this conclusion" because, presumably, they had never heard the word before. That is not to say that it was completely unknown, however. Sid Porter in a January 2020 article, "The History of Baphomet," on *Medium.com*, says:

> Historians have noted that the first written occurrence of *Baphomet* was in 1098 by Anselm of Ribemont, who was "count of Ostrevant and Valenciennes," and is considered to be "one of the most brilliant figures in the First Crusade." . . . Anselm recounted in his writing the events of the Siege of Antioch, during which, he stated that, 'the Turks "called loudly upon Baphomet."

Wikipedia adds that "In the *Chanson de Simon Pouille*, written before 1235, a Saracen idol is called *Bafumetz*."

Porter explains that "Given the context, 'most scholars believe that the word (referred) to Muhammad, the founder of Islam.'"

From the beginning, though, this explanation has been unsatisfactory to some scholars. Various theories have been proposed. The name comes from a Greek combination of *Baphe* "Baptism" and *Metis* "Wisdom," "Baptism of Wisdom," is one of them. This would accord with the purported Gnosticism of the Templars, it is thought. Or it is a corruption of *Bufihimat*, a Moorish pronunciation of the Arabic for "Father of Wisdom." Some suggest that *Baphomet* was a Kabbalistic cipher for the Gnostic Goddess Sophia. Others simply make it a variant name for the Greek goddess Metis, Goddess of Wisdom, which was another form of Sophia.

"François Raynouard, in the 1813 edition of his *Monumens historiques*,"* discounts the whole thing. He says, "that '*Baphomet* was a simple scribal error or mispronunciation, and not an esoteric mystery,' at all, arguing" says Sid Porter, "that the scribe who recounted the questioning of the witnesses in the deposition

* Full title *Monumens Historiques relatifs à la Condamnation des "Chevaliers du Temple et l'Abolition deleur Ordre.*

clearly made a mistake in spelling or pronunciation when transcribing the testimony."

Chapter 4
Black Father

The most convincing explanation that I have heard leads to conclusions more outlandish and nefarious than any proposed to date. Idries Shah, in his 1964 book *The Sufis*, suggested, as others had done, that *Baphomet* may actually be the Arabic word *Abufihamat*. On face value the word means "Father of Understanding." The "Father" angle is interesting.

In *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements* (1924), Nesta Webster says that Eliphas Levi proposed an etymology of the word "Baphomet." The letters reversed would be TEM OHP AB, which he thought was an anagram for the Latin phrase, *Templi omnivm hominum pacis abbas*, which translated means, "The Father of the Temple of Peace of All Men," a reference to King Solomon's Temple. So the "Father" attribution has been around.

Idries Shah was a renowned scholar on Sufism. His father was Afghani-Indian and his mother Scottish. In London he studied Wicca with Gerald Gardner and befriended John G. Bennett, founder of the Institute for the Comparative Study of History, Philosophy and the Sciences. Shah presented Sufism as a universal form of wisdom that predated Islam.

Without committing himself too decisively beyond his "Father" idea, Idries Shah notes that the Arabic word for "Wisdom" or "Understanding" is the consonantal *FHM*, which is also the word, concretely, for "Coal" and by extrapolation "Black." Shah suggests that a blackened head of an Arab had been taken in combat by the Templars, a war casuality, and was used as a trophy. To illustrate his hypothesis, He mentions crusader her-

aldry in which severed heads are depicted in the iconography on shields, for example, brandished by victorious crusaders.

Necromancy

There is another possible interpretation. The word *Baphomet* simply means "Black Father." Not Black as in "Negroid" but *Black* symbolically, in a Gnostic sense, the opposite of the purported Catholic god. Keep in mind the Kabbalistic idea of plumbing evil to reach the light. And the Gnostic inversion, which the Ophites, for example, embraced. The serpent of Eden being, in their estimation, not a deceiver but an enlightener and liberator: pure Theosophy and Illuminism.

When one considers that the Turks whom Anselm of Ribemont heard crying out for "Baphomet" in the First Crusade were Seljuks, a possible explanation begins to coalesce. The Seljuks were Turkish-Persian, both Indo-European. But Persia itself had long been ruled by the Arabs. There was a great deal of cultural intermixing.

Doubtless, the spirituality that dominated among the common soldiery was mysticism. Why? Because mysticism always dominates among the common people. It is sensual.

The *Encyclopedia Britannica* (1998) says concerning Sufism, which is Islamic mysticism: "The Importance of Sufism in the history of Islam is incalculable." One of the famous mystics, al-Husayn ibn Mansur al-Hallaj, said "I am the Creative Truth." This is often taken to mean, "I am God." This was Oriental mysticism along the lines of Hinduism, which was radical to Western thought, even radical compared to Gnosticism. Gnosticism is dualistic, a kind of necessary circumlocution predicated by the presence of the Truth, Judaism to Jews before Christ and Christianity afterward, but this Sufist thought is Monistic pantheism. Gnosticism also espoused the godhood of the practitioner, but the intractable presence of the Truth, the Judeo-Christian reality, required a workaround.

Consider this in light of what Robert Lomas says in his *The*

Secrets of Freemasonry: Revealing the Supressed Tradition: that the leader of the Knights Templars was called *Christ*. And the next in line was the Christ Designate.

Sufism, like Hasidism among the Jews of the Middle Ages, was popular, much as the Charismatic Movement in Christianity has become. Within each respective religion, it tends toward heresies and Gnosticism.

Couple this with the general ignorance of the people with regard to Islamic orthodoxy, let alone Christian orthodoxy among the crusaders, and you have a recipe for monstrous aberrations. Furthermore, the Templars were on the Temple Mount, a site coveted by Satan himself. Would he not have benefited by corrupting these crusaders?

Lastly, are demons not territorial? That is, associated with certain places. Notwithstanding the fact that the Israelites had been there and at least for a short time had cleansed the land; had the disembodied spirits of the Rephaim-giants not haunted the place? Had the Israelites themselves not been plagued by them? Witness the seduction of the religion of the Canaanites.

The witchcraft of ancient Canaan included a curious form of necromancy. Very much like Voodoo, the Canaanites would place the decapitated head of an deceased family member in a votive niche in their abodes and communicate with spirits through it. This sort of necromancy was not unknown among Celtic and Germanic witches, either. They were known to reanimate corpses by conjuring spirits within them. There is good reason to consider if the Templars may not have been witches before they even left Europe for the crusades.

One thing in particular contributes to this hypothesis. According to the Templar accounts during their trial, the name "Baphomet" was written on the gruesome artifact in question or inscribed on a plaque. Idries Shah probably was unaware of more recent archeological evidence that Canaanites would inscribe the name of the deceased on a piece of copper and place it in the mouth of the moldering skull. Some variation of this Canaanite method of using the epitaph may have been employed by the Templars.

Between the Fakirs and Dervishes of Sufi Islam, the local Gnostic sects, Johannites and Essenes, among others, and the indigenous demons, spirits of the Nephilim-giants haunting the country, not to mention Satan's own fascination with the Temple Mount, which may have predicated his own presence there; the Templars, having rejected the only protection for their souls, the blood of Jesus Christ, were vulnerable to exploitation. Perhaps even possession.

In the 2004 article "The Knights Templar" from the website *Historical Satanism*, Vexen Crabtree says:

> It is general knowledge in the occult community that the Templars were Devil Worshippers of some kind, traditional Satanists worshipping some kind of hybrid god borne from Christian, Jewish, and Occult mythologies.

This general understanding of the Templars' practice led to the modern depictation of Baphomet which broadly diverges from the scanty testimony provided in the trial.

Sabbatic Goat

In the 19th-century, the French magician Eliphas Levi portrayed Baphomet as a figure in a piece of artwork which he called the "Sabbatic Goat." He avowedly designed it to represent the mysteries of the occult.

We are not going to examine the specifics of the syncretistic symbolism in the depiction of the monstrous bat-winged, goat-headed creature. There is plenty of information about that. But I draw your attention to the fact that the figure is hermaphroditic.

The occult is often called *Hermeticism*. Hermes, from which the word is derived, fathered a son in a liaison with Aphrodite, Goddess of Love. The son's name was an accouplement of both parent's names, *Hermaphroditos*. He was not just androgenous, but he had both male and female sexual organs. Symbolically, this represents the marriage of the spiritual and physical dimen-

sions. The figure is even gesturing up with one hand and down with the other, "As above, so below," a hermetic dictum from the Emerald Tablet of Hermes Trismegistus.

Eliphas Levi also used as his model for the creature the testimonies of witches in the Middle Ages, who described Satan himself as a goat-headed gargoyle. Clearly, he believed that the Templars were worshiping Satan. Little wonder that occultists afterward would consider his Baphomet a portrait of Satan.

Levi's *Baphomet* was adopted by the famed occultist Aleister Crowley as a symbol of Satan. On the Tarot deck which he designed, Edward Arthur Waite featured Baphomet on "The Devil" card. As a result of these usages, Levis' depictation of Baphomet has come to be the definitive portrayal of the Devil.

In 1966, Anton LaVey conflated Baphomet with the Goat of Mendes. He adopted a goat's head inside an inverted pentagram as the logo of the Church of Satan. This sign is also commonly used by Satanists around the world. But not only by Satanists. On his *templarhistory.com*, Stephen A. Dafoe says . . .

> "According to . . . Nesta Webster, Eliphas Levi held the conviction that not only did the Templars adore the Baphomet but anyone embracing the Occult sciences did also."

Chapter 5
Devil's Seed

The Knights Templar were burned at the stake in the 14th century, condemned for heresy in the Inquisition. The prevalent opinion in modern scholarship is that the Templars were the victims of a wicked pope and an avaricious king. The charges against them were fabricated, revisionist scholars say. Occult historians, however, take issue with that assessment. Eliphas Levi, Helena Blavatsky, and Manly P. Hall, all experts in the occult, agree that the Templars were actually involved in anti-Christian occultism.

Were all the Knights Templar killed in the Inquisition? Forty of them, including Jacques de Molay, their Grand Poopah, were burned at the stake. But what about the others?

The 1913 edition of the *Catholic Encyclopedia* informs us that

> The pope . . . adopted a middle course: he decreed the dissolution, not the condemnation of the order, and not by penal sentence, but by an Apostolic Decree (Bull of 22 March, 1312). . . . As to the members, the Templars recognized guiltless were allowed either to join another military order or to return to the secular state. In the latter case, a pension for life, charged to the possessions of the order, was granted them.

It appears that some of the Templars may have survived the Inquisition.

Eliphas Levi believed that some of the Templars remained in France and became associated with the incipient Rosicruician Order of the Priory of Sion. Naturally, Manly P. Hall, a 20th-

century historian of occultism and Masonry, following suit, also thought that they had perpetuated their cult in France.

However, 19th-century historian Wilhelm Ferdinand Wilcke objects to this idea.

French Sanctuary?

In *Geschichte des Tempelherrenordens*, II (1827), Wilcke says . . .

> The present Knight Templars of Paris will have it, that they are direct descendants from the ancient Knights, and endeavor to prove this by documents, interior regulations, and secret doctrines [. . .] Such inventions are necessary . . . to the assertion that the Parisian Templars are the offspring of the ancient order.

"Turning to Clavel, one of the best Masonic authorities," a 2008 article on *reddit.com* called "The Jesuit Connection to the Knights Templar!" says . . .

> It is clear that the erection of the French Order of the Knight Templars is not more ancient than the year 1804, and that it cannot lay any legitimate claim to being the continuation of the so-called society of *La Petite Resurrection des Templiers*, nor this latter, either, extend back to the ancient Order of the Knights Templars.

While the Templars did not remain in France, a couple of other destinations where they may have fled for sanctuary have been proposed by historians. Both or neither may be true.

The 1913 *Catholic Encyclopedia* says that . . .

> The order having been suppressed, the pope himself was to decide . . . the disposal of its possessions. As to the property, it was turned over to the rival Order of Hospitallers to be applied to its original use, namely the defence of the Holy Places. In Portugal, however, and in Aragon the possessions were vested

in two new orders, the Order of Christ in Portugal and the Order of Montesa in Aragon.

Spanish Refuge?

The article "Dominus ac Redemptor 1773" from *farnesius.wordpress.com*, says that . . .

> The Knights Templar had been received with enthusiasm by the Crown of Aragon from their foundation in 1128. King James II of Aragon in 1312 persuaded Pope John XXII to permit him to regroup the Templar properties in Aragon and Valencia, and to create a new military order not essentially differing from that of the Templars, which should be charged with the defence of the frontier against the Moors and the pirates. The Spanish would not completely eject the Muslims until Ferdinand and Isabella 180 years later. The new order was dedicated to Our Lady, and based at Montesa. Pope John XXII approved it on 10 June 1317, and gave it the Cistercian rule.

This has lead to speculation that some of the Templars may have continued their secret society in Spain. Tupper Saussy and Ruggero Marino perpetuate the myth that Christopher Columbus was a Templar, presumably because the *Nina*, the *Pinta*, and the *Santa Maria* each bore a red cross on their sails. Has the red cross not always been a Christian symbol? Has it not been used in numerous venues, which have nothing to do with Templars?

There is "zero" connection between Christopher Columbus and the Knights Templar.

The King of Spain asked the pope if he could constitute an order of knights along the lines of the Templars. Because the Templars had just been burned for heresy, it is very unlikely that he was suggesting to the pope that he intended to lead another occult rebellion. rather, he asked for permission to appropriate their heraldry, their "red cross" emblem. The pope consented. This was how it ended up on the sails of the expeditionary ships.

Having said that, some of the Templars may very well have

found a home, so to speak, in other orders, but that is a far cry from connecting them with the Alumbrados. The Alumbrados, an Antinominian Protestant offshoot, would come almost three hundred years later. Nevertheless, for preservations sake, they remained observant Catholics. This in itself shows a lack of character and integrity, but they certainly did not spit on the cross. There is nothing linking them to the Templars. "Zero!"

On the other hand, there is a long-standing tradition that some of the surviving Templars went to Scotland where they aided the pro-Catholic Jacobins in trying to establish the Stuart dynasty on the throne of England and presumably assisted in the formation of Scottish Rite Masonry. This is the Ramsayan myth, which we disprove elsewhere. "Operative" Masonry had ten degrees or twenty-five degrees, depending upon whom one believes; the Templar degrees were not added until the 18th century, which does not bode well even for the Scottish refuge theory; in addition to all the other evidence to the contrary.

Highlanders?

"Ramsay's Oration" in 1736 declared that the Freemasons were the descendants of the Crusaders. And in 1760, George Frederick Johnson stated that Freemasons were the direct heirs of the Templars. But there is no evidence of this and appears to have been fanciful thinking.

"Of course, some of the fugitive Templars found their way to Scotland," says William Frederick Wilcke, as reported in the article "The Historical Origins of Freemasonry: The Knights Templar" on the Universal Co-Masonry website (*blog.universal-freemasonry.org)*;

> and it may be believed that some of the brethren were admitted into the building fraternities, but that is no reason why either the Lodges of Builders or the Knights of St. John should be considered as a continuation of the Templar Order, because they both received Templar fugitives, and the less so as the building guilds were not, like the Templars, composed of chiv-

> alrous and free-thinking worldlings, but of pious workmen who cherished the pure doctrines of religion.

In *A New Enclyclopedia of Freemasonry* (1921), Edward Arthur Waite concurs. Even the motive for continuation would probably have been benign, but Waite definitely considers Templarism a late invention.

> In the eighteenth century the Templar Grade of Kadesh may be said to stand alone . . . . It is known by relatively late recensions, through the modifications and added pretensions of which there appears to emerge the original design of the Grade, being the old alleged Templar dream of rebuilding the Temple in Jerusalem: there is no vengeance motive, no cause against king or pope.

The last sentence makes reference to the Inquisition against the Knights Templar and the possibility that any survivors might have sought revenge, with the accompanying poisonous witchcraft and revolutionary revolt and usurpation.

In other words, Freemasonry adopted the Templars dream of rebuilding Solomon's Temple, but it did not become a haven for renegade Templars as evidenced by the lack of the peculiar vengeance which would have characterized surviving Templars. Unless one considers the historical animosity of Freemasonry with the Roman Catholic institution an example of this. But this does not require direct communication. And while Freemasonry definitely became a repository of revolutionary foment during the Enlightenment, the motivations seem to have been distinct from a three-hundred-year-old animosity.

Arthur Edward Waite also writes in "The Templar Orders in Freemasonry" (1927), which contains a historical consideration of the origin and development of the Masonic Templar degrees:

> There is no historical evidence for the existence of any Templar perpetuation story prior to the Oration of Ramsay . . . There is further – as we have observed – no evidence of any Rite or Degree of Masonic Chivalry prior to 1737, to which date is referred in the discourse of Ramsay. That this was the

> original impetus which led to their production may be regarded as beyond dispute, and it was the case especially with Masonic Templar revivals.

In the 2018 article "The Royal Black Institution, Chivalry and the Jesuits" on the website *evangelicaltruth.com* we read:

> Masonic historian Robert J. Currie explains in *Templar Influence of the Eighteenth Century*: "Jacobite Freemasonry or Stuart Freemasonry as it was sometimes known, was the system or orders of Freemasonry which were supposedly invented or adapted by the Scottish Jacobites living in exile in France and Italy during the 1700s. Most of the early Masonic historians have come to the conclusion that the Jacobites may have been the originators or the instigators of what is commonly now known in some constitutions as the higher degrees of Freemasonry. The most common being the Knights Templars and the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite."

The curious connection here is that Jacobites were Catholic but Freemasonry was generally anti-Catholic. In dispelling the myth of Templar origins of Freemasonry, we have already, here, touched upon the salient connection, a conspriatorial element within the Catholic institution itself, an idea which we will flesh out as we go.

Similarly, we read in the article "The Historical Origins of Freemasonry: The Knights Templar" on *blog.universalfreemasonry.org*:

> Dr. Burnes, who was a believer in the legitimacy of the French Order of the Temple, as being directly derived from de Molay through Larmenius, and who, therefore, subscribed unhesitatingly to the authenticity of the 'Charter of Transmission,' did not believe that the Templars formed the Scottish Rite or were heavily involved.

"All these asseverations," says William Frederick Wilcke, "about the claim that the Templars continued in France, "unsupported by history, were fabricated . . ."

Nevertheless, 18th-century Freemasonry revered the Knights Templar. Perhaps they sympathized with them as victims of Roman Catholic persecution and a tyrannical monarchy, both institutions which the Enlightement rejected. Freemasons in fact became major workers in fomenting the revolutions to overturn this two-fold power structure of Old Europe of the Middle Ages, which can be summed up in the term *feudalism*, the form of society preferred by the Roman Catholic institution.

Masonic Homage

Not only is there presently an Order of Knights Templar, named in homage to the Templars, which is associated with Freemasonry; the higher degrees of Scottish Rite Masonry, the 30th to the 33rd degrees, are also called *Templar Rites*.

Pierre G. Normande, editor of *The Plumbline*, a quarterly bulletin of the Scottish Rite Research Society in Houston, Texas, says on the webpage *The Templar Degrees of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry*:*

> The 30th -32nd Degrees are the Kadosh [variant of Hebrew *Kodesh*] Degrees: The Knights Kadosh are the true soldiery of the Holy House of the Temple of Solomon. The history of the Knights Templar as a treasured part of the 30th Degree.

The 2013 article concludes by saying:

> The fact that the Scottish Rite is the spiritual descendant of "The Poor Fellow Soldiery of the Temple of Solomon" (The Order of the Knights Templar) is best betrayed, however, in the full name of "The Supreme Council (Mother Council of the World) of the Inspectors General Knights Commanders of the House of the Temple of Solomon of the Thirty-Third Degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry for the

* Later, after Normande's editorship, the article was removed from by the Scottish Rite Research Society website and published as a .pdf.

Southern Jursidiction of the United States of America."

The operative words here are "spiritual descendant." There is no practical ancestry, no literal descent of the organization.

F. Tupper Saussy in his 1999 *Rulers of Evil* comes close to asserting a Jewish connection to the Jesuits and thus also to the Templars. One of his central theses is that the Jesuits are the revival of the ancient Templars. The Templars, so he says, and quite possibly so, practiced Kabbalah. Technically, however, Kabbalah does not appear historically much before Templarism. It was exclusively a Jewish phenomenon in Italy; they certainly did not get it from the Templars.

The Illuminati defector Svali mentions the Templars as if the Illuminati were to some extent educated about them and had certain views on Templarism. She says that they were prepetuated through the banking dynasties in Europe. That may be. It is well off the beaten path. Most conspiracy theories gravitate to the Spanish, Scottish, or Swedish retreats, and then chiefly under auspices of Freemasonry not particularly the banking establishment. But the bankers could have been Freemasons.