

A Review of John Salza's
*Masonry Unmasked:
An insider reveals the
secrets of the Lodge*
by
V. W. David S. Julian

©2006 David S. Julian



DAY JEWEL PUBLICATIONS

16052 - 46th Ave S

Seattle, WA 98188

(206) 246-6460

www.dayjewel.com

dsjulian@comcast.net

About the author of the book

Even though there are somewhere between three and five million Freemasons in the US who understand the basic principles of Freemasonry; recognize that Freemasonry is an adjunct to religion, not a religion of its own; and find no conflict between their Christianity and Freemasonry, every now and then one comes along who just doesn't seem to get it. John Salza says he is a lifelong (Roman) Catholic and former Freemason, Shriner, and Blue Lodge Officer. He is also an apologist for Roman Catholic Church beliefs and teachings as outlined in his 2005 book *The Biblical Basis for the Catholic Faith*, and he is the creator of the website *scripturecatholic.com*. Salza is also a *self-confessed liar*, although he claims he was misled into lying. So consider the source.

About the author of this review

V. W. David S. Julian is a Past Master of Daylight Lodge #232, Past Musician of St. John's Lodge #9, Member of Walter F. Meier Lodge of Research # 281, Honorary Past Master of Century Lodge #208, Past Cochairman of the Leadership Training Committee, Past Deputy of the Grand Master for District #5, Past Grand Musician, Past Grand Organist, and Past Grand Bible Bearer, all of the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of Washington. He is also the author of *David vs. Goliath?* a book that definitively answers the question: *Can a Christian be a Freemason?* while exposing anti-Masonic charlatans, world conspiracy whacko's, and profit-making online bookstore "businesses masquerading as ministries" that is available free on the Internet at his *dayjewel.com* web site.

A brief foreword from the reviewer

Somewhere along the line John Salza started to question whether his personal religious beliefs were in conflict with what he calls "*the religious and moral teachings of American Freemasonry*". It happens. Freemasonry isn't for everybody. If it were, all American men over the age of 21 (18 in some states) would be Freemasons. Then again, Roman Catholicism isn't for everyone. If it were, all 200 million Americans who call themselves Christians would be Roman Catholics. But I knew where this book was heading as soon as I read "*Many thanks to Duane Washum for helping me through the difficulties of severing ties with the Lodge, and for assisting me with the compiling and reviewing many of the Masonic authorities cited in this book.*" My own book *David vs. Goliath?* is a point-by-point refutation of Washum's proven lies and total mischaracterization of Freemasonry -- and Christianity -- which Washum described like this: "*Obviously, you have not read enough of the bible you carry around as Grand Bible Bearer to understand that Christianity is not a religion...*" In order to maintain the façade of incompatibility, Washum, and now Salza, have to redefine terms that have had clear, concise, and common meanings for centuries, into their own language of separatist Neofundamentalism. In their eyes, Christianity is not a religion, but Freemasonry is, which is the diametric opposite of the definitions you and I have come to know.

That being said, it is important to recognize here that the opinions expressed herein that are not directly quoted from others are my own; nor are they the official opinions of any Lodge or Grand Lodge that I have ever attended, been a member of, or been an elected or appointed officer in; nor are they necessarily the opinions of any other Freemason, living or dead, in this or any other part of the world.

[Editor's note added since the original review: *John Salza responded to this review by publishing a 160+ page diatribe against me personally that you can read at his oxymoronicly named scripturecatholic.com website. My response to his response is appended to the end of this review. Save yourself from a lot of unnecessary drivel. Jump down to Page 65 and read to the end.*]

Chapter I -- My Masonic Credentials

For any Freemason reading this book, red flags will go up beginning with the first page of the First Chapter. Salza says he went from Initiation to 32° Scottish Rite to Shriner between June 24, 1996, and December 7, 1996. It is very doubtful anyone moving on such a fast track would have any more than a superficial understanding of the nature of the fraternity. In addition, he received his Proficiency Card by learning all of the Lodge “*rod and floor work*” in all three degrees, something he describes as “*memorizing hundred pages of Masonic lectures, charges, and physical movements required to be made about the Lodge,*” and he “*spent countless hours mastering the Masonic ritual*” all within one year of his initiation, and by his own admission, “*sooner than anyone in Wisconsin history.*”

I’m the first to admit that in many jurisdictions, Freemasonry was at a low point during the 1990’s. The men who had joined the fraternity after World War II were beginning to die off at a rapid rate, and due to some questionable political choices, we essentially lost the whole generation of the Viet Nam War era. That led some jurisdictions to desperate measures like one-day conferrals of the Blue Lodge degrees, one or two day conferrals of the Scottish Rite degrees, and even dropping the Scottish Rite/York Rite requirement to join the Shrine. The attempt at accelerated Masonry soon backfired, however, when we realized that we had initiated, passed, and raised a bunch of warm bodies, not Freemasons. The fact that Salza could go from Junior Deacon to Master-elect (skipping Junior Steward, Senior Steward, Chaplain, Marshal, and Senior Warden) in 4 years clearly indicates that his was one of those desperate Lodges. If Salza was doing all that degree work, where were all those newly-made Masons going? Salza says he occasionally would come across an anti Masonic article or web site but dismissed their attacks as religious fanaticism. He says he “*saw those people as intolerant, judgmental, Bible thumpers with whom I had nothing in common.*” Apparently now they are intolerant, judgmental, Bible thumpers with whom he has much in common.

During his “*tenure*” Salza claims he “*frequently heard my Lodge brothers comment on the Catholic church’s position on Masonry.*” Masons reading this will find that statement quite strange, since all discussion about sectarian religion and partisan politics is forbidden from the Lodge room. Although it is not strictly forbidden, as a courtesy to other members, that policy is usually extended to the times immediately before and after the meetings. So the official position of the Roman Catholic Church (RCC) on Freemasonry would be of absolutely no interest to, and it certainly would not normally be a frequent topic for discussion by non-Catholic Masons. Even his Parish Priest had no objection to his membership in Freemasonry. But since he brought it up, lets clear up some of the confusion about the official position of the RCC. In a speech for Vancouver Grand Masonic Day, October 16, 1999, Dr. Gary Leazer, former Director of the Home Missions Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, said this:

A Freemason, Giuseppe Garibaldi, led the successful effort to crush the temporal power of the Pope in Italy, reducing the Roman Catholic Church’s holding in Italy to the 109-acre Vatican City. This successful effort was a main catalyst for Pope Leo XIII’s infamous encyclical, *Humanum Genus*, in 1884. It condemned Freemasonry as a “wicked force” and a “contagious disease” because freemasons:

- call for religious liberty;
- call for separation of [the Roman Catholic] Church and state;
- call for education of children by laymen rather than the [Roman Catholic] Church and;
- believe people have the right to make their own laws and elect their own government.

In addition, many Jesuits priests were active in the revolutions that liberated much of Latin America from the despotic control of the Holy Roman Empire. So it is no wonder the Catholic Church maintained a hostile relationship toward the Masonic fraternity.

In 1981, this was the official position of the post-Vatican II Roman Catholic Church, as outlined in a letter to the Masonic Service Association, March 23, 1981 by Thomas C. Kelly, General Secretary, National Council of Catholic Bishops:

The Declaration of the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, released February 17, 1981, is primarily a reminder of the principles of Canon Law governing the application of penalties and only in this way does it directly address the situation of an individual joining a Masonic association. The Declaration does not answer the question "What is the nature of a Masonic organization?" The focus is not on the association *per se*, but on the individual Catholic and his possible membership in a Masonic fraternity.

The Declaration states that the general law of the Roman Catholic Church, issued in 1917 remains in effect, namely that a Catholic, under penalty of excommunication, is not to join any organization which plots against the church or legitimate civil powers. At the same time the Declaration reminds us that to incur excommunication, certain requirements must be met. Among these, it seems clear, would be the fact that the association in question is one which actually plots against the Catholic Church or a legitimate government. I understand that this would not appear to be the case with Masonic fraternities in the United States.

In 1992, four years before Salza petitioned to join a Lodge, Brother Reid McInvale published a complete history of Roman Catholic Church Law concerning Freemasonry in *Transactions*, the official publication of the Texas Lodge of Research. From it we learn:

After the Second Ecumenical Council (Vatican II) there began clerical questioning of the church's condemnation of Masonry. In 1968 a book was printed in Spain entitled *La Masoneria Despues del Concilio* (Masonry after Vatican II). The author was a Jesuit Priest, Father J. A. Ferrer Benimeli, whose thesis was that regular Freemasonry should not be condemned. He condemned irregular Freemasonry only, since it was atheistic and anticlerical. The growing ambivalence of the church's position regarding Freemasonry became official in 1974 when Franjo Cardinal Seper, Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, sent letters to John Cardinal Krol of Philadelphia and others regarding the force and meaning of Canon 2335 of the 1917 Code of Canon Law. The Cardinal, doubtlessly prompted by the ecumenical fervor of the times, stated that the Canon still remained in force, but that since penal laws are subject to strict interpretation, excommunication would only be applicable to those Roman Catholics who joined organizations which actively plotted against the Roman Catholic Church. Given that Masonry does not plot against the Roman Catholic Church, the letter was interpreted by many to mean that the Cardinal's statement signaled that the ancient strictures against Roman Catholic membership in Masonry had been removed...

While the apparent tolerance of American Catholics toward Masonry is encouraging, the Vatican and the US Conference of Bishops have made determinative rulings by which American Catholics at large are expected to abide. The final nail in the coffin of any possible near term rapprochement between the Catholic Church and Freemasonry appears to have been a declaration published in the official Vatican newspaper *L'Osservatore Romano* by Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, "... The faithful who enroll in masonic associations are in a state of grave sin and may not receive holy communion..."

Apparently, as current Pope Benedict XVI, Joseph Ratzinger, the immediate past Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (formerly known as the Inquisition), has not changed the anti-Masonic stance he had when he was a Nazi soldier. Ironically, this same denouncement, *“in a state of grave sin and may not receive holy communion”*, was used for blatantly political purposes against certain liberal US Catholic politicians in a recent election. That means, in no uncertain terms, this particular instrument of torture is only used against those who deny the inerrancy of the Apostolic authority of the papacy, i.e., the Church’s perceived political opponents.

This is where Salza declares his true purpose for writing the book: *“I wasn’t aware of any Catholic books that addressed the subject of Freemasonry. It seemed that all of the anti-Masonic books and Web sites were promoted by radical Christian fundamentalists.”* After all, why should the Neofundamentalist Protestant *sola scriptura* crowd reap all the profits from the cottage industry of anti-Masonry, now booming again as the result of Dan Brown’s megahit *The Da Vinci Code*.

On page 17, Salza, who by his own admission had only been a Freemason for less than four years, has the *cajones* to call himself *“an expert in Masonic ritual.”* I personally know more than a dozen Masonic researchers from all over the world, some who have been studying the rich history and philosophy of the various Masonic orders for half a century or more. None would ever presume to characterize himself as an “expert,” even after a lifetime of study and participation. Obviously the memorization of hundreds of pages of text can hardly be defined as becoming an *“expert in Masonic ritual”*, any more than the rote memorizing of Bible verses can be defined as making one an expert in Christianity. When Salza finally does seek advice and counsel from his elders, what does he discover? *“Not one Mason was able to provide plausible answers. Most of them weren’t even aware of the content of the Masonic Rituals! Many denied that the rituals taught religious ideas, even when I presented them chapter and verse. They told me I was taking it too far.”* Does that mean the Past Masters, Grand Lecturer, and even the Grand Master -- the equivalent of Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of the Board of Directors -- did not know the contents of the degrees? Of course not! The degrees of Freemasonry are allegorical plays that teach moral lessons. They aren’t history. And they aren’t to be taken any more literally or seriously than the *“symbolic penalties.”*

On page 19, Salza makes this statement: *“I found no evidence that any pope, cardinal, bishop, priest, or monk had ever been in Masonry.”* Yet in my own study I found a Roman Catholic anti-Masonic organization that has called for the excommunication of dozens of members of Italian Masonic Lodges, ironically many of which work directly in or for the Vatican. Even when his own parish priest told him it was acceptable to be a Mason, still Salza was not satisfied. So he *“started looking for a priest who had actually studied the question. Unable to find any such priest...”*

It is this dissatisfaction that it at the core of the problem. Not the problem of one becoming dissatisfied and leaving the Lodge, for, as I stated way back in the beginning, Freemasonry is not for everyone. The real problem is this: *why is it that a handful of departing Masons like Washum, Hilton, Harris, and now Salza cannot seem to leave the fraternity without trying to trash it, as they try to convince themselves and anyone else who will listen that their bizarre perceptions are right, while the perceptions of literally millions of other Masons and non-Masons are wrong?*

To close this chapter, Salza asks two very good questions: *“Why, then, had my brothers told me that the Church now permitted membership, and why had my parish priest not known about the Church’s position?”* The answer to both of those questions is hidden in definition of the word “semantics.” Semantics is the study of word meanings. So when the pope issues an edict banning Catholic membership in “secret societies”, does that edict apply to membership in all Masonic groups, even those that are not secret?

For example, publicly declaring one's membership in the Freemasons, especially in order to receive to advantageous treatment, is strictly forbidden in most European countries. The when's, where's and who's of Freemasonry are as tightly held as the secrets between attorney and client, or priest and confessor. So the Masonic fraternity in one of those countries might reasonably be defined as a "secret society." But in the United States, the when's, where's, and who's of Freemasonry are public information. Freemason's Lodges are identified by signs that say "Masonic Lodge" and have Square and Compasses emblems (usually with a letter "G" enclosed) conspicuously displayed, some so large that they cover the exterior wall of a two-story building. The actual locations of the Lodge buildings and their phone numbers are usually listed in the phone book. The members openly wear hats, jackets, ties, rings, watches, and lapel pins; and prominently display bumper stickers, car emblems, newsletters, and magazines -- with Masonic emblems prominently displayed on them -- and they post public notices with the times, dates, and locations of their meetings and other activities, many of which are open to the general public. You'd have to stretch the imagination pretty far to define US Freemasonry as a "secret society."

The reason for all the confusion is that the edicts emanating from Rome about this are particularly vague. The following is a list and brief synopsis of bulls, edicts, *etc.*, issued by the Vatican regarding Freemasonry since 1964 (the entire list is published online at Gary Dryfoos' web.mit.edu/dryfoo/Masonry/Misc/Bulls/timeline.html website):

November 21, 1964 "*Unitatis redintegratio*" published by Paul VI. Decrees positive Catholic response to ecumenism as a means to bring non-Catholic believers into the Church.

October 28, 1965 "*Nostra Aetate*" published by Paul VI. Decrees tolerance for, and an exchange of ideas with, non-Catholic beliefs and philosophies.

December 7, 1965 "*Dignitatis Humanae*" declaration published by Vatican II, on religious liberty.

1968 "*La Masoneria Despues del Concilio*" (Masonry since the [Vatican] Council) published in Spain. Author, J.A. Ferrer Benimeli, S.J.; "... regular Freemasonry, 'based on belief in God, could not stand condemned under the Papal Bulls', whose charges should be directed only against the irregular Grand Lodges which preach and practice atheism and anticlericalism."

1971 Two English Freemasons are permitted by the Vatican to join the Church without renouncing their Masonic affiliations, at the request of Cardinal Heenan.

July 19, 1974 Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith pulls the teeth from Art. 2335. "The Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith ... has ruled that Canon 2335 no longer automatically bars a Catholic from membership of masonic groups ... And so, a Catholic who joins the freemasons is excommunicated only if the policies and actions of the freemasons in his area are known to be hostile to the Church ...". This document was signed by Cardinal Seper, Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. ... Suffice to say that in July 1974 Cardinal Heenan received a communication from the Holy See announcing that the Papal ban had been lifted. Roman Catholics everywhere [but not Officers of the Church of Rome] are now able to join the Craft without the penalty of excommunication and already a number of excellent Roman Catholic Candidates have joined the Craft in England." [See Carr's *The Freemason at Work*, pages 277-281].

1983 Canon 2335 replaced by new Canon 1374 which condemns only "association(s) which plot(s) against the Church," and no longer mentions Freemasonry or "secret societies." Following is the text of Canon 1374 (1983) in an English translation prepared for use by the Catholic faithful. [Canon 1374: A person who joins an association which plots against the Church is to be punished with a just penalty; one who promotes or takes office in such an association is to be punished with an interdict.]

1983 In this same year in a statement by [The Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith] then under a new Prefect, Cardinal Ratzinger, the 1974 letter was "clarified", saying, that Masonic principles are still considered irreconcilable with orthodox Catholic doctrine, and Catholics are still prohibited from joining Masonic bodies. Official opposition appears since 1983 to be limited to two points: 1. The erroneous view that Freemasonry is a religion, and contending that no Catholic can be a member of another religion. The view is that Freemasonry "competes with", rather than "supports", religion. 2. The ceremony of the 3rd Degree in Freemasonry has been misinterpreted as supporting belief in the resurrection of one other than Christ, rather than the simple disinterment and reinterment of a dead body.

1985 Debate (informal, as far as is known) reopened by Italian television and the Vatican press. The position now seems to be that Catholics wishing to join Masonic bodies should approach their local Bishop to see if there is any explicit objection forthcoming.

So we can see that between 1964 and early 1983 the view of the church toward Freemasonry had softened substantially, especially toward Masonic organizations (like in the USA) that had never opposed the Roman Catholic Church or the legitimate government. That's why many Masons, even to this day, believe that the RCC lifted it's ban on Masonic membership -- and why many Roman Catholic priests still think that too. When his own parish priest told him that his Church had no such objection, Salza obviously missed the priest's subtle message: *"I may or may not know what the official position of the Church is, but we don't need to open that can of worms here..."* In case you haven't figured it out yet, although he memorized all the lines and actually performed in the allegorical plays called degrees, Salza didn't get their subtle messages either.

Chapter II - An Introduction to Freemasonry

A Brief History of Freemasonry

Salza begins this chapter with another semantic problem when he says “*The true origins of Freemasonry are debated.*” Semantically, *debate* implies formal argument, each party presenting a case with facts, evidence, statistics, and the like. The true origins of Freemasonry are actually *completely unknown*. As with most Masonic elements, there is much wild speculation about both the origins and true meaning of the signs, symbols, grips, words, ornaments, furniture, fixtures, jewels, emblems, tenets, stations, places, and offices. Anti-Masons, of course, try to link them to all kinds of occult groups like Kabbalists, Gnostics, Rosicrucians, Bavarian Illuminati, Enlightenment Cogniscenti, Witchcraft, Devil Worship, and all manner of other perceived anti-Christian and world-conspiracy groups. Some Masonic “historians” have attempted to link the fraternity to the Knights Templar and other monkish orders of the Crusades, not to mention the ancient craft stonemasons. From Solomon's Temple in Jerusalem, to the Great Pyramid of Giza, to the Hanging Gardens of Babylon, to the Statue of Zeus in Olympia, the Temple of Artemis in Ephesus, the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus, the Colossus of Rhodes, the Lighthouse at Alexandria, on to the ancient edifices of Greece and Rome, to the Gothic cathedrals of medieval Europe, certain architectural “secrets” were preserved so that the builders could freely travel between countries to use their unique skills. The origins of the geometry and engineering knowledge that was required to erect some of these structures still baffles historians and engineers today. I belong to the Walter F. Meier Lodge of Research, and in all my years in Masonry I have never ever heard anyone espouse any origin of the Freemasonry that is practiced in the US today from any source other than that Grand Lodge alliance formed in the Goose & Gridiron Tavern in London in 1717 between the Reverend James Anderson, D.D.; Reverend John Theophilous Desaugliers, L.L.D., F.R.S.; Philanthropist George Payne, and the United Kingdom's first Grand Master, Anthony Sayer.

It should be noted here that they weren't drunks meeting in a bar. The Goose & Gridiron was actually located in the church yard of St. Paul's Cathedral, and in the early part of the 18th-century, taverns and inns were the only public meeting places available for such purposes. (There were no “public eateries” or restaurants in London until the late 1700's.) It is only speculation that the stonemason guilds (operative masonry) were the forerunners of modern Freemasonry (speculative masonry). The only empirical evidence for that is in some ancient Operative Masons' Lodges in Scotland, but that is way ahead of the other conjectures, for which there is no evidence at all. Yet there are many peculiar coincidences, especially those perceived by the authors of books about these theories. On page 23 Salza states that “*Evidence shows that historical Masonry before the formation of the Grand Lodge of England was Christian.*” and “*The Masonic rituals developed by the Grand Lodge of England reflect the influence of Enlightenment philosophy. Freemasonry's degrees eliminated Christian prayer and any references to the Catholic religion.*” This is disingenuous at best and patently false at worst. When the Grand Lodge of England was first started it was only a banquet, so it didn't involve any “ritual” at all. Seven years later, when the Grand Lodge did begin meeting in earnest, all prayers were offered up to the Triune God of the Church of England. Significantly, modern Freemasonry (since 1717) has never made any direct references to the Roman Catholic religion, so there were no such references to be “*eliminated.*” Reverend Brother James Anderson, D.D., author of the 1723 *Constitution of the Free-Masons*, a handbook for the operation of the Grand Lodge of England, was himself a Presbyterian minister, who obviously found no conflict between his ministry and his Masonry.

Brother Thomas Augustine Arne, a Roman Catholic and one of the first Grand Organists, composed *Rule Britannia* and *God Save The Queen*, which was the music for our own National Anthem, *America*, until 1931. Brother Samuel Wesley (nephew to John Wesley) was a Grand Organist near the turn of the 19th Century. Even today, Lodges in the Grand Lodge of Washington, where I live, continue to be dedicated to St. John the Baptist (the harbinger of the Messiah) and St. John the Evangelist (the identifier of the Messiah). And the official Great Light and Volume of the Sacred Law is the *Holy Bible, King James Version*.

The Enlightenment Period began in earnest when God revealed the technology of lenses, first to Galileo, the inventor of the telescope, and then to Copernicus, who studied the heavens with the telescope and discovered the solar system. Both were Roman Catholic monks who were among those persecuted by the Inquisition for denying the decrees of "infallible" popes who continued to insist that they knew by divine revelation that the earth was both flat and the center of the universe. After that, the concept of papal infallibility fell apart, along with the rest of the house of cards that was the Holy Roman Empire. So the only significant question about the history of Freemasonry is: *why did Freemasonry come into being in the first place?* And its corollary, *why do Salza and other professional anti-Masons consistently choose to completely ignore this crucial piece of the puzzle?*

In the early 1700's England was in a turmoil. Scotland, England, and Wales had just become The United Kingdom after decades of religious civil war and the Hanoverian (German) dynasty of Kings and Queens had just started with George I. George didn't like the British Isles much, so he left it without any direct supervision much of the time. The Church of England, being fully based on the prior licentiousness of Henry VIII, deteriorated to the point where it raised funds by operating alehouses and other houses of ill-repute which were facetiously called "nunneries," places where widowed women could find "employment" after thousands of their husbands committed suicide after losing their life savings in a nationwide, wildly speculative pyramid scheme. The resulting parentless children were put in church-sponsored "orphanages" which were scarcely more than slave labor camps for the burgeoning Industrial Revolution. On the mainland, Christianity fared no better, as the extravagance of the Pope in Rome far exceeded his income. What was left of the once "catholic" (meaning "universal") Church was forced to extort money from its extensive flock in Italy, France, Spain, and Portugal, and to begin the colonization and subsequent exploitation of North America, South America, and Africa. To keep the flock in line, the Pope used the Inquisition, which had the power to torture and even kill "heretics" (meaning dissenters), and which continues to this day as the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (presumably without the physical torture and killing).

Freemasons came to America along with all the Puritans, Quakers, Shakers, Episcopalians, Methodists, Presbyterians, Anabaptists, Mennonites, Congregationalists, Huguenots (French Protestants) and the rest of the people trying to escape the merciless persecution of this totally corrupt and brutally repressive European Christianity.

The Organization of Freemasonry

With a few minor discrepancies, Salza's description of the organization of American Freemasonry is correct. There was one glaring misrepresentation, however, when he said, *"The basic organizational unit of the Shrine is the Temple or Mosque, in recognition of Allah, the honored deity of the Shrine."* This is pure nonsense. In the Shrine, like every other Masonic body, the only honored deity is the God who is the creator of the universe and Father of us all. That's the God of Genesis 1:1; and the same God the Father prayed to by Jesus throughout the New Testament.

The Shrine has no degrees, and its initiation ceremony is a tongue-in-cheek replica of old time fraternity hazing, which has been substantially toned-down in recent years. The "ritual" was written by a couple of theatrical people from New York who had attended a lavish party hosted by a Sultan from Arabia. They thought it would be a great fundraising idea to simulate that environment. As a result the Shrine is known for more than just its "*sponsorship of hospitals and other philanthropic activities.*" The Shrine children's hospitals and burn centers are fully funded and fully supported by the Shrine. The primary difference between a Shrine hospital and a Catholic Hospital is that the Shrine hospital has no billing department. In recent years, the Shrine has come under some harsh criticism from American Muslims who claim that the Shrine is desecrating their religious symbols. It looks like there will be no syncretism with Islam either.

Who speaks for Freemasonry

Like most anti-Masons, Salza is forced to concede that "*There is no authority that speaks for worldwide Freemasonry,*" and then he proceeds to quote from three "*authorities*" -- all deceased, one for more than half a century, and one for more than a whole century. Lets be very clear here: *there is no one who speaks for Freemasonry, period.* Not worldwide, nationwide, statewide, countywide, citywide, or Lodge-wide. Each state's Grand Lodge is completely autonomous. And within each Grand Lodge, each Lodge has a great deal of flexibility in the way it handles most Masonic activities. And within each Lodge, each Member has a great deal of latitude when it comes to his own definitions of Masonic terms and principles, especially his rights to "Free Speech, Free Worship, and Free Assembly." That's why I can write this review, without prior permission from my Lodge, the Grand Lodge, or even the Grand Master. That's because each Freemason, from the youngest Entered Apprentice to the Oldest Past Master, has a right to express his own opinion. It's also what gets us into some trouble. One Mason thinks Freemasonry is Kabbalistic, another Gnostic, another Christian. In books, articles, and other presentations they make plausible claims about the way Masonic symbols might be interpreted. This is where Salza really shows his Masonic immaturity and ignorance. On page 27, Salza says: "*Although Grand Lodges operate independently, their teachings are essentially the same. This is because Freemasonry is built upon certain ancient, unalterable principles called 'Landmarks.' Landmarks are the universal rules of the Craft existing from time immemorial, and handed down by oral tradition. Without them, Freemasonry's identity would be destroyed.*" Then in the very next sentence he contradicts himself when he continues, "*There is no consensus among Masons as to every single Landmark,...*" So which is it, Landmarks are universal rules or *there is no consensus* as to what Landmarks are? Salza continues, "... yet approximately half of the Lodges in the United States have adopted Dr. Albert Mackey's list of twenty-five." So what are the other half of the Lodges using as "*universal rules*"? One of the Landmarks of St. John's #9 Lodge in Seattle is that only the Grand Master is escorted to the East holding his left arm. One of the Landmarks of Daylight Lodge #232 is that the chairs of the Senior Deacon, Chaplain, and Marshall face each other. Hardly universal. Not at all defining Freemasonry's peculiar identity. Salza says, "*Grand Lodges agree that the Landmarks of Masonry must include a belief in God as the Great Architect of the Universe, the immortality of the soul, and the resurrection of the body. Other Landmarks require the use of symbolism and allegory to teach moral and religious truth, secrecy, covenant oaths, and the absence of physical and mental defects as a requirement as a requirement for Masonic candidacy.*" Certainly there are certain fundamental and unalterable principles that define a Masonic Lodge. In Washington, one of the first things a candidate is asked is: "*Do you believe in one ever-living and true God, and in a transition to a future life?*" The one ever-living and true God is the God of candidate's own conscience. A future life can be the immortality of the soul, but it doesn't have to be. Likewise, the transition can be the resurrection of the body, but it doesn't have to be.

Along with “Grand Architect of the Universe,” throughout the Masonic rituals, God is also called “God, Almighty God, Almighty Father of the Universe, Great Architect of the Universe, Most Holy and Glorious Lord God, Giver of All Good Gifts and Graces, Glorious Author, Author of Light and Life, Supreme Architect of the Universe, the Creator, the Deity, the Supreme Intelligence, the Supreme Grand Master of the Universe, Almighty and Everlasting God, Almighty Eternal God, Creator and Upholder of the Universe, the All-bounteous Author of Nature, The Lord, Maker and Ruler of All Worlds, Great Source of Love and Happiness, Giver of Every Good and Perfect Gift, Most Glorious God, Author of All Good, and Giver of All Mercy,” *etc.*

One explanation for the transition to a future life is found in the Lecture to the Entered Apprentice:

The covering of a Lodge is no less than the cloudy canopy or starry-decked Heaven, where all good Masons hope at last to arrive by the aid of that theological ladder which Jacob in his vision saw extending from earth to heaven, the three principle rounds of which are denominated Faith, Hope, and Charity, and admonish us to have Faith in God, Hope in immortality, and Charity for all mankind. The greatest of these is Charity; for our Faith may be lost in sight; Hope may end in fruition; but Charity extends beyond the grave through the boundless realms of eternity.

Genesis 28:10-17 And Jacob went out from Beer-sheba, and went toward Haran. And he lighted upon a certain place, and tarried there all night, because the sun was set; and he took of the stones of that place, and put them for his pillows, and lay down in that place to sleep. And he dreamed, and behold a ladder set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven: and behold the angels of God ascending and descending on it. And, behold, the LORD stood above it, and said, I am the LORD God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac: the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed; And thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth, and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south: and in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed. And, behold, I am with thee, and will keep thee in all places whither thou goest, and will bring thee again into this land; for I will not leave thee, until I have done that which I have spoken to thee of. And Jacob awaked out of his sleep, and he said, Surely the LORD is in this place; and I knew it not. And he was afraid, and said, How dreadful is this place! this is none other but the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven.

Of course, every Christian knows that Jacob's Ladder was actually a prophetic vision of Christ, as revealed by St. John the Evangelist, one of the two Patron Saints of Freemasonry:

John 1:51 And he saith unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man.

It's a subtle but important distinction that in Masonic ritual, Faith, Hope, and Charity are denoted as the “principle rounds,” or most important steps of Jacob's ladder, but they are definitely not the only rounds. Freemasonry does not “provide” the “faith” (*Psalms 33:15 He fashions their hearts individually*); nor does Freemasonry “guarantee” immortality (it only instructs the Mason to have the “hope” of the same). What Freemasonry does provide is plenty of opportunities to provide “charity to all mankind.”

1 Corinthians 13:13 And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity.

*We are climbing Jacob's ladder,
We are climbing Jacob's ladder,
We are climbing Jacob's ladder,
Soldiers of the cross.*

*Every round goes higher, higher,
Every round goes higher, higher,
Every round goes higher, higher,
Soldiers of the cross.*

-- Negro Spiritual

Symbols and allegorical plays are not “*required*” to teach moral truths, but they are often used effectively for that purpose. Religious “truths” are, of course, a matter of individual conscience, so they are not taught in Freemasonry as such, at all. I’ve been a Freemason for more than twenty years, and I have never heard anything as outlandish as “*the absence of physical and mental defects as a requirement for Masonic candidacy.*” In the Grand Lodge of Washington the only exclusions are women, young boys, senile old men, atheists, raving lunatics, and others who lack the personal freedom, wherewithal, or legal right to make decisions for themselves. An “*absence of physical... defects*” would mean no one who wore glasses or a hearing aid or false teeth could be accepted. More preposterous nonsense. His “Appendix C” contains several different versions (and nowhere near a complete list) of what are supposed to be “*unalterable principles*” and “*universal rules.*” Now we know that Salza doesn’t even know what a Landmark really is. That’s no big deal, because, like all other supposedly “*universal*” Masonic symbols, nobody else does either.

On page 28 Salza shows where he completely missed the point of Freemasonry when he says, “*Because receiving the degrees is what makes a man a Mason, Masonic rituals are the primary authority to be evaluated in light of the teachings of the Church.*” In the opening and closing ritual of all three degrees the question is asked: *What makes you a Mason?* The answer is never “*receiving the degrees.*” What really does make a man a Mason? Two things: (1) the desire to better himself by being accountable to his fellow Masons for attempting to live a more honorable and moral life, and, (2) the desire to give aid and comfort to the less fortunate. It’s all clearly spelled out in the Charge to the Entered Apprentice:

As a Mason, you are to regard the volume of the Sacred Law as the Great Light in your profession; to consider it as the unerring standard of truth and justice; to regulate your actions by the divine precepts it contains. In it you will learn the important duties which you owe to God, your neighbor and yourself:

To God, by never mentioning His name but with the awe and reverence which are due from the creature to his Creator; by imploring His aid in all laudable undertakings, and by looking up to Him in every emergency for comfort and support;

To your neighbor, by acting with him upon the square; by rendering him every kind office which justice or mercy may require; by relieving his distresses, and soothing his afflictions; and by doing to him as, in similar cases, you would that he should do unto you:

And to yourself, by such a prudent and well-regulated course of discipline as may best conduce to the preservation of your corporeal and mental faculties in their fullest energy; thereby enabling you to exert the talents wherewith God has blest you, as well to His glory as to the welfare of your fellow-creatures.

As a citizen, you are enjoined to be exemplary in the discharge of your civil duties, by never proposing or countenancing any act which may have a tendency to subvert the peace and good order of society; by paying due obedience to the laws under whose protection you live, and by never losing sight of the allegiance due to your country.

As an individual, you are charged to practice the domestic and public virtues. Let Temperance chasten, Fortitude support, and Prudence direct you, and let Justice be the guide of all your actions. Be especially careful to maintain, in their fullest splendor, those truly Masonic ornaments, Brotherly Love, Relief and Truth.

Apparently Salza was too busy memorizing the text to learn what was actually being taught here too. It's a common problem when men try to take on too much, too fast.

Chapter III - The Ideology of Freemasonry

Introduction to the Problem of Indifferentism

On page 34, Salza shows that he doesn't know any more about the Roman Catholic Church than he knows about Freemasonry, when he says: *"Further, the Church actively promotes unity among the human family in spite of religious, ethnic, or cultural differences."* I have already shown that the RCC has taken ten steps backward in that regard, by reactivating its condemnation of Freemasonry and denial of the Eucharist to Freemasons and certain politicians. And I can assure you that when I recently attended a wedding in a Catholic church (interestingly officiated by the bride's Catholic priest and the groom's Lutheran minister), during the Mass I was not permitted to share in the reenactment of the Lord's Supper simply because I was not a Roman Catholic, never mind a Protestant or a Freemason. Protestant Christians fall under the same condemnation -- as are those who advocate for birth control and women's reproductive rights, support public education, separation of Church and State, and especially those who deny papal infallibility. And thanks to Roman Catholic actor Mel Gibson's movie *"The Passion of Christ,"* Judeo-Catholic relations have also been set back to Vatican I standards. One of the few places the RCC actively promoted unity in the last few years has been the unity of Altar Boys with homosexual pedophile priests. Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, alias Pope Benedict XVI, came down hard on American Freemasons for no good reason at all, but he has yet to excommunicate or even publicly condemn any of the offenders or their superiors who knew and yet covered up this ongoing child abuse. *"Unlike the Church, which declares that the fullness of God's truth is found in the Person of Jesus Christ, the Lodge never defines for its members the religious 'truth' it seeks",* says Salza. Thank you John Salza for finally admitting the truth: *Freemasonry cannot be a religion because it does not define a specific religious doctrine.* Freemasonry also has no specific religious services, no specific religious dogma, no specific Savior or Messiah -- its membership fees and dues are not even tax-deductible -- because Freemasonry is a philanthropic fraternity, not a path to salvation. Nowhere in any of my Masonic literature does it ever say that *"all religions are competitive attempts to express the truth about God and equally effective in advancing one's spiritual life..."* On the contrary, in the Lecture to the Entered Apprentice we learn:

By the exercise of Brotherly Love we are taught to regard the whole human race as one family... who, created by one Almighty Parent and inhabitants of the same planet, ought to aid, support, and protect each other. On this principle, Masonry unites men of every country, sect, and opinion, and conciliates true friendship among those who might otherwise remain at a distance.

When Manly P. Hall (who died in 1990 at the age of 89) described a Mason as *"one who worships at every shrine, bows before every altar, whether in temple, mosque or cathedral, realizing ... the oneness of all spiritual truth. To the true Mason Christ, Buddha, or Mohammed, the name means little,"* He obviously wasn't speaking for me or any other Christian Freemason. Here is an interesting excerpt from his official biography:

Unlike so many of his contemporaries, he concluded that wisdom was not to be found on only one path or in only one religion. Instead, he saw wisdom as the highest realm where philosophy, religion, and science come together without boundaries. Barely twenty years old, the gifted young man began his public career in the fall of 1920 when he was invited to speak to a small group in a room over a bank in Santa Monica, California on the subject of reincarnation... He showed thousands how universal wisdom could be found in the myths, mysteries, and symbols of the ancient Western Mystery teachings and how to embody this wisdom in their own lives.

It should be noted that Brother Hall also believed that the content of his plays indicated William Shakespeare had a complete knowledge of Rosicrucian philosophy, a claim neither made nor supported by the Rosicrucians or any real Shakespearean expert or authority. And it should also be noted that Brother Hall was a Canadian that started the Philosophical Research Society in Los Angeles in 1934. Significantly, on its official website, PRS says it is not affiliated with Freemasonry in any way. Hall's most significant accomplishment was the raising of more than \$100,000 (the equivalent of a million dollars today) to "vanity" publish his own book. Then Salza continues on by quoting Brothers Albert Pike, Albert Mackey, and Henry Wilson Coil concerning their personal views on how Freemasons should regard Freemasonry in the light of spirituality and religion. If this is not your first encounter with anti-Masonry then you will probably be asking yourself: *With more than 2000 different authors of books on Freemasonry cataloged in the Library of Congress, why do anti-Masons invariably quote from the same handful of books?* It doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out that each of these Masonic authors wrote books primarily to share their personal perceptions of religion and spirituality in Freemasonry with other Masons to try to convince them to adopt those views as well. But one must always remember this fact: *None of them speaks for Freemasonry, for any Grand Lodge, for any Lodge, or even for any other Mason.* Their works may contain many concepts that I and other Masons support. But they may also contain many other perceptions that I and other Masons totally disagree with, partly because they are mostly antiquated if not obsolete Theosophic ideas, and partly because their opinions conflict with our own personal religious beliefs. Unlike papal bulls, decrees, and catechisms which define Roman Catholicism, no Freemason is required to adopt any of anyone else's religious views.

On page 35, Salza says *"Freemasonry, therefore goes beyond promoting the common good; it moves into the realm of religion and soteriology (that part of theology dealing with salvation.) The Lodge claims that its principles will advance its members to 'the heavenly lodge above,' but it requires no belief in Jesus Christ or his Church."* No matter what Henry Coil said, Freemasonry never claims it's principles will guarantee the advance its members to the *"heavenly Lodge above"*. Remember, Freemasons are admonished to have Faith in God, Hope in immortality, and Charity for all mankind. I submit that Salza missed still another very subtle but nonetheless very important distinction: that's a *Hope in*, not a *Guarantee of*, immortality. Next Salza states, *"The Lodge considers any specific doctrines concerning God beyond what can be known by nature and reason to be "sectarian."* Then he introduces a new name, Joseph Fort Newton, also speaking for himself, who *"explains, 'Masonry seeks to free men from a limited conception of religion, and thus to remove one of the chief causes of sectarianism.'"* Rev. Newton was a Baptist Minister, known for his evangelism, planting of hundreds of churches, and for being another in a long line of clergymen who have found no incompatibility between his Freemasonry and his Christian ministry. Before we get bogged down again in semantics, let's reiterate what Freemasonry says about God by listing the official Masonic adjectives used to describe Him: *One, True, Living, Almighty, Great, Most Holy, Glorious, Supreme, Grand, Everlasting, Eternal, All-bounteous*, and, of course, *Him*. Take a minute to call your local chapter of the American Atheists. Ask them which of those terms describing the One True and Living God can only be known by *"nature and reason."* So what does *sectarian* really mean? From the *Merriam-Websters Collegiate Dictionary*:

sectarian *adj.* [Date first used: 1649] 1: of, relating to, or characteristic of a sect or sectarian, 2: limited in character or scope: parochial; *n.* 1: an adherent of a sect 2: a narrow or bigoted person

parochial adj. [Etymology: Middle English *parochiall*, from Middle French *parochial*, from Late Latin *parochialis*, from *parochia* parish, Date first used: 14th century] 1: of or relating to a church parish 2: of or relating to a parish as a unit of local government 3: confined or restricted as if within the borders of a parish 4: limited in range or scope (as to a narrow area or region)

Salza defines it like this: “*Sectarianism is a pejorative term indicating that a religion so described is too limited in its scope.*” But that’s not what the dictionary says. Adjectival definition 2 above describes the “*limit in scope*” as “*parochial,*” which means “*limited to a narrow area or region, like a parish.*” The Masonic usage of “*sectarianism*” is Noun definition 2, the mindset that produces “a narrow or bigoted person.” Rather than quarreling about trivial and unresolvable issues like how many Christian sacraments there are; whether or not the pope is really infallible; whether or not celibacy in the Roman Catholic priesthood is a hoax; whether the bread wafer and wine really do turn into Jesus’ human flesh and blood; whether or not *Allah, the Eleyon of the Elohim, Yahweh, and Pater Nostra* are the same God; or whether Mary, the mother of Jesus, should be considered a co-redemptrix to be worshipped right along side Jesus as his equal, with followers and websites of her own -- these sectarian Neofundamentalists (of every religious persuasion) need to drop their phony-baloney, holier-than-thou separatist dogma and join forces with the rest of mankind in fighting the real causes of evil: *hunger, violence, poverty, ignorance, and disease* throughout the world. In the words of former nun, Karen Armstrong, in *A History of God*:

During the eighteenth century, deists rejected traditional Western Christianity largely because it had become so conspicuously cruel and intolerant. The same will hold good today. All too often, conventional believers, who are not fundamentalists, share their aggressive righteousness. They use “God” to prop up their own loves and hates, which they attribute to God himself. But Jews, Christians, and Muslims who punctiliously attend divine services yet denigrate people who belong to different ethnic and ideological camps deny one of the basic truths of their religion. It is equally inappropriate for people who call themselves Jews, Christians, and Muslims to condone an inequitable social system. The God of historical monotheism demands mercy not sacrifice, compassion rather than decorous liturgy.

Freemasonry is certainly indifferent about different sectarian religious beliefs, not because, as Salza alleges, “*God looks only at the sincerity of the person’s intentions, not to his or her particular doctrinal beliefs,*” but because Freemasonry is a philanthropical fraternity, not a religion; it is a way of providing charity, not a path to salvation; it honors God, but does not worship God -- and it has no time or other resources to waste on those who continue to confuse the *narrow way* with the *narrow mind*.

On page 38, Salza’s real agenda arrives when he quotes this Bible passage: “*For what partnership have righteous and iniquity? Or what fellowship has light with darkness? What accord has Christ with Belial?... Therefore come out from them, and be separate from them, says the Lord. (2 Cor 6:14-15, 17)*” This is the core belief of separatist Neofundamentalists, Protestant, Catholic, or otherwise. They think they are righteous, everyone else is iniquitous (sinful). They think they are controlled by Christ, everyone else is controlled by the devil. Therefore, they conclude, they must completely separate themselves from everyone else. What’s wrong with this picture, as every student of hermeneutics knows, is that each verse of the Bible has to be analyzed according to its context -- who, what, when, where, and why it was written. According to *Fausset’s Bible Dictionary*, the city of Corinth is described like this:

In Paul's time it was capital of Achaia, and seat of the Roman proconsul (Acts 18:12). Its people had the Greek love of philosophical subtleties. The immorality was notorious even in the pagan world; so that "to Corinthianize" was proverbial for playing the wanton. The worship of Venus, whose temple was on Acrocorinthus, was attended with shameless profligacy, 1,000 female slaves being maintained for the service of strangers.

Basically Corinth was the site of one of the largest houses of prostitution in Greece at that time. But these weren't religious devotees donating their bodies to their goddess. This was a place where, for the right "contribution," you could sexually abuse any one of a thousand slave girls any way you wanted. What Paul obviously discovered was that many of the men attending the Corinthian Church were also attending the Temple of Venus. The majority of Chapter 6 delineates the way the parishioners were supposed to act, clearly implying that they were not acting appropriately before Paul's arrival.

2 Corinthians 6:14-18 Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, And will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.

Salza conveniently skipped verse 16 which refers to the worshipping of God in the temple of their own bodies and not defiling themselves by partaking of the worship of idols like Venus. It's not about withdrawing into protected Christian communes and monasteries. In verse 14, the key word is "*unequally*," another word missing from Salza's interpretation. Freemasons meet "upon the level" which means no Mason is required to follow any religious beliefs other than his own. Freemasonry does not teach that all religions are equal, or that it doesn't matter what religion you are, or even that all religions lead to heaven. Freemasonry provides a sanctuary from all the bickering and infighting that invariably erupt when the sectarian belief systems of religions collide. None of this applies to Freemasonry anyway, because Lodge meetings are not worship services. How could they be, since even Salza admits that contentious, sectarian religious beliefs -- including separatist Christian beliefs -- are not given any direct acknowledgment in the Lodge meetings.

On page 40, Salza indicates that he has just as immature a perception of his church as he has of Freemasonry, when he says: "*The Church's appraisal of the religious teachings of the Lodge should not be viewed as a criticism of the right to religious freedom. The Church like the Lodge, holds that the human person has a civil right to religious freedom, declaring that "all men are to be immune by coercion on the part of individuals or of social groups and of any human power, in such wise that no one is to be forced to act in a manner contrary to his own beliefs"*" (quoted from Vatican II, *Dignitatis Humanae*, 1965) If it's not *criticism of the right to religious freedom*, then what do you call it when Roman Catholic Freemasons who, like millions of other Freemasons who find no incompatibility between their religious faith and the fraternity, believe that the basis for the recent hostility toward US Freemasonry, which has never challenged or attacked the RCC or its sectarian views or attempted to undermine the validity of the government of a "Catholic" country, is wrong and they are falsely accused of being "*in a state of grave sin.*" And then for no good reason they are denied participation in "*holy communion*" or threatened with excommunication? I guess Salza is going to have to add "coercion" to his growing list of words to he has to redefine. From Karen Armstrong, once again:

This image of the divine Tyrant imposing an alien law on unwilling human servants has to go. Terrorizing the populace into civic obedience with threats is no longer acceptable or even practicable, as the downfall of the communist regimes demonstrated so dramatically in the autumn of 1989. The anthropomorphic idea of God as Lawgiver and Ruler is not adequate in the temper of post-modernity. Yet the atheists who complained that the idea of God was unnatural were not entirely correct. We have seen that Jews, Christians, and Muslims have developed remarkably similar ideas of God, which also resemble other conceptions of the Absolute.

When people try to find an ultimate meaning and value in human life, their minds seem to go in a certain direction. They have not been coerced to do this; it is something that seems natural to humanity. Yet if feelings are not to degenerate into indulgent, aggressive, or unhealthy emotionalism, they need to be informed by the critical intelligence.

On page 41, Salza says, “*Without the objective reality of truth, there is no objective right to freedom. Because freedom is grounded in truth, the Church teaches that these God-given freedoms are not a license to adhere to error. (cf. CCC 2108). While recognizing the civil right to religious freedom, man does not have a moral right to worship outside the parameters that God has revealed. As a result, religious freedom can never be used to defend the relativism of Freemasonry.*” What is religious freedom? Although it is often called Freedom of Religion, what is actually guaranteed by the First Amendment of our Constitution is Freedom *from* Religion. The First Amendment doesn’t guarantee you the right to worship in the church of your choice. It simply prevents the government from endorsing or giving preferential treatment to a religious establishment. In fact, the Supreme Court has upheld that the Establishment Clause specifically means that the government must remain completely indifferent to all religious establishments.

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

In Washington State, where I reside, it is the State Constitution that grants me (and the other residents) Freedom of Conscience.

SECTION 11 RELIGIOUS FREEDOM. Absolute freedom of conscience in all matters of religious sentiment, belief and worship, shall be guaranteed to every individual, and no one shall be molested or disturbed in person or property on account of religion; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness or justify practices inconsistent with the peace and safety of the state. No public money or property shall be appropriated for or applied to any religious worship, exercise or instruction, or the support of any religious establishment *PROVIDED, HOWEVER, That this article shall not be so construed as to forbid the employment by the state of a chaplain for such of the state custodial, correctional, and mental institutions, or by a county's or public hospital district's hospital, health care facility, or hospice, as in the discretion of the legislature may seem justified.* No religious qualification shall be required for any public office or employment, nor shall any person be incompetent as a witness or juror, in consequence of his opinion on matters of religion, nor be questioned in any court of justice touching his religious belief to affect the weight of his testimony.

[NOTE: *The italicized text was added to the original wording of Section 11 as Amendment 34 to 1957 Senate Joint Resolution No 14, p. 1299, approved November 4, 1958. Prior to that date, it was illegal for the State to pay salaries to Chaplains for any of the listed positions previously staffed by volunteers.*]

In spite of Salza's claim to the contrary, it is certainly possible to "*detach human freedom from its essential and constitutive relationship to truth.*" This Freedom of Conscience, or Freedom from Religion, grants every citizen of this country, including Roman Catholics, the *Constitutional right to be wrong*. The common attributes of religions are the belief that their god is the only true god, the need for man to connect (or reconnect) with that god, and the belief that their proscribed path is exclusive means to do so. The idea that the RCC recognizes the civil right but not the moral right is nothing but bizarre doublespeak, something else the RCC is noted for. Salza gives another example of this ecclesiastical gobbledygook when he says "*The Church does not deny that goodness and truth can be found in other religions. The Second Vatican Council says this: 'The Catholic Church rejects nothing of what is true and holy in these religions. She has a high regard for the manner of life and conduct, the precepts and teachings, which although differing in many ways from her own teaching, nonetheless often reflect a ray of truth which enlighten all men.'*" Then out of the other side of his mouth, Salza says, "*But followers of other religions are, objectively speaking, in a gravely deficient situation in comparison with those who, in the Church, have the ordinary means of salvation. This is why any goodness and truth that can be found in other religions must be used as a 'preparation for the Gospel' (CCC 843).*" Salza then quotes Pope Paul VI who says:

... the presentation of the Gospel message is not an optional contribution for the Church. It is the duty incumbent on her by the command of the Lord Jesus, so that people can believe and be saved. This message is indeed necessary. It is unique, It cannot be replaced. It does not permit either indifference, syncretism or accommodation. It is a question of people's salvation.

What's wrong with this picture is twofold. Theologically, George Barna, the famous Christian researcher stated in his recent book, *Revolution*, that "The typical church member will die without leading a single person to a lifesaving knowledge of, and relationship with, Jesus Christ." That clearly indicates that the stated goals of the Church are not being met. And it also means that even if Freemasonry were a religion of its own, which it is most definitely not, the Church would be required to respect at least some of Freemasonry's moral truths (which it does not). That's because the current Pope and Past Prefect of the Inquisition has been basing his opinions on erroneous information provided to him by sources like Salza. Freemasonry is not indifferent toward God. On the Contrary, we have shown that even the lowly Entered Apprentice Mason is required to do his duty to God "...by never mentioning His name but with the awe and reverence which are due from the creature to his Creator; by imploring His aid in all laudable undertakings, and by looking up to Him in every emergency for comfort and support..." That is not "indifference", that is *respect!* In the Fellowcraft Degree, the candidate learns that the letter G (that you find inside the Square and Compasses emblem) "alludes to the sacred name of deity, before Whom all should humbly bow." That's not indifference, that is also respect.

Indifference Toward God and Jesus Christ

On page 43 Salza completely distorts this perceived indifference by actually misrepresenting the ritual when he says, "*The Worshipful Master places his left hand on the candidate's head and asks, 'In whom do you put your trust?' If the candidate professes a belief in any 'Supreme Being' the Worshipful Master says, 'your trust being in God, your faith is well founded. Arise, follow your conductor, and fear no danger.'*" The correct answer to the question is on every coin minted in the US since 1956. (*In God We Trust* -- just in case you missed it). And my ritual cipher goes so far as to say that the candidate must not be prompted to give it.

Remember, before the candidate can even enter the Lodge room, he had to answer this question: “Do you believe in one ever-living and true God, and in a transition to a future life?” So Salza’s claim that “Thus one Mason’s belief in a pantheistic God, for example could flatly reject or contradict another Freemason’s monotheism, but Freemasonry declares to both that their faith is well founded,” is basically nonsense, and is designed to intentionally inflame the passions of Christians reading the book. The real truth is the only time a Mason might actually believe in a pantheistic God is if he is a Roman Catholic. Some sectarian Christian denominations consider the RCC to be pantheism because of their belief in the Trinitarian Godhead (Father, Son, and Holy Spirit), their belief in the Communion of Saints (praying to thousands of demigod intercessors -- St. Christopher for travel, St. Cecile for musical talent, etc.), and the belief in Mary as the co-redemptrix and equal to Jesus Christ/Father God. Once again, Salza must be speaking Christianese, for there is no way a person who believes in the *one ever-living and true God* can be a pantheist (defined as the worship of all gods of different creeds, cults, or peoples indifferently). Significantly none of this applies to Freemasonry anyway, because, as stated earlier, Freemasonry does not involve worship at all, no matter how many times or different ways Salza misstates it. The other issue here is Salza’s equally bizarre concept that religion can be “objective truth.” Semantically, the difference between *objective* and *subjective* is this: *objective* is of, relating to, or being an object, phenomenon, or condition in the realm of sensible experience independent of individual thought and perceptible by all observers: having reality independent of the mind; *subjective* is characteristic of or belonging to reality as perceived rather than as independent of mind.

To you and I that means the difference between them is that an “objective truth” can be clearly demonstrated by empirical evidence to independent observers. On the other hand, “subjective truth” can only be perceived in the eye of the beholder. I find it curious that many of Salza’s new separatist Neofundamentalist Protestant cohorts also have books and tracts describing Roman Catholicism as the same kind of deceptive cult religion as they, and Salza, falsely describe Freemasonry as being. With Catholicism, at least they are half right (Roman Catholicism is a religion); with Freemasonry they are completely wrong (Freemasonry is neither deceptive nor a cult religion -- it is only a philanthropic fraternity).

For the next several pages, Salza wastes everyone’s time with a big discussion about a variety of men’s (some Masons, some Catholic Fathers) opinions and some Bible verses carefully extracted out of context, finally quoting Pope John Paul II, who was considered by all Roman Catholics to be infallible at the time, who said, “*If something is true, then it must be true for all peoples at all times.*” This is more RCC doublespeak. Let’s use a few examples from the Bible to prove that popes are not any more “infallible” than any other men, instead of quoting Albert Pike, who clearly indicated in the preface of *Morals and Dogma*, that “Everyone is entirely free to reject and dissent from whatever herein may seem to him to be untrue and unsound.”

First Example: Who were the Twelve Apostles?

This should be a pretty easy question to answer even by a fledgling Bible student.

Mark 3:16-19 And Simon he surnamed Peter; And James the son of Zebedee, and John the brother of James; and he surnamed them Boanerges, which is, The sons of thunder: And Andrew, and Philip, and Bartholomew, and Matthew, and Thomas, and James the son of Alphaeus, and Thaddaeus, and Simon the Canaanite, And Judas Iscariot, which also betrayed him: and they went into an house.

Luke 6:13-16 And when it was day, he called unto him his disciples: and of them he chose twelve, whom also he named apostles; Simon, (whom he also named Peter,) and Andrew his brother, James and John, Philip and Bartholomew, Matthew and Thomas, James the son of Alphaeus, and Simon called Zelotes, And Judas the brother of James, and Judas Iscariot, which also was the traitor.

Acts 1:13 And when they were come in, they went up into an upper room, where abode both Peter, and James, and John, and Andrew, Philip, and Thomas, Bartholomew, and Matthew, James the son of Alphaeus, and Simon Zelotes, and Judas the brother of James.

Matthew 10:2 Now the names of the twelve apostles are these; The first, Simon, who is called Peter, and Andrew his brother; James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother; Philip, and Bartholomew; Thomas, and Matthew the publican; James the son of Alphaeus, and Lebbaeus, whose surname was Thaddaeus; Simon the Canaanite, and Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed him.

Answer:

(1) Simon (called Peter) Jonah, (2) his brother Andrew Jonah, (3) James Zebedee, (4) his brother John Zebedee, (5) Judas Thomas (the doubter), (6) James Alpheus, (7) Philip (the Greek-speaker), (8) Bartholemew (that means “son of Ptolemy” or idiomatically “The Wizard”), (9) Simon the Canaanite Zealot, (10) Levi (called Matthew, the tax collector), and (11) the infamous Judas Iscariot.

Was the twelfth Apostle Lebbaeus Thaddaeus (MK 3:16, MT 10:2), or Judas James (Luke 6:13, Acts 1:13)? If the Bible contains truth “*for all peoples at all times,*” then the Christian must be willing to believe Lebbaeus Thaddaeus and Judas James were one and the same person.

apostle n. 1. a person sent out on a special mission 2. [usually A-] any of the twelve disciples sent out by Christ to teach the gospel: originally, Andrew, Bartholomew, James (the younger, son of Alphaeus), James (the elder) and John (sons of Zebedee), Jude (or Lebbaeus or Thaddaeus), Judas Iscariot, Matthew (or Levi), Philip, Simon the Canaanite, Simon (called Peter), and Thomas (or Didymus); Paul, the “Apostle to the Gentiles,” was not among the original twelve; Judas was replaced by Matthias 3. the first Christian missionary in a place 4. any of a group of early Christian missionaries 5. an early advocate or leader of a new principle or movement, esp. one aimed at reform 6. any of the twelve administrative officials of the Mormon Church.

From the list in definition 2 above, is it any wonder no one knows for sure who they were? It’s a trick question anyway. There weren’t twelve Apostles; there were fourteen, because Paul was the “Apostle to the Gentiles” while Matthias replaced Judas Iscariot.

Luke 22:28-30 Ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations. And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; That ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

At the time Jesus made this statement, Judas Iscariot was still one of the twelve. Adding Matthias and Paul, that makes fourteen Apostles. Even if you assume Judas Iscariot lost his kingdom after the betrayal, that still leaves thirteen Apostles.

Revelation 21:14 And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb.

So which twelve of the possible thirteen remaining names are written on the foundations of heaven?

Second Example: Does the sun rise?

Matthew 5:44-45 But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.

We know that this statement about the rain (representing curses) is *true*, because rain does in fact fall on the righteous and the unrighteous. But the statement about the sunrise (representing blessings) was *not true*. We now know that the sun does not rise or set or move across the sky, but it only appears to move as the earth revolves on its axis. We can safely presume that God knows that too. But the author of Matthew did not know that because that “truth” wasn’t revealed to man until hundreds of years later. During those years, as the new “truth” was revealed, men, some who were devout churchmen who were simply searching for God in the heavens, were tortured and killed for professing the truth of the heliocentric solar system because it contradicted the official, infallible “truth” of a Church led by popes no more or less fallible than you or I. Jesus just as easily could have told the author of the *Gospel of Matthew* to write, “*He maketh His sun to shine on the evil and the good...*” So why didn’t He? It’s because this truth, like every other truth, is revealed over a period of time. So how do we sift truth from the falsehood during this time we live? *Truth exists with you or without you, falsehood cannot exist without a believer in it.*

No one in our day and age could possibly be taken seriously if they literally believed that the earth is flat (separating above-sky water from below-sky water), that the sun can be kept from moving across the sky (because the sun doesn’t actually move at all), that sins (the conscious or unconscious violation of God’s laws) of the parents are the cause of blindness or deformities in their children or great grandchildren, that insanity is caused by “possession” by evil spirit demons that can be exorcised and forced to enter the bodies of domestic animals, that the earth was created less than 6000 years ago, or that anything could survive the inundating of the earth for up to one year and submerging most of it to a depth of about five miles, including a handful of humans and a menagerie of animals that would be forced to survive on diluted sea water and eating each other while becoming equally inundated with animal feces and urine, all in a boat that would have to have been so massive that it would have required the wood from practically every tree in Israel to construct. All of these things were “truths” of the Bible that are no longer true today.

On page 46, Salza makes this statement which is as false as it is insulting: “*While Freemasonry promotes the general worship of the subjective God, the Christian Mason disclaims any responsibility in bearing witness to the objective truth of Jesus Christ.*” I can personally assure you that those of us who are active in the Body of Christ, in Bible-believing churches, and in Prison and other prodigals ministries, are witnessing our beliefs on a daily basis. We witness by the values expressed by the way we live our lives. Confrontational evangelism, however, is not always appropriate. It’s not permitted in a Masonic Lodge, just as it’s not permitted in Salza’s Law Office in Milwaukee. Furthermore, for Salza to claim that the truth of Jesus Christ is “objective” is patently ridiculous. I submit that there is an “objective truth” of Jesus Christ -- but the Bible clearly indicates that it will happen at His return.

Romans 14:11 For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God.

In the meantime, Christ cannot be perceived “objective truth,” for if His presence was readily demonstrable at this time, then I submit that everyone all over the world would be Christian. But that’s not what Christ says happens, according to the Bible.

John 20:29-31 Jesus saith unto him, Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed. And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name.

John Salza's scripturecatholic.com website says "John holds a Bachelor of Arts degree (*Magna Cum Laude*) from the University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee, and a Doctor of Law degree (*Cum Laude*) from the University of Wisconsin Law School. John is a member of the Phi Beta Kappa Society, the American Catholic Lawyers Association, the National Italian-American Bar Association, the Justinian Society of Lawyers and the Saint Joseph's Society." I find it astounding that someone with such impressive academic and legal credentials does not appear to know the difference between fact and opinion. If I were on the Board of *Phi Beta Kappa*, after reading this tome, I would demand that Salza return his key.

Indifference Toward the Holy Bible

On page 46 Salza makes this equally incendiary and false statement about the way Freemasonry reveres the Holy Bible. "Because Freemasonry views other religious writings as equally legitimate expressions of God's will, it offers them an equal place on the altar with the Bible. Whether it's the Book of Mormon, the Koran, the Vedas, the Zend Avesta, the Sohar, the Kabbalah, the Bhagavad Gita, the Upanishads, or any other religious writing, all are given center stage in the Masonic Lodge room." To be sure I heard him correctly, I referred to the Glossary of Masonic Terms he provided in Appendix B. Looking up the word "altar" I found this definition: *The most important article of furniture in a Lodge room. On it rest the Volume of the Sacred Law, Square, and Compasses.* Looking up the word "furniture" I found this definition: *Furniture of the Lodge. The Volume of the Sacred Law, the Square, the Compasses, and the Masonic altar.* This is quoted directly from the Lecture to the Apprentice Mason in the *Washington Monitor and Freemason's Guide*:

The *furniture* of the Lodge consists of the Holy Bible, Square, and Compasses. The Holy Bible is dedicated to God, the Square to the Master, and the Compasses to the Craft. The Holy Bible is dedicated to God because it is the inestimable gift of God to man and on it we obligate a newly admitted brother; the Square to the Master, because it is the proper Masonic emblem of his office; and the Compasses to the Craft, because by due attention to their use they are taught to circumscribe their desires and keep their passions within due bounds.

As a more definite guide for a Freemason, the Lodge furnishes him with unerring rules whereby he should form his conduct. The Book of the Law is laid before him, that he may not say that through ignorance he erred. This Rule, the Square, and the Compasses are emblematical of the conduct we should pursue in society: to observe punctuality in all our engagements; faithfully and religiously to discharge those important obligations which we owe to God and to our neighbor; to be upright in all our dealings; to keep within bounds those unruly passions which oftentimes interfere with the enjoyment of society and which degrade both the man and the Freemason.

Just to be sure he gets the real meaning, each Entered Apprentice is given a copy of the *Holy Bible, King James Version* of his own. *Wait a minute?* I thought Salza said any religious writings would be offered an "equal place" and "center stage" on the altar. So why does the Master's lecture say that the Great Lights of Freemasonry are the "Holy Bible, Square, and Compasses?" Why does the lecture also indicate to the newly obligated Brother that one reason the *Holy Bible* is the most important of the three (not four) essential pieces of furniture (furniture is what defines the kind of room you are in) in the Lodge is the one on which he must take his official Oath of Obligation?

I can't speak for Wisconsin's ritual, but there is nothing anywhere in the Washington State ritual work that contains any mention of any of the other "religious writings" Salza lists at all, never mind as supposed equals to the Holy Bible. And as the Past Grand Bible Bearer, I can again personally assure you that I never carried any other VSL than the *Holy Bible, King James Version* to any Masonic event, procession, meeting, or private ceremony -- ever!

The objective truth is that Salza got these bizarre ideas from reading the personal reflections of Coil, Mackey, Pike and others who had some pretty weird theosophical ideas in the 19th and early 20th Century. But they don't apply to today's Freemasonry, and the vast majority of Freemasons have never read their works, if they have ever heard of them at all. Even the "Masonic Bible" he quotes from was originally published nearly a century ago and is virtually unchanged since then. Salza quotes G. W. Chase (whose most famous work is the history of Haverhill, MA in 1861). "*In fact, Blue Lodge Masonry is nothing whatsoever to do with the Bible; it is not founded on the Bible. If it was, it would not be Masonry; it would be something else.*" How is this possible since the Charge to The Entered Apprentice says: "As a Mason, you are to regard the volume of the Sacred Law as the Great Light in your profession; to consider it as the unerring standard of truth and justice; to regulate your actions by the divine precepts it contains." The answer is, of course, is that Chase was saying that although the degrees, which are allegorical plays that teach moral lessons, were set in the time of the construction of King Solomon's Temple -- they should in no way be considered Biblical or even historical for that matter. The Third Degree Drama, for example, is not presented to pretend that Hiram Abiff or any of the other characters in the play actually did or said anything exactly as portrayed there. The purpose of the Drama is to teach the value of daily devotions to God, and to learn the meaning of "fidelity." *Fidelity* is "the quality or state of strict and continuing faithfulness to an obligation, trust, or duty to which one is bound by pledge." Obviously, he missed that lesson, too.

Next Salza identifies Oliver D. Street as a "*renowned Masonic scholar,*" but he neglects to mention Brother Street was born in 1866. Then, instead of quoting him, he paraphrases him, saying: "*The Bible is only a symbol; a Mason is not required to believe its teachings; some other book may be substituted for it.*" Not on my watch. Not in my jurisdiction. In fact, in Washington State, one of the universal principles adopted by all regular Lodges is that there is a direct line of light between the *Holy Bible* and the Master of the Lodge that is maintained at all times that cannot be breached by any of the Lodge members. Members of the Lodge moving from the Southeast to Southwest (or vice versa) have to go around the west end of the Lodge to keep that beam intact. That's a posture of ultimate reverence, not indifference, and Salza simply cannot claim that when he was a Mason he did not know that.

Final Thoughts

This is where Salza attempts to justify his own personal religious views by making a series of erroneous statements about Freemasonry, his religion, and mine. If he were still a Freemason I would not respond to his religious fallacies, but would acknowledge his right to his own opinion -- *his Constitutional right to be wrong*. But instead he chose to acknowledge that he is a self-confessed liar. Therefore, I am charged by the Master of my Lodge to defend the character of my brother Masons. During his degrees he was asked more than a dozen times "*Is this of your own free will and accord?*" And he always answered "Yes." Three times he was assured by the Master of the Lodge that there would be nothing in his Oath of Obligation that would conflict with his duties to God. If he disagreed with that he was always free to leave. So why didn't he? The objectively truthful answer to that lies in his motivation for joining in the first place -- and why he is described as "*the first Catholic known to write a major book after leaving the secret organization.*" God knows he wasn't the first Catholic to join or leave Freemasonry. Yet it is a real testimony to the fraternity that out of literally millions of members, only a handful have found the need to justify their decision to leave by attempting to build such an elaborate, although false, case as this.

“Many Christian Masons in this country never consider the issue of indifferentism. This is not surprising since indifferentism seems to be the religion of America’s pop culture. We live in a land of freedom and tolerance where equality is considered an absolute value,” says Salza on page 50, clearly missing the whole point of the Bill of Rights. Equality isn’t “considered” an absolute value -- it **is** an absolute value. We declared our independence from the corruption of European Christianity and the tyranny of European aristocracy, for the reasons stated so well by Thomas Jefferson (who was not a Freemason) in the Declaration of Independence:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.

Salza continues, *“We are told to embrace the equality of ideas, not just the equality of persons. The Lodge can be very appealing to those who praise these ideals.”* So which ideals are appealing to Masons, the self-evident truth that all men are created equal, or Salza’s strange perception that because each citizen is to be treated equally under the law, that their philosophies, religions, and harebrained schemes are also to be treated equally? Under the law, not only do you have the right to be wrong, but you also have the Constitutionally guaranteed right to think you’re right and everyone else is wrong, along with the right to speak your mind and try to convince them. Do you or I think that the people advocating the dictatorship of Marxist communism have ideas that should be treated equally to those of us enjoying democratic capitalism? Are the violent religious ideas of jihadist Muslims to be treated as equal to the religious ideas of peaceful Christian missionaries? Of course not!

Salza concludes this chapter using some below-the-belt punches at the Protestant Church when he says, *“In interpreting the Bible, Protestant reformers elevated private judgment over the infallible teaching authority of the Catholic Church.”* Anyone with even a superficial knowledge the history of the Roman Catholic Church knows that the Protestant Reformation began when Martin Luther, a Roman Catholic Priest, refused to sell “indulgences” as a fundraiser to support the extravagance of the papacy. He listed 95 separate ecclesiastical reasons why the Church should not be accepting cash money to allow people to get away with murder (literally) and a whole host of other sinful acts. What continued the Reformation was when, for the first time, common people were able read the Bible for themselves, so they could compare the actual behavior of the Churchmen with the standard of the Bible. How did the RCC respond to these challenges to the obvious fallacies and inaccuracies of what were supposed to be *“infallible teaching authority”*? The same as it always responds, by threats of excommunicating (if not murdering and torturing) the dissenters. So Catholic Freemasons are in good company when they are being told by the pope that if they join Masonic Lodges they are *“in a state of grave sin and may not receive holy communion.”* Yet the penalty for being a pedophile priest is: *to be transferred to a different diocese and being placed in charge of the youth programs there.* And the penalty for covering this up? None. The Reformation lives on because the objective truth is that the Roman Catholic Church is as morally bankrupt now as it was then. And attempts, through Vatican II, to correct that, are being slowly and deliberately rolled back, from the top down.

So lets recap:

- The concept that to Freemasonry all gods are equal, all religious writings are equal, or that Masons of different religions “worship” together at the altar are all just nonsense.
- The objective truth is that because Freemasonry is a philanthropic fraternity and not a religion or path to salvation, in the Lodge one’s sectarian religious beliefs are just not an issue.

- If the Mason's conscience leads him to call his ultimate destination Heaven or Nirvana or even the Celestial Lodge Above, or if he calls the One True and Living God, Creator of the Universe, and Father of All Mankind by one name or another, that does not matter -- within the confines of the Lodge.
- Outside the Lodge room, the Christian Freemason is free to evangelize all he wants -- even to other Freemasons.

Finally, Salza says, "*Protestants may have removed the living teaching authority of the Catholic Church, but Masons have removed Christ himself.*" More hogwash. It wasn't Freemasons, Protestant reformers, pagans, atheists, "indifferentists" or the Enlightenment, but God Himself who removed the "*living teaching authority*" from the corrupt human beings who usurped and abused God's own unique attribute of being perfect (and therefore infallible) -- as revealed through the mouths of RCC priests and monks. And the ludicrous claim that Freemasons have "*removed Christ himself*" simply indicates that Salza has no idea of Christ's true magnitude or power, or why that unbroken beam of light from the *Holy Bible* to the Master of the Lodge must be maintained.

Jeremiah 23:24 Can any hide himself in secret places that I shall not see him? saith the Lord. Do not I fill heaven and earth? saith the Lord.

Chapter IV - Specific Masonic Doctrines and Practices

Overview of Masonic Syncretism

Once again Salza gets bogged down in the semantics of his own perceptions, when he says, *"The Masonic Lodge's pursuit of credal elements common to many religions results in a compromise known as syncretism. Syncretism is the blending of different beliefs or practices without regard for consistency, systematic connection, or compatibility with Christian truth."* Whew, that's a real mouthful. My dictionary says it like this:

syncretism n., [Etymology: New Latin *syncretismus*, from Greek *synkritismos* federation of Cretan cities, from Cretan *synkretkris*; Date first used: 1618] 1: the combination of different forms of belief or practice 2: the fusion of two or more original different inflectional forms

I submit that no beliefs and/or practices can be "blended" or combined together unless they are both consistent and compatible. If my belief is that all murderers should be put to death, and your belief is that all murderers should be forgiven and released, then our beliefs can never be blended. For example:

Confucius said, *"What you do not wish upon yourself, extend not to others."*

Jesus said, *"And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise."* (Luke 6:31).

Mohammed said, *"Hurt no one, so that no one may hurt you."*

The Charge to the Entered Apprentice says, *"... and by doing to him as, in similar cases, you would that he should do unto you..."* Is that a syncretism, a blending from three different religious beliefs? Of course not. It's simply the acknowledgment that God's universal principles are God's universal principles, no matter whose mouth they come out of. Salza continues, *"If all religions are equally valid then there is no problem blending them together. Such a practice flows from a denial of the unique value of any one particular religion."* There are only two universal religious beliefs adopted by Masonic Lodges: belief in one, true and living God, and belief in a transition to a future life. But if Freemasonry accepted all religions as equally valid, then there would be no need discern from the potential candidate that he professes a belief in God or in a transition to a future life. Likewise there would be no need for the question, *"In whom do you put your trust?"* Now let's look at some real examples of syncretism.

After Roman Emperor Constantine made Christianity the official religion of the Holy Roman Empire, Roman Latin became the official language of Christianity. The only problem with Latin, however, is that its numbering system is very bulky and inefficient. Just try adding these three numbers: MCMLXVIII + CMXCIV + MCMLVII (= MMMMCMIXX). God help you if you needed to multiply or divide. Or try to determine how many days it is to next Easter. Salza says *"The Church has fought against syncretism throughout history. Such instances included attempts to combine elements of Christianity with Judaism, Greek philosophy, Zoroastrianism, Buddhism and ancient mystery religions. It was against the forces of syncretism that the Catholic Church developed her creeds and the canon of Scripture."* If the RCC was fighting syncretism, it wasn't fighting very hard. From Judaism it took the Old Testament and the prophesied Jewish Messiah; from the Greeks, language, art, and culture; from Zoroastrianism, Purgatory and the continuing battle between angels and demons; from Buddhism, monasticism and (indirectly) mathematics -- and from pagans, the dates of feasts and celebrations. It's no coincidence that Christmas is celebrated three days after the Winter Solstice (the pagan festival of Saturnalia) and Easter is the first Sunday after the first full moon after the Vernal Equinox (the celebration of Eastre, the Teutonic Goddess of Fertility.)

The Arabic numerals we use today for our mathematics actually came from India via ancient Sanskrit, the holy language of Hindus and Buddhists. So, at least in its secret financial documents, the Roman Catholic Church uses the syncretism of Hindu, Buddhism, and Islam -- taken from the very infidels they attempted to rid the world of during the Crusades.

Genesis 1:1 In the beginning God created the Heaven and the earth.

Who created heaven and the earth? How many Creator (Father) Gods are there?

Not a few of the gods created, or some of the gods created, or even all of the gods created -- heaven and earth were created by the one, true and living God, the Creator of all things great and small throughout an infinity of universes, from what we know, to what we imagine, to what we can't begin to imagine. Now here's the hard question: *what is the proper name of the one, true and living God of the Old Testament, the Father God of Jesus? Adon, Adonay, El, El Olam, El Roi, El Shaddai, Eleyon, Eloahor, Eloi, Elohim, Elowah, Hupistos, Hayah, Kurios, Shaddai, Yahweh* and dozens of other hyphenated descriptive names -- all in the Bible, all referring to the same God, all depending only on the time and place. *Allah*, the Father God of the Islamic world, is a dialectal variation of *Eloi*. Ironically, that means traditional adversaries — Christians, Jews, and Moslems — all share the same Father God as well as the same common ancestor, Abraham. Michael Baigent and Richard Lee in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Deception* put it this way:

The Dead Sea Scrolls offer a new perspective on the three great religions born in the Middle East. The more one examines those religions, the more one will discern not how much they differ, but how much they overlap and have in common — how much they derive from essentially the same source — and the extent to which most of the quarrels between them, when not precipitated by simple misunderstanding, have stemmed less from spiritual values than from politics, from greed, from selfishness and the presumptuous arrogance of interpretation. Judaism, Christianity, and Islam are all, at present, beset by a resurgent fundamentalism. One would like to believe — though this may be too much to hope for — the greater understanding of their common roots might help curb the prejudice, the bigotry, the intolerance and fanaticism to which fundamentalism is chronically prone.

On page 54 Salza destroys any academic credibility he might have had up to this point when he says, “*Masonry places emphasis on the spirituality and mysticism of the East as a source of wisdom and light. The Lodge also borrows from ancient pagan mystery religions, especially in the regeneration ceremony of the third degree (also discussed later). One can even see elements of Wicca and occultism in the Lodge’s esoteric liturgies.*”³ As we have already seen, the exclusive, unbroken source of Masonic wisdom light is the *Holy Bible, King James Version*. The Drama of the third degree is the same kind of allegorical morality play as the first and second degrees, with a bit more drama. The so-called “*regeneration ceremony*” will turn out to be no such thing.

But what really nails Salza is his footnote reference to Bill Schnoebelen, an impostor who claimed he was a former Alexandrian Wiccan Priest before he became a Freemason, ostensibly because of a similarity between the symbols of witchcraft and the symbols of Masonry, before “*giving his life to Christ*” in 1984. Yet while doing research on my book, *David vs. Goliath?*, a Wiccan minister played me a tape recording indicating that when confronted on a radio program in Seattle -- while on the air -- Schnoebelen was forced to admit he had never actually been an Alexandrian Witch at all. Not only that, in his book *Masonry Beyond The Light*, Schnoebelen claimed to have received his Masters Degree in Theological Studies degree from St. Francis School of Pastoral Ministry in 1980, during the time he was apparently not 'saved'.

On page 15 of the book, however, Schnoebelen claims, *"This was a time of considerable spiritual searching for me. I had been saved by Jesus while a member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS), known as the Mormons."* What's more, during the time he claims to have been a "witch", a Mormon, and a Freemason, his website says he was also attending Loras College in Dubuque, Iowa, which bills itself as *"The Premier Catholic Liberal Arts College."*

The following was taken from a flyer advertising one of Schnoebelen's public appearances in 2005:

Exposing The Illuminati from Within

Bill Schnoebelen was a Satanic and Voodoo High Priest, 2nd degree Church of Satan, New Age guru, occultist, channeler, 90th degree Mason, Knight Templar, and a member of the Illuminati. Bill shows how the conspiracy works and how it uses the Lodge and the highest echelons of power and technology from secret "black project" operations to form a world government.

The Sons of God and the Antichrist

Bill Schnoebelen has seen over 100 UFO's and studied them for over 40 years. He was a member of National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena NICAP. Interviewed over 100 people who have been abducted. including Christians. Bill will show pictures of physical evidence of the Sons of God. He will explain their connections to black magic, fallen angels DNA and how it relates to the Mark of the Beast and a counterfeit Gospel. Bill says the Sons of God will reveal themselves and be a part of deceiving millions of people, including Christians, into denying Jesus.

By the way, Schnoebelen claims to have gotten to the 90th Degree in "Palladium Masonry". Palladium Masonry was the fictitious creation of French pornographer Leo Taxil and part of his famous hoax discrediting the Catholic Church. As of December, 2003 his biography shows him to be *"a Naturopathic doctor, a Nutritional Herbologist and a Certified Natural Health Professional."* It should come as no surprise that the American Association of Naturopathic Physicians has never heard of him either. Salza concludes this subsection by stating, *"The focus of this chapter, however, is the current doctrines and practices of American Masonry. These include Masonry's understanding and worship of God, its view of morality as the basis for salvation, its belief in the resurrection of the body, and its ceremonial burial rites that publicly present these doctrines."* As Billy Boy Franklin paraphrased Joseph Goebbels' famous *argumentum ad nauseum* technique, *"If a lie is repeated often enough all the dumb jackasses in the world not only get to believe it, they even swear by it."* Freemasonry doesn't involve worship in any way, shape, or form; it does not dictate a specific path to salvation; nor does it require a belief in bodily resurrection -- no matter how many times Salza continues to repeat it.

Great Architect of the Universe

On page 55 Salza makes this preposterous claim: *Freemasonry's understanding of God differs from that of Christianity.* Let's get this straight right here and now. Freemasonry is a philanthropic fraternity. Christianity is a religion. Neither of them have an *"understanding of God."* It's not because God can't be understood, or doesn't want to be understood. It's because organizations, like the Freemasons or the Roman Catholic Church, do not have *"understanding."* Organizations have constitutions, by-laws, rules and regulations, rites of passage, policies and procedures, and the like. Only individuals can have understanding. Understanding of Freemasonry comes from knowledge and experience. Salza's understanding of Freemasonry is completely different from mine.

Perhaps he wasn't in it long enough to see past the superficial. Perhaps he went so fast that he missed much of the beauty and subtlety. Perhaps he got lost in Freemasonry's murky past of Theosophists trying to syncretize the basic principles of Masonry into any number of other "spiritual" pursuits. Perhaps he joined for the wrong reasons and his expectations went unfulfilled. Perhaps, God forbid, he just joined the fraternity to trash it. The unvarnished truth is that we Freemasons owe John Salza a sincere apology. *Either we failed to screen him more carefully, or we failed to educate him properly.* Freemasonry is not found in the Lodge Room, or in the Rituals, or in historical documents. Freemasonry it is found in the hearts of Freemasons. Salza continues on, *The Lodge sees God as the syncretistic Great Architect of the Universe who is worshipped in all religions, not the Triune God of the Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit revealed in the Person of Jesus Christ.* Frankly I don't see how Salza can tell this kind of bald-faced lie and continue to call himself a Christian. The Lodge, as we have shown, puts God in a position of deepest respect because He *is*, not he is seen as, the Great Architect of the Universe. That is, of course, unless Salza can come up with a different Father God, greater than the God of Genesis 1:1. This is a quote from one of Salza's separatist, Neofundamentalist cohorts, Anthony Grigor-Scott. Asked if a Freemason could also be a Christian he replied, "... not a single one of them is a Christian, including the pastors and ministers. They are for the most part Trinitarians, and the Trinity is of the Devil..." Reverend Grigor-Scott operates a ministry in Australia called Bible Believers. So which is it, Freemasons can't be Christians because they don't believe in the Trinity, or they can't be Christians because they do?

Now Salza quotes Carl Claudy (born in 1879), another Mason speaking for himself, who said "'A hundred paths may wind upward around a mountain; at the top they meet.'" Salza continues, *"Masonry's Great Architect of the Universe (GAOTU) is considered to be one God representing the deities of all religions."* The vast majority of Freemasons are Trinitarian Christians, as are the vast majority of Americans, so I can assure you that we Trinitarian Christian Freemasons most assuredly do believe in *"the Triune God of the Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit revealed in the Person of Jesus Christ."* That is exactly the Great Architect of the Universe who is revealed in the *Holy Bible, King James Version* that is located both on the altar in my Masonic Lodge and on the altar at my Church. Within the confines of the Lodge, the specific details of how other Trinitarian Christian, non-Trinitarian Christian, or even Non-Christian Masons define God or the transition to a future life is not my concern. Salza continues, *"As the term is used, it requires that all deities are equal and that no particular faith or creed is unique."* Nonsense. As the term is used, all faiths and creeds are considered equally unique and extraordinary, providing of course they include a belief in one true and living God and in a transition to a future life. You can easily see the fallacy of Salza's logic here. If Masons consider all religious beliefs as equals and Masons are indifferent to separate religious beliefs, then why are discussions of sectarian religious beliefs forbidden within the confines of the Lodge? I submit that the reason is because many Freemasons, myself included, are as passionate about our religion as we are about our Freemasonry. *"The origin of the name GAOTU is Freemasonry's rationalistic belief that God definitely reveals himself only through the geometrical perfection of the universe..."* says Salza near the bottom of page 55. What's wrong with that statement is threefold. First, GAOTU is not a name at all. It is just a series of the initials standing for the one five-word phrase describing just one of God's many attributes. The most common name for God in Masonic Lodge ritual is: "God".

Second, articles and prepositions don't rate capital letters in acronyms or abbreviations unless they are used for effect, so the United States of America is USA not TUSOA So the Great Architect of the Universe would be the GAU, not the GAOTU.

Third, of course, is that God is no more limited to revealing Himself *only* through geometry than He would be limited to revealing Himself *only* through the Bible, *only* through nature, *only* through the Roman Catholic Church, *only* through the Holy Spirit, or *only* through Jesus Christ. God can and does reveal Himself as whoever, however, whenever, wherever, and with whatever He wants.

On page 56 Salza alleges, “*Because geometry is Masonry’s best evidence of God’s existence, God is symbolized in American and other English-speaking Lodges by the Capital letter G, standing by Masonic tradition, for God, Geometry, and Gnosis.*” Here in Washington State the significance of the letter “G” is explained in the Fellowcraft degree. Here is exactly how it is presented, word for word in the Washington Monitor and Freemason’s Guide and cipher:

My Brother, I will now direct your attention to the letter “G” suspended in the East. The letter G is the initial of Geometry. Geometry, the first and noblest of sciences, is the basis upon which the superstructure of Freemasonry is erected. By Geometry we may curiously trace nature through her various windings to her most concealed recesses; by it, we discover the power, wisdom, and goodness of the great Artificer of the Universe, and view with delight the magnificent proportions which compose this vast machine; by it we trace the movements of the planets in their respective orbits and demonstrate their various revolutions; by it we account for the change of seasons, and the variety of scenes which each season displays to the discerning eye. Numberless worlds around us, all framed by the same Divine Artist, roll through the vast expanse, and are controlled by the same unerring law of Nature. My Brother, the letter “G” has a higher and holier signification. [*The Master raps the gavel three times to bring the entire Lodge to their feet*] It alludes to the sacred name of deity, before whom all, from the youngest Entered Apprentice in the northeast corner of the Lodge to the Worshipful Master in the East, should, with reverence, most humbly bow. [*All bow.*]

You’ll pardon me for pointing out that the Greek word *gnosis* is not mentioned here or anywhere else in the Fellowcraft degree -- or in the Entered Apprentice or Master Mason degrees either. It was just another buzzword inserted by Salza for no other reason than to inflame the passions of Christians reading the book. The next paragraph (on the bottom of page 56) is another example of his continuing *argumentum ad nauseum*, when he says “*The intended result of using one symbol and a unique name for this representation is not only to unite men of various faiths into one spiritual brotherhood; it is also to unite the various deities of the different religions into one spiritual godhead. You cannot unite the worshippers without also uniting the worshipped. The Masonic Bible calls this the unity of the Godhead (p.63).*”

Now we know why, when Salza asked his Masonic superiors for explanations, they told him he was taking things too way far. The one symbol is the letter “G” that represents the “*one, true and living God*”. The same God as in “*In God We Trust*”. The same God as in “*I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth...*” Freemasonry has absolutely nothing to do with “*trying to unite the various deities of the different religions,*” just as Freemasonry has absolutely nothing to do with worship or worshippers. And Salza’s so-called “Masonic Bible” is the *Holy Bible, King James Version with Masonic References*, compiled by the Heirloom Bible division and published by DeVore & Sons, of Wichita, KS, who, coincidentally, also publish the *Fireside School and Church Bible* through their Fireside Catholic Bibles division. On page 63, under the listing of Unity of God, we find:

Q. What is the doctrine of Freemasonry on this subject?

A. Freemasonry rejects both the blindness of atheism and the folly of polytheism; one of the most famous secrets of Masonic mysteries is “the unity of the Godhead”. One of the basic reasons for Freemasonry was the refutation of the ancients in the dogmas of “many gods.”

Wait a minute. Wasn't this Q & A listing supposed to indicate that the "unity of the Godhead" included polytheistic religions as equals to the Trinitarian Christian religion? Doesn't Salza subsequently list Brahma, Vishnu, and Shiva (all part of polytheistic Hinduism) as examples of that supposed syncretism? Yet the listing clearly says "the folly of polytheism" is "rejected by Freemasonry"! I guess it's just another of the many subtleties of Freemasonry that were apparently invisible to him while he was busy building his case.

Further down the page, Salza makes this statement "*Just like the Romans of the ancient world, who were happy to absorb the gods of the conquered peoples while maintaining devotion to the gods of hearth and home, Christian Freemasons are to be content with praying to the Triune God on Sunday morning and to the Grand Artificer on Monday night. But Jesus said: 'No one can serve two Masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other or he will be devoted to the one and despise the other. You cannot serve God and mammon.'* (Mt 6:24; cf. Lk 16:13)." This is still another example of his *argumentum ad nauseum* -- and it is really starting to get getting nauseating. Christian Freemasons *do not* worship in Lodge or pray to different "gods" different days of the week. For Trinitarian Christian Freemasons the Triune God of Sunday Morning is the only God, and therefore He *is* the Great Artificer of the Universe. Let me tell you more about the one, true and living God of Freemasonry:

He is the First and Last, the Beginning and the End!
He is the keeper of Creation and the Creator of all!
He is the Architect of the Universe and the Manager of all Times.
He always was, He always is, and He always will be
Unmoved, Unchanged, Undefeated, and never Undone!
He was bruised and brought healing!
He was pierced and eased pain!
He was persecuted and brought freedom!
He was dead and brought life!
He is risen and brings power!
He reigns and brings Peace!
The world can't understand him,
The armies can't defeat Him,
The schools can't explain Him, and The leaders can't ignore Him.
Herod couldn't kill Him,
The Pharisees couldn't confuse Him, and the people couldn't hold Him!
Nero couldn't crush Him,
Hitler couldn't silence Him,
The New Age can't replace Him, and Oprah can't explain Him away!
He is light, love, longevity, and Lord.
He is goodness, Kindness, Gentleness, and God.
He is Holy, Righteous, mighty, powerful, and pure.
His ways are right,
His word is eternal,
His will is unchanging, and
His mind is on me.
He is my Savior,
He is my guide, and He is my peace!
He is my Joy,
He is my comfort,
He is my Lord, and
He rules my life!

I serve Him because His bond is love,
His burden is light, and His goal for me is abundant life.
I follow Him because He is the wisdom of the wise,
The power of the powerful,
The ancient of days,
The ruler of rulers,
The leader of leaders,
The overseer of the overcomers, and is to come.
And if that seems impressive to you, try this for size.
His goal is a relationship with ME!
He will never leave me,
Never forsake me,
Never mislead me,
Never forget me,
Never overlook me and
Never cancel my appointment in His appointment book!
When I fall, He lifts me up!
When I fail, He forgives!
When I am weak, He is strong!
When I am lost, He is the way!
When I am afraid, He is my courage!
When I stumble, He steadies me!
When I am hurt, He heals me!
When I am broken, He mends me!
When I am blind, He leads me!
When I am hungry, He feeds me!
When I face trials, He is with me!
When I face persecution, He shields me!
When I face problems, He comforts me!
When I face loss, He provides for me!
When I face Death, He carries me Home!
He is everything for everybody everywhere, every time, and every way.
He is God, He is faithful. I am His, and He is mine!
My Father in heaven can whip the father of this world.
So, if you're wondering why I feel so secure, understand this:
He said it and that settles it.
God is in control, I am on His side, and that means all is well with my soul.

The quotes from the Bible (Matthew 6:24 and Luke 16:13) also do not apply to Freemasonry. Here Salza really shows his ignorance of the Bible. Matthew 6 is from the Sermon on the Mount, from the part commonly known as the Beatitudes. Essentially it is a description of how Jesus wants Christians to behave. Matthew 6:24 is part of the section that begins at verse 19 where Jesus is comparing treasures on earth vs. treasures in heaven -- spending your time on self aggrandizement vs. spending your time helping the less fortunate.

Matthew 6:19-33 Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal: But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal: For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also. The light of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light. But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!

No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon. Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment? Behold the fowls of the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they? Which of you by taking thought can add one cubit unto his stature? And why take ye thought for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: And yet I say unto you, That even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which to day is, and to morrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?

Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? (For after all these things do the Gentiles seek:) for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.

Luke 16:11-15 If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true riches? And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another man's, who shall give you that which is your own? No servant can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon. And the Pharisees also, who were covetous, heard all these things: and they derided him. And he said unto them, Ye are they which justify yourselves before men; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God.

So we can see that neither passage has anything to do with syncretizing different religious practices. The have to do with not focusing all our attention on gaining earthly riches (unrighteous mammon), but instead, focusing our attention on the true riches that come from unselfishly serving others (rich in good works). Paul further explains this in First Timothy:

1 Timothy 6:5-19 Perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself. But godliness with contentment is great gain. For we brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out. And having food and raiment let us be therewith content. But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.

But thou, O man of God, flee these things; and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness. Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life, whereunto thou art also called, and hast professed a good profession before many witnesses. I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and before Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession; That thou keep this commandment without spot, unrebukeable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ: Which in his times he shall shew, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honour and power everlasting. Amen.

Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not highminded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; That they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate; Laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life.

But Freemasonry isn't about hoarding and saving money -- its about Charity -- the exact opposite.

On the bottom of page 57, Salza says, "Another of the Lodge's syncretistic symbols for God is the All-Seeing Eye. The meaning of the symbol has clear connections to Enlightenment deism. Deists, commonly called 'free thinkers,' reject revealed truth and authoritative religious teaching in favor of purely rationalistic speculation about God (another reason Masonry calls itself 'free' and 'speculative'.) Deism thinks of God as the divine watchmaker, the All-Seeing Eye, who having created the world, no longer takes an active part in its course." This quote is so full of distortions, half-truths, and outright lies, I hardly know where to begin.

Continuing with his *argumentum ad nauseum*, alleges the All-Seeing Eye is once again an example of the syncretism of various religious practices. I submit that just like my previous example of God's universal principle of the Golden Rule, another of God's universal principles is that He has His All-Seeing Eye on you and I. As Christians we believe that God is not only watching us, but actually resides in us in the form of the Holy Spirit. The Lecture to the Master Mason puts it this way:

The Sword Pointing to a Naked Heart reminds us that justice will sooner or later overtake us; and although our thoughts, words, and actions may be hidden from the eyes of man, yet that *All-Seeing Eye*, whom the Sun, Moon, and Stars obey, and under whose watchful care even Comets perform their stupendous revolutions, pervades the innermost recesses of the human Heart, and will reward us according to our merits.

From the Great Light of Freemasonry, the *Holy Bible, King James Version*:

Proverbs 24:12 If thou sayest, Behold, we knew it not; doth not he that pondereth the heart consider it? and he that keepeth thy soul, doth not he know it? and shall not he render to every man according to his works?

Psalms 33:13-22 The LORD looketh from heaven; he beholdeth all the sons of men. From the place of his habitation he looketh upon all the inhabitants of the earth. He fashioneth their hearts alike; he considereth all their works. There is no king saved by the multitude of an host: a mighty man is not delivered by much strength. An horse is a vain thing for safety: neither shall he deliver any by his great strength. Behold, the eye of the LORD is upon them that fear him, upon them that hope in his mercy; To deliver their soul from death, and to keep them alive in famine. Our soul waiteth for the LORD: he is our help and our shield. For our heart shall rejoice in him, because we have trusted in his holy name. Let thy mercy, O LORD, be upon us, according as we hope in thee.

Matthew 16:27 For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works.

2 Corinthians 5:9-10 Wherefore we labour, that, whether present or absent, we may be accepted of him. For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.

Revelation 20:11-15 And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them. And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire.

Revelation 22:12 And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be.

It has already been pointed out above that Deism did not come about because of a revival of the worship of nature or ancient Egyptian gods. Deism came as a result of the rejection of traditional Western Christianity that had become “conspicuously cruel, intolerant, and corrupted.” But Salza loves this word *syncretism* -- so much so that he seems to see one under nearly every Masonic symbol. For example, on page 59 Salza states, “*Freemasonry consequently invites believers of every stripe to gather under the canopy of the GAOTU*” We have already established that “The covering of a Lodge is no less than the cloudy canopy or starry-decked Heaven...”, and that Freemasonry does not invite “*believers of every stripe.*” For the next several pages Salza continues on with another of his recurring themes: Whether it’s Coil, Mackey, Hall, Pike, Claudy or from old Short Talk Bulletins from the 1920’s and ‘30’s, he continues to quote the Theosophists of yesterday’s Freemasonry as if they were today’s leaders. Prefacing with phrases like “*In spite of the opinions of these prominent Masonic authorities, some Christian Masons...*” is a thinly veiled attempt to deceive the reader into believing that today’s Freemasonry is being led by men, some of whom have been dead for more than a century -- and whose personal reflections, some of which were already obsolete in their own day, are the official interpretations of the rites and ceremonies of today’s Freemasonry.

On page 61 Salza states boldly, “*For Christianity, the starting point for understanding the truth about God is the very mystery of the Trinity.*” I submit that the true starting point for understanding the truth about God is Genesis 1:1: *In the beginning God created the Heaven and the earth.* The rest of the Great Light tells us how and why. The concept of the Trinity isn’t even introduced to Christianity until the 4th Century, and, as we learned from Reverend Grigor-Scott above, not even every Christian believes in it. When Salza says “*For the Lodge, truth begins and ends with the GAOTU. Therefore the Masonic understanding of God is in profound conflict with that of the Christian faith,*” not only do I have to take exception, I have to acknowledge that I find this blatant untruth demeaning, distasteful, and extremely insulting. Like Almighty God, who *is* the Great Architect of the Universe among many other divine attributes, truth doesn’t begin and end, it just *is*. What Salza really means to say here is that his own, warped perception of what he calls “*the Masonic understanding of God*” is in profound conflict with his own, equally distorted perception of what he calls “*that of the Christian faith.*” In the Great Light of Freemasonry, the *Holy Bible, King James Version*, Jesus addressed this issue with the Apostles, and Paul with the forerunners of the Roman Catholic Church:

Mark 9:38-39 And John answered him, saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and he followeth not us: and we forbid him, because he followeth not us. But Jesus said, Forbid him not: for there is no man which shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me.

Luke 9:49-50 And John answered and said, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name; and we forbid him, because he followeth not with us. And Jesus said unto him, Forbid him not: for he that is not against us is for us.

Romans 14:1-12 Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations. For one believeth that he may eat all things: another, who is weak, eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth: for God hath received him. Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up: for God is able to make him stand.

One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks. For none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself.

For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's. For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living. But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God.

I further submit that if Salza's statement were true, there is no way any of the pastors and ministers, many of whom have spent a lifetime serving the Lord, would have ever joined the Fraternity, never mind remained members for decades.

Prayer and Worship

On page 62 Salza commits the sin of omission when he says, "*The name of Jesus Christ is deliberately omitted from Masonic prayers.*" The omission, of course, is that all other sectarian names for the *one, true and living God*, are also omitted. And here again his logic fails, for if the generic prayers offered were in fact a syncretistic view of God as he alleges, then the prayers should include, rather than exclude, at the very least, all the names of God used by the members present. If Salza had even a cursory knowledge of the Bible, then he'd also know that the New Testament contains hundreds of prayers to Father God through Christ, by the Apostles, by Paul, and by numerous others -- but not one of them ends with the phrase "*in Jesus' name.*" In the Washington Monitor and Freemasons' Guide, the Prayer at Opening is preceded by this phrase, "This or other appropriate form of prayer may be used." The very first sentence of the suggested prayer contains this clause, "*Thou hast promised that where two or three are gathered together in Thy name, Thou wilt be in the midst of them and bless them. In Thy name we assemble...*" To actually open the Lodge, the Master begins by saying, "*In the name of God... I now declare [Lodge Name and Number] open on the first [or second or third] degree...*" Now, to put this syncretism nonsense to bed once and for all, how many of these supposedly interchangeable Volumes of Sacred Law contain the promise of God to be among and bless them when two or three are gathered in His name? This is the only one I could find:

Matthew 18:19-20 Again I say unto you, That if two of you shall agree on earth as touching any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven. For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.

Perhaps I didn't search long or hard enough. Or, just perhaps, John Salza is just full of so much crap. On page 65 Salza says "*Approaching God in prayer as merely the 'Great Architect of the Universe' also fosters a very impersonal view of God and robs him (sic) of his (sic) divine essence.*" But we have already learned that the Great Architect of the Universe is just one of many descriptions of the one, true and living God of Freemasonry. The ritual prayers are only recommended -- Masons are welcome to approach God in any way they choose -- as long as the prayer is "appropriate." Appropriate means not intentionally offensive. That's because the Lodge room is supposed to be a refuge from the kind of in-your-face, sectarian divisiveness that is so characteristic of religious fundamentalism. The Lodge is, after all, primarily a philanthropic fraternity, not a religion; and the meetings are primarily business meetings or allegorical plays, not worship services. And, once again Salza indicates his immature understanding of the omnipotent, omnipresent, and omniscient Almighty God, the Architect, Creator, and Sustainer of the Universe. No man can rob God of His divine essence, any more than he can have any secrets from Him or hide from His all-seeing eye. I have already indicated that it is the fault of Freemasonry that Salza has such a warped view of the fraternity; the Roman Catholic Church will have to accept responsibility for his religious immaturity and ignorance.

On page 69 Salza says, "*Because of the dangers or relativism and syncretism, Christians should avoid praying with nonbelievers, most especially on a regular and systematic basis as occurs in the lodge (sic). Some argue that silent prayer would be more appropriate when both Christians and non-Christians are present. Silent prayer, however would defeat the objectives of the Lodge.*" Salza then goes on to spell out what he perceives those objectives to be when he says "*When Masons bow in unison before the letter G, calling on the GAOTU with the same prayers around the same altar of Freemasonry, they are in pursuit of the common goal of spiritual, not fraternal, fellowship.*" If a Christian is afraid to pray in the presence of non-Christians because he fears "*the dangers of relativism and syncretism,*" then I submit he is a very immature Christian. Mature Christians are called to be *in* the world but not *of* the world and lead exemplary lives among the non-Christians.

John 17:15-18 I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil. They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth. As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world.

1 Peter 2:11-17 Dearly beloved, I beseech you as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul; Having your conversation honest among the Gentiles: that, whereas they speak against you as evildoers, they may by your good works, which they shall behold, glorify God in the day of visitation. Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme; Or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of them that do well. For so is the will of God, that with well doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men: As free, and not using your liberty for a cloke of maliciousness, but as the servants of God. Honour all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honour the king.

I find it ironic that it is not the Gentiles who speak against Christian Freemasons as evildoers, but some of their less informed Christian brethren. And I hate to be the one to inform Salza that in my Lodges, we often call for silent prayer, called "a moment of silence," usually in respect for departed brethren, and especially for our soldiers who die overseas.

For mature Christians, including Christian Freemasons, exposure to people of other religions, cultures, and spiritual concepts is no threat to their faith; in fact, it is an opportunity to witness to them using the example of their own lives that actually enhances their Christian walk. And did you get the not-so-subtle message about when Masons are supposedly bowing “before the letter G?” We have already established that the “G” is the “initial of Geometry” but it represents God, before Whom “all... should humbly bow.” Freemasons do not bow before a letter, or the Worshipful Master, or anyone else in the Lodge except Almighty God, the Father Creator, and Sustainer of Heaven and Earth. He’s not only the GAOTU, but He’s also the FCASOHAE.

On page 71 Salza makes this statement and additional sin of omission, “*Although many Masons assume that the practice of their faith is encouraged by the Lodge, no such instruction exists in Masonic ritual. Masonry considers itself a completely self-sufficient system of religious and moral teaching whose members need nothing else to be spiritually edified, either in this life or the life to come...*” He then goes on to quote Daniel Sickles, once again someone who does not speak for Masonry but expresses his own personal opinion in his book *Ahimon Rezon or Freemasons Guide*. The sin of omission, of course, is that Salza failed to disclose that Sickles’ book was originally published in 1875. And, as we have already disclosed, the Mason’s duty to God includes “imploring His aid in all laudable undertakings, and by looking up to Him in every emergency for comfort and support.” Masonic Lodges, at least in Washington (and I’m pretty sure Wisconsin), are dedicated to God, St. John the Baptist (the harbinger of the Messiah), and St. John the Evangelist (the identifier of the Messiah). And the Great Light is the *Holy Bible, King James Version*. And in the ritual we learn what that meant to Hiram (and therefore should mean to Masons):

Masonic tradition informs us that, at the building of King Solomon’s Temple it was the daily custom of our Grand Master Hiram Abif, at high twelve, when the craft were called from Labor to Refreshment, to enter the temple, inspect the work and see if anything could be added for strength or ornament and draw designs on the trestle board. After which he entered the Sanctum Sanctorum or Holy of Holies to offer up his devotions to Deity. An altar being before you, in humble imitation of this pious custom, you will kneel and pray. This you may do orally or mentally, after which say “Amen.”

Up until this point in the Drama, the candidate is not blindfolded. he can clearly see the altar with the Holy Bible on it and he has just been specifically directed to kneel and pray to God. In the Lecture to the Master Mason, the Mason is encouraged to endeavor to emulate Hiram Abif, among other things, “...in his unfeigned piety to God.” Continuing on, Salza says, “*Freemasonry therefore, precludes the opportunity for religious dialogue and tolerance in the lodge, and certainly any opportunity to bear witness to Christ.*” Here in Washington State, Grand Lodge allows no “work” on Sundays, and the only two official Sunday Grand Lodge events are a joint church service with our Prince Hall brethren at a Baptist Church (Prince Hall is fully recognized by the Grand Lodge of Washington) and an annual service at the largest Episcopal church in Seattle. And at this past Grand Lodge, as Grand Musician, I was honored to be able to participate in Vesper Services for the Grand Master, the brethren, and their families that was officiated by Past Grand Chaplain, Archbishop and Most Reverend Delmer Tripp “Bud” Robinson, Ph.D., Th.D. The opening hymn was The Old Rugged Cross and the closing hymn was How Great Thou Art. There are plenty of opportunities to bear witness to Christ in Freemasonry -- just not during the business meetings or allegorical plays.

System of Morality

On page 72, Salza states “*Freemasonry defines itself as ‘a peculiar system of morality, veiled in allegory, and illustrated by symbols.’ No other benevolent fraternal order claims as much. But if Freemasonry truly can help mankind lead a morally better life, it is immoral to keep that knowledge to itself behind the secrecy of the lodge doors.*” Now we are getting back to the core of Salza’s unique perception of Freemasonry: his apparent belief that any system of morality, other than the specific, sectarian system of morality taught by the Roman Catholic Church is a religion of its own; and that any group of people who choose to open their meetings with generic prayers not specifically endorsed by the RCC is praying to a syncretistic god or gods. My *Washington Monitor and Freemason’s Guide* does not contain the word “peculiar” in the definition, as does the *Holy Bible, King James Version with Masonic References* that Salza calls the “Masonic Bible.” Perhaps that is just another example of what Salza considers a landmark, a principle universal to all of Freemasonry, that isn’t universal at all. Salza should have kept reading under the listing for Definition of Freemasonry. If he had, he would have read this: “Freemasonry is not, however, a system of religion; it is the handmaiden to religion, enforcing its daily practice.” Is this so-called “peculiar” system of morality, that is taught by symbols and allegorical plays called degrees, a secret being kept behind the Lodge doors? Personally I find the only secret being kept behind the Lodge doors is that many of the Stated (business) Meetings can be pretty dull and boring. The *Monitor* completely discloses the system of morality by stating that Lodges are dedicated to God, St. John the Baptist and St. John the Evangelist, and that the *Holy Bible, King James Version* is the Great Light -- as well as disclosing the meanings of the symbols. The only thing “peculiar” about it is the specific content of some of the degree work, known as the “modes of recognition” and the obligations. But even those are not really secret, because since *Anderson’s Constitutions* were written in the early 1700’s, every few years someone comes along who just cannot resist the temptation to make money by selling still another so-called unmasking of what isn’t really masked at all.

On page 74 Salza makes these preposterous claims: “*Since American Masonic Lodges are predominantly Christian and Jewish, one would suppose that the Craft would, at a minimum, make reference to the Ten Commandments in its teachings.*” This is amazing. Salza has just spent 73 pages of the book trying to convince his reader that Freemasonry is a syncretistic haven for all kinds of monotheistic and polytheistic religious beliefs, indifferent to sectarian religion, now, suddenly, he claims “*American Masonic Lodges are predominantly Christian and Jewish*”. So which is it, American Masonic Lodges are “*indifferent to Christianity*” or “*predominantly Christian and Jewish*”? The answer, of course, is that neither statement is correct. American Masonic Lodges aren’t “*indifferent*” or “*predominantly Christian and Jewish.*” The religious beliefs American Freemasons are distributed in roughly the same percentages as the general population, with the obvious exception of atheists. The Ten Commandments present an interesting theological problem that clearly demonstrates why it is necessary that sectarian divisiveness should be left outside the Lodge room. *What are the Ten Commandments?*

Ten Commandments the ethical commandments of God given according to biblical accounts to Moses by voice and by writing on stone tablets on Mount Sinai

The table on the next page shows the two most common versions:

<i>Commandments Exodus 20:1-17</i>	<i>Catholic/Lutheran</i>	<i>Protestant/Masonic</i>
<i>1 And God spake all these words, saying,</i>		
<i>2 I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. 3 Thou shalt have no other gods before me.</i>	I	I
<i>4 Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: 5 Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; 6 And shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.</i>		II
<i>7 Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain.</i>	II	III
<i>8 Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. 9 Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: 10 But the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: 11 For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it.</i>	III	IV
<i>12 Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.</i>	IV	V
<i>13 Thou shalt not kill.</i>	V	VI
<i>14 Thou shalt not commit adultery.</i>	VI	VII
<i>15 Thou shalt not steal.</i>	VII	VIII
<i>16 Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.</i>	VIII	IX
<i>17 Thou shalt not covet... thy neighbour's wife...</i>	IX	X
<i>17 Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, ... nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbour's.</i>	X	

So we can see that even in Christendom, there is no universal agreement as to which are the “Ten” Commandments. So are there two different sets of the Ten Commandments? No, there are at least three, because in Exodus 34 we are presented with a whole new set of Commandments. What happened between Exodus 20 and Exodus 34? Moses came down from Mt. Sinai with the tablets and found that the Chosen People had abandoned their God and were worshipping and making sacrifices to a golden calf idol. So Moses did what any godly man would do -- he lost his temper and smashed the tablets (with God’s own handwriting on both sides of the stones) to pieces.

Exodus 32:26-28 Then Moses stood in the gate of the camp, and said, Who is on the Lord's side? let him come unto me. And all the sons of Levi gathered themselves together unto him. And he said unto them, Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, Put every man his sword by his side, and go in and out from gate to gate throughout the camp, and slay every man his brother, and every man his companion, and every man his neighbour. And the children of Levi did according to the word of Moses: and there fell of the people that day about three thousand men.

Now read this next verse carefully.

Exodus 34:1 And the Lord said unto Moses, Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first: and I will write upon these tables the words that were in the first tables, which thou brakest.

God did not give the Children of Israel only X Commandments, He gave them the DCXIII (613) Commandments! -- the first 10, and therefore presumably the most important, are:

<i>The Ten Commandments Exodus 34:14-28</i>	Second	First
<i>27 And the Lord said unto Moses, Write thou these words: for after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel. 28 And he was there with the Lord forty days and forty nights; he did neither eat bread, nor drink water. And he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments.</i>		
<i>14 For thou shalt worship no other god: for the Lord, whose name is Jealous, is a jealous God: 15 Lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land, and they go a whoring after their gods, and do sacrifice unto their gods, and one call thee, and thou eat of his sacrifice; 16 And thou take of their daughters unto thy sons, and their daughters go a whoring after their gods, and make thy sons go a whoring after their gods.</i>	I	I
<i>17 Thou shalt make thee no molten gods.</i>	II	I/II
<i>18 The feast of unleavened bread shalt thou keep. Seven days thou shalt eat unleavened bread, as I commanded thee, in the time of the month Abib: for in the month Abib thou camest out from Egypt.</i>	III	-
<i>19 All that openeth the matrix is mine; and every firstling among thy cattle, whether ox or sheep, that is male. 20 But the firstling of an ass thou shalt redeem with a lamb: and if thou redeem him not, then shalt thou break his neck. All the firstborn of thy sons thou shalt redeem. And none shall appear before me empty.</i>	IV	-
<i>21 Six days thou shalt work, but on the seventh day thou shalt rest: in earing time and in harvest thou shalt rest.</i>	V	III /IV
<i>22 And thou shalt observe the feast of weeks, of the firstfruits of wheat harvest, and the feast of ingathering at the year's end.</i>	VI	-
<i>23 Thrice in the year shall all your men children appear before the Lord God, the God of Israel. 24 For I will cast out the nations before thee, and enlarge thy borders: neither shall any man desire thy land, when thou shalt go up to appear before the Lord thy God thrice in the year.</i>	VII	-
<i>25 Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leaven; ...</i>	VIII	-
<i>25 ...neither shall the sacrifice of the feast of the passover be left unto the morning.</i>	IX	-
<i>26 The first of the firstfruits of thy land thou shalt bring unto the house of the Lord thy God. Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother's milk.</i>	X	-

Exodus 34:1 clearly says that this is the same Ten Commandments as the originals in Exodus 20.

Some religious Jews oppose the posting of the Ten Commandments in public schools, as they feel it is wrong for public schools to teach their children Judaism. The argument is that if a Jewish parent wishes to teach their child to be a Jew (as most do), then this education should come from practicing Jews, and not from non-Jews. This position is based on the demographic fact that the vast majority of public school teachers in the United States are not Jews; the same is true for the students. This same reasoning and position is also held by many believers in other religions. Many Christians have some concerns about this as well; for example, can Catholic parents count on Protestant or Orthodox Christian teachers to tell their children their particular understanding of the commandments? Differences in the interpretation and translation of these commandments, as can be seen above, can sometimes be significant.

Ironically, the whole Ten Commandments thing is a moot issue for Christians. Paul spends a great deal of time in his Epistles convincing the fledgling Christian Church that Jesus Christ is the Fulfillment of the Law (of Moses), therefore Christians are no longer to required to live under it or be judged by it.

Hebrews 8:5-12 Who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle: for, See, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount. But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises. For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: And they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more. In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away.

On page 75 Salza tries confuse the issue even further by claiming that because some preference is given to poor and distressed Masons, somehow that makes Masonic charity different from Christian charity. On the next page, he'll even claim that a Mason's giving preference to the treatment of his own or another Mason's wife, mother, sister or daughter means that a Mason could have "*carnal intercourse with non-Masonically affiliated women*" without penalty. Nothing could be further from the truth. First of all, according to Washington work, the Master Mason is precluded from "violating the chastity" of another Mason's wife, mother, sister, or daughter. "Violating the chastity" means a lot more than simply "*illicit carnal intercourse.*" It specifically means avoiding any "impurity in conduct or intention" in front of women. In addition, the Closing Charge, given to the Lodge by the Master before dismissing the Brethren, contains these statements: "We are about to quit this ...retreat... to mingle again with the outer world. Amid its concerns and employments, forget not the duties which you have heard so frequently inculcated and so forcefully recommended, in this Lodge... These generous principles extend further, for every human being has a claim upon your kind offices." That means all the principles the Mason has learned through the symbols and allegorical plays called degrees during the Lodge meetings now need to be applied to the Mason's daily life -- and that those same principles that he learned to apply to Freemasons during the allegorical plays now need to be applied to "every human being." It should be patently obvious that should a Mason be guilty of such conduct in front of a lady, he would be immediately expelled from the Fraternity.

In the pages following Salza will use that same distortion of the truth to claim that Masons have to protect other Masons that are criminals, that "*if a man is physically or psychologically challenged and cannot perform these gestures [secret signs of self-mutilation], he is not allowed into Freemasonry's system of morality,*" and the most asinine claim of all, "*denying membership to females...*"

From the current Constitution and By-laws of the Grand Lodge of Washington:

Sec. 27.01 Const. (Constitution)

Masonic Conduct. A Mason's conduct is judged as that of a Master Mason and subject to the discipline as provided in the Washington Masonic Code.

Sec. 27.02 Const.

Classes of Masonic Offenses. Masonic offenses are of two classes:

1. Those acts which are morally wrong in themselves; and
2. Those acts which are wrongful only because they are expressly prohibited or enjoined.

Sec. 18.03 B.L. (By-laws)

Sole Test. The Lodge shall itself determine a petitioner's physical qualifications by the sole test of whether any disability in his body renders him incapable of conforming reasonably to what the several degrees require of him.

Sec. 28.10 B.L.

Verdict in Criminal Proceeding. A guilty verdict in a criminal proceeding is, on the face of it, evidence and creates a presumption of fact that a crime has been committed.

So we can see that Section 27 of the Constitution clearly indicates that any act that is morally wrong is subject to discipline. Section 28 of the By-laws clearly defines a guilty verdict in a criminal proceeding is presumption of misconduct. (Salza says he got his distorted view from Edmund Ronayne's *Handbook of Freemasonry*, a book that was already obsolete when it was originally printed in 1901.) Section 18.03 of the By-laws indicates that the determination of whether or not a petitioner has sufficient physical and mental faculties to participate in the degrees rests solely with the Lodge itself. For the past two years, my primary Lodge has performed more degrees work than any other Lodge in the jurisdiction, and I have never witnessed any instance where a candidate was refused admission because of a perceived physical or mental defect. One even went through the entire Master Mason degree in a wheelchair! As for not admitting females, Freemasonry is, after all, a philanthropic *fraternity* -- a brotherhood -- not a *sorority* (sisterhood)!

On page 78 Salza tries to play the race card, except that his obvious lack of knowledge of American history is showing. Fr. Augustus Tolton became the first black Roman Catholic Priest in 1886. He could have been ordained sooner, except, according to his official biography, "...the American Catholic Church did not allow Black men to be admitted to studies in United States seminaries... Tolton's increasing popularity unleashed both hidden racism and the jealousy of both Catholic and non-Catholic ministers in the area... The extent of the persecution Tolton received especially from the other Catholic pastor in Quincy [IL] (Fr. Weiss) led to his transfer from Quincy to Chicago." The US Armed Forces were racially segregated until Brother Harry S Truman, President of the US and Past Grand Master of Missouri, integrated the services in 1950. The point is, of course, that well into the 20th Century, racial segregation was the norm in the USA -- and none of us should be proud of that part of our history. At one point in time, fifteen percent of the men in the US were members of the Ku Klux Klan. Most of the rational ones, however, left that organization when it changed from a benevolent, self-help society into the violent, racist, domestic terrorist group it is today.

Now let's clear up any misconceptions you might have about the "apron" and Freemasonry. This is the Apron Lecture from the Entered Apprentice Degree in it's entirety, taken directly from the *Washington Monitor and Freemason's Guide*:

[My brother, I now present you with this] lambskin or white leather apron. It is an emblem of innocence and the badge of a Mason; more ancient than the Golden Fleece or Roman Eagle; and, when worthily worn, more honorable than the Star and Garter, or any other order that could be conferred upon you, at this time, or at any future period, by King, Prince, Potentate, or any other person, except he be a Mason. It is hoped that you will wear this emblem with equal pleasure to yourself and honor to the Fraternity.

[Optional:] It is yours to wear throughout an honorable life and, at your death, to be placed upon the coffin that shall contain your mortal remains, and be with them laid in their final resting place. Let its pure and spotless surface be to you an ever-present reminder of a purity of life and rectitude of conduct, a never-ending inspiration for nobler deeds, for higher thoughts, for greater achievements; and when at last your weary feet shall have come to the end of life's toilsome journey, may the record of your life and actions be as pure and spotless as this fair emblem. [Take it, carry it to the Senior Warden in the West who will teach you how to wear it as an Entered Apprentice Mason.

Senior Warden: My Brother, at the building of King Solomon's Temple there were three classes of workmen and each, as a distinctive badge, wore their aprons in a peculiar manner: Entered Apprentices, being hewers of wood and stone wore theirs with the bib turned up so as to protect their clothing. In this manner you will wear yours as an Entered Apprentice Mason.

Did you see or hear any reference to a "*Great White Throne?*" Was the "white leather or lambskin" apron really "more ancient than the Golden Fleece or Roman Eagle"? One only has to look at ancient statues and carvings to see the importance of aprons in early cultures and civilizations. For example, initiates of the proto-Christian Essenes, Mithras, and Saducees of Jesus' day wore aprons, as did the ancient initiates of early Chinese societies, Mayans, Incas, and Aztecs. More recent civilizations such as the Hopi, Vikings, and Zulus wore aprons as emblems of high office. Aprons frequently adorn the statues of Greek, Roman, and ancient Egyptian gods. The Ancient Persians also used the apron as a national emblem. Therefore the apron as a symbol of "work" or "labor" is almost as old as time itself.

Genesis 3:7 And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons .

And no, Adam was not the first Freemason. His apron was not made of lambskin or white leather and it was not presented to him as a badge of honor. Adam's apron was homemade, made of fig leaves, and represents man's futile attempt to justify himself and hide his sin from God; just as his book, *Masonry Unmasked*, is John Salza's fig leaf apron, and as such it represents his own futile attempt to justify himself as a self-confessed liar. On the bottom of page 81 Salza makes what I consider to be the most egregious statement to this point:

The building of the spiritual temple, in the Lodge's system of morality, thus is not just a matter of living a moral life; it is a way of earning the reward of heaven. Through the symbolism of the Rough Ashlar, the Common Gavel, and the Masonic apron, Freemasonry makes a statement about what it believes is necessary to gain admission into heaven: a Mason's good conduct, no matter what religion he professes. In other words, Freemasonry teaches that Masons make themselves fit before God and gain eternal life by their own works, independent of God's grace through faith in Jesus Christ. Masonry thus identifies religion with morality while ignoring the theological differences of its members. This moralization of religion renders Christianity nothing more than a system of ethical behavior useful for helping one lead a better life, instead of the exclusive means by which God in his (sic) mercy calls us to eternal life in his only-begotten Son.

This is just a reiteration of the same false premises on which Salza has based his opinions of Freemasonry and therefore much of this book. As I clearly stated before, heaven is the hoped-for destination of Freemasons, not one that is guaranteed simply by joining the fraternity.

The *Rough Ashlar* is a stone as taken from the quarry in its rude and natural state. The *Common Gavel* is an instrument used by operative masons to break off the corners of rough stones, the better to fit them for the builder's use; but we, as Free and Accepted Masons, are taught to make use of it for the more noble and glorious purpose of divesting our hearts and consciences of all the vices and superfluities of this life, thereby fitting our minds, as living stones, for that spiritual building -- that house not made with hands -- eternal in the heavens.

Freemasonry never claims that it is a closed system of morality where "*Masons make themselves fit before God and gain eternal life by their own works.*" If that were the case, we wouldn't need each Mason to acknowledge God, a future life, and a transition to the same and especially, we wouldn't need the Holy Bible on the altar as the ultimate *rule and guide of our faith*. If that were the case, none of the Priests, Pastors, Elders, Deacon Chairmen, and other devout churchmen -- who see no conflict between their Masonry and their Ministry -- would have joined the fraternity to begin with, or remained lifelong Masons. If that were the case, atheists would make ideal Masons. Obviously, that's not the case. Freemasonry simply illuminates the path to heaven, *it is not the path itself*. Apparently that was another concept too subtle for John Salza to grasp.

We Christians know that "the way" to eternal life is revealed in the Person of Jesus Christ, yet we also know that not everyone can see it. But it's not up to us to try to force it on them. The Ten Commandments were replaced by a much stricter law, encompassed in the Four Commandments: *Love God, Love each other, Love your neighbor, and Love your enemies*. What does the *Holy Bible*, the Great Light of Freemasonry, say about how you determine who is godly and who is not?

*2 Corinthians 5:9-10 Wherefore we labour, that, whether present or absent, we may be accepted of him. For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to **that he hath done**, whether it be good or bad.*

*Revelation 20:11-15 And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them. And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man **according to their works**. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire.*

*Revelation 22:12 And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man **according as his work shall be**.*

*Matthew 16:27 For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man **according to his works**.*

While the gift of salvation is provided through faith in and by the grace of God, the Bible clearly and repeatedly states that each man's ultimate heavenly reward is based solely "according to his works" or "that he hath done." It's a subtle but important distinction: In Masonic ritual, Faith, Hope, and Charity are denoted as the "principle rounds," or most important steps, of Jacob's ladder, but they are definitely not the only rounds. Freemasonry does not provide any path to salvation beyond those first three rounds (the rest is up to the individual Freemason); nor does Freemasonry guarantee immortality (it only instructs the Mason to have the "hope" of the same). What Freemasonry does provide is plenty of opportunities to provide "charity to all mankind." Now Salza has me repeating myself.

1 Corinthians 13:11-13 When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child: but when I became a man, I put away childish things. For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known. And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity.

I'm sorry to have to be the one to tell him this but Salza's theology is skewed as his perception of Freemasonry. The greatest of these is not faith or hope -- it's charity -- which is why Freemasonry is based on it. Organizations based primarily on faith are churches. Organizations based primarily on hope are schools. Organizations based primarily on charity are philanthropies.

John 3:16-21 For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved. But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God.

John 3:16 and 3:18 are not the only verses in the Bible, and if they are not interpreted in the context of the whole Gospel, then they can easily lead to the false conclusion that all one needs to be "saved" is to "believe on Jesus." Read it carefully. This passage does not say "he that comes into the light does truth." It says the one who does truth comes into the light.

This is just a paraphrase of what Jesus said earlier:

John 15:1-17 I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away: and every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit. Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you. Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches: He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me ye can do nothing. If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned. If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you. Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be my disciples. As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you: continue ye in my love. If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love. These things have I spoken unto you, that my joy might remain in you, and that your joy might be full.

This is my commandment, That ye love one another, as I have loved you. Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends. Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you. Henceforth I call you not servants; for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth: but I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you. Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain: that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, he may give it you. These things I command you, that ye love one another.

Jesus says he is the True Vine and his Father is the Vintner. God the Father doesn't care what you call yourself or what you say you believe, he only cares that you bear fruit. And if you don't bear fruit you're dead wood. Every branch that bears fruit gets pruned so it can produce even more. Even more than that, Jesus says that without Him, you can't produce any fruit at all -- and the abundance of the fruit is how God shows his approval. What does the Bible say about those who try to tear others down who are producing His fruit?

Mark 9:38-41 And John answered him, saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and he followeth not us: and we forbid him, because he followeth not us. But Jesus said, Forbid him not: for there is no man which shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me. For he that is not against us is on our part. For whosoever shall give you a cup of water to drink in my name, because ye belong to Christ, verily I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward.

Matthew 7:18-23 A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them. Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity.

That means in no uncertain terms that John Salza is on dangerous ground here. Isn't he trying to cast out the devils of Freemasonry, even though he is forced to admit that the fruit of Masonic charity (donations of nearly three million dollars a day) is substantial?

Resurrection of the Body

On page 85 Salza makes one of the most outrageous and demonstrably false claims of the book when he says, *"It is the third degree that teaches the most sublime of all Masonic beliefs: the resurrection of the body and the immortality of the soul."* What's wrong with this picture, of course, is that all of the documents he has cited so far have gone way out of the mainstream to demonstrate that the cited so-called Masonic authorities did not believe Freemasonry was a Christian organization. First he claimed that it was a *syncretism* of Christianity with other religions. Then he attempted to prove it was actually *indifferent* toward Christianity. Next, after using several pages to describe part of the Third Degree allegorical play called the Drama (which is actually a play within a play) he concludes by skipping right over the most important part of the degree. *"Right after the Mason is raised, he is given a lecture that articulates the meaning of the Hiram Legend and, thus, the third degree. That meaning is a testament to Masonry's 'faith in the resurrection of the body and the immortality of the soul.'"* Now he is attempting to prove it is Christianity. Neither my cipher nor Monitor makes any direct reference at all to *"the resurrection of the body and the immortality of the soul."* In fact, the meaning is so obvious that it is right in the *Washington Monitor and Freemason's Guide* for all to see:

Hence, my Brother, how important it is that we should endeavor to imitate our Grand Master Hiram Abif in his truly exalted and exemplary character, in his unfeigned piety to God, and in his inflexible fidelity to his trust; that we may be prepared to welcome death, not as a grim tyrant, but as a kind messenger sent to translate us from this imperfect to that all-perfect, glorious, and celestial Lodge above, where the Supreme Grand Master of the Universe forever presides.

“Once the veil of this allegorical drama is lifted, one can only conclude that the Mason, without forewarning, has just been reborn (‘raised’) into a new religious faith through symbolic death, burial, and resurrection.” Now Salza has really gone over the top. Trying to equate what happens in the allegorical plays called degrees with reality, never mind religion, is just silly.

First, all three degrees, not just the Master Mason degree, are allegorical and they are all part of the same drama. There are three’s all over the place. Three principle officers, three great lights, three lesser lights, three orders of architecture, three symbolic pillars, three cardinal virtues, three errant Fellowcrafts, three gates, three craftsmen, three north, three south, three east, three west, three grips, three words, *etc., etc.* So that means the Freemason is baptized into the Trinity, right? Of course not. Does every Christian denomination that uses the Bible as the rule and guide of their faith believe in the Trinity? Of course not. It took nearly 400 years for the Roman Catholic Church to “unanimously” agree that Father and Son were even made out of the same substance. The Trinitarian Godhead was invented by Athanasius of Alexandria to distinguish the Orthodox believers from the dualism of the Gnostic Christians, and the Unitarian Christians. And it was only unanimous because, as always, the so-called catholic (universal) Church excommunicated and disfellowshipped all the dissenters.

Second, the raising of Hiram Abif is not symbolic of the resurrection of the body, even if it is mislabeled by some as being raised from a *“dead level to a living perpendicular.”* Since the Working Tools of the Fellowcraft Mason are the Plumb, Square, and Level, the Monitor says, “The Plumb admonishes us to walk uprightly in our several stations before God and man, squaring our actions by the Square of Virtue, and remembering that we are traveling upon the Level of Time to that undiscovered country from whose bourne no traveler returns.” If we are “walking uprightly” while “traveling upon the Level of Time,” we are not “dead level” but quite alive, thank you.

Once again Salza is guilty of the sin of omission. His description of the Drama leaves us after the almost-Master Mason (playing the part of Hiram Abif) has been raised from the second of three grave sites. His goal, of course, is to make the reader think that the candidate has just been symbolically raised from the dead. *But that’s not what occurred!* The candidate was not raised from the dead, nor was Hiram Abif, the character he was playing. The character was lifted out of the grave by the characters King Solomon and King Hiram of Tyre, after the character of King Solomon makes this declaration: Most Excellent King Hiram, you will form the Craft in Grand Procession and go with me to raise the body of our Grand Master Hiram Abif and bring it to the temple for more decent interment...” Does the now-supposedly-resurrected Hiram Abif go back to work on the Temple, astonishing all his friends and coworkers? Of course not! The Lecture, the part Salza just skipped over lightly, tells us exactly what happened:

My Brother, the body of our Grand Master Hiram Abif was buried three times: First in the rubbish of the temple, second, on the brow of a hill west of Mt. Moriah, and lastly, as near to the Sanctum Sanctorum or Holy of Holies of the temple as the Jewish law would permit; and Masonic tradition informs us that there was a marble monument erected to his memory...

What, they resurrected him from the grave on Mt. Moriah so they could bury him alive in a marble monument near the Holy of Holies?

Here we have to temporarily leap forward to pages 97 and 98 where Salza returns to his resurrection symbolism and tries to justify the unjustifiable, when he says, “*The problem with this argument is that the ritual and a plethora of other Masonic authorities expressly state that the raising of the candidate symbolically testifies to the Masonic faith in the resurrection of the body. While the Masonic lecture provides that Hiram was literally reburied, it also shows him being symbolically raised from the dead.*” Once again he completely misses the point. It doesn’t matter to Freemasonry what a “plethora” of other Masons think. It only matters what the individual Mason thinks. If Joseph Fort Newton (another devout Christian minister who found no conflict between his Masonry and his Ministry) wants to believe it symbolizes the bodily resurrection of *Revelation* he certainly may. But unlike a religion, Freemasonry does not dictate this or any other dogmatic belief to its members. Symbols are symbols because they symbolize what the observer wants them to symbolically represent -- therefore a symbol does not have to represent only one person, place, thing, or idea. The only “*Masonic authorities*” are the current Grand Masters. No one Mason (or plethora of Masons) speaks for all of Freemasonry, all Freemasons, or even another Mason -- no matter how thick their book is. Digging himself further into the pit, Salza says “*Another problem with the reinterment argument is that the candidate is never reburied, either actually or symbolically, at any time after the raising.*” But the candidate was informed of the purpose of the disinterment of the body of the character Hiram Abif. Remember King Solomon’s declaration -- “...to raise the body of our Grand Master Hiram Abif and bring it to the temple for more decent interment...”? Ironically Salza almost gets it right when he says that “*Masons making the reinterment argument ... forget that Freemasonry is ‘veiled in allegory which will unfold its beauties to the candid and illustrious inquirer.’*” But you can see where he missed it when you look back on page 86 when he said, “*Before the Hiramic Legend commences, the Master Mason degree proceeds in a fashion similar to that of the Entered Apprentice and Fellowcraft degrees.*” What he was supposed to realize was that the Drama contained certain key information from the Entered Apprentice and Fellowcraft degrees that the candidate was required to be proficient in before being allowed to take the Master Mason degree. That means, the allegory of the “Hiramic Legend” actually begins with the initiation of the Entered Apprentice and ends when the lambskin or white leather apron and the sprig of Acacia are placed upon the Mason’s coffin just before burial.

Returning to page 91, Salza makes this bizarre statement, “*Following the lecture explaining the degree, the Master Mason is presented with a Masonic Bible. The Masonic Bible, which I cite throughout this book, offers further catechesis on Freemasonry’s belief in the resurrection of the body...*” What makes this bizarre, of course, is: why is the newly raised Master Mason given the *Holy Bible, King James Version with Masonic References* instead of, say, the *New International Version*, or even the *New American Bible*? Why isn’t the candidate presented with a holy book from each of the supposedly syncretized religions, along with a study guide of the various supporting scriptures in each one? Or better still, why isn’t he presented a Bible with all the overtly Christian references blacked out, or removed altogether? Then he continues, “*It was the problem of Masonry’s teaching on the resurrection that finally convinced me to leave the Lodge.*” More bizarre nonsense. If Salza had researched Freemasonry a little less from obsolete books and more from the hearts of current Masons, then some of the subtle distinctions I have pointed out would have become obvious to him. What convinced him to leave the Lodge was when he discovered that the Lodge would not be a source of wealthy potential clients, and he realized he could make a few extra bucks by selling a book “unmasking” the supposedly secret Masonic non-secrets. It’s obvious from his website that what he enjoys most is email sparring with people with inferior intellects and trying to scripturally justify Roman Catholicism.

Salza uses this logic:

- A. *Freemasonry believes in a bodily resurrection to the celestial lodge above*
- + B. *Freemasonry does not believe in the necessity of faith in Jesus Christ*
- = Freemasonry is incompatible with Christianity

As noted before, both of his premises are wrong, and therefore so is his conclusion.

Premise A: Some Freemasons (Christians) believe in a bodily resurrection to the Celestial Lodge above. Then again some do not. Some Freemasons believe in a spiritual resurrection to the Celestial Lodge above. Some Freemasons believe heaven is a real place. Some believe it is an imaginary place. *Freemasonry* doesn't believe anything because belief is a human trait.

Premise B: Some Freemasons do not believe in the necessity of faith in Jesus Christ, either for their eternal salvation or to participate in a philanthropic fraternity. Most Freemasons (Christians) believe in the necessity of faith in Jesus Christ for their eternal salvation, but they do not believe in the necessity of faith in Jesus Christ to participate in a philanthropic fraternity. Once again, *Freemasonry* doesn't believe anything because belief is a human trait.

Conclusion: For nearly all Freemasons, their *Freemasonry* and their Christianity are more than compatible -- in fact, each enhances the other -- because *Freemasonry* is a philanthropic fraternity (charity-based), while Christianity is a religion (faith-based). The remainder don't really care if *Freemasonry* and Christianity are compatible or not -- because they're not Christians.

Salza then continues down the same false path, "*In the Master Mason degree, immortality is presented as an unmistakable truth into which the candidate is initiated. Moreover, because not all religions believe in bodily resurrection proves that Masonry has its own religious beliefs independent of the faith of its members.*" The candidate is not initiated into the unmistakable truth of immortality in the Master Mason degree. We have already established that *before he is even permitted to become a Mason*, the candidate has to assent to a belief in "a transition to a future life." We have also shown that being lifted out of one grave to be buried in another is not resurrection. And we have shown that Masonry doesn't "believe" anything because belief is a human trait, so *Freemasonry* can't possibly have beliefs "independent of the faith [beliefs] of its members." And after pages and pages of quotes from the Bible and seemingly endless encyclicals, Papal decrees, and other Catholic mumbo-jumbo showing that Jesus Christ is the only way to eternal salvation, he finally admits that is not the current official position of the Church. "*The Church has always taught that 'those who, through no fault of their own, do not know the gospel of Christ or his Church, but nevertheless seek God with a sincere heart, and, moved by grace, try in their actions to do his will as they know it through the dictates of their conscience -- those too may achieve eternal salvation.'*" This statement, part of what is known as the *Lumen Gentium* of the 1964 Council commonly known as Vatican II. This is just another of those forward-thinking precepts that are being rolled back by the current Neofundamentalist leadership.

Certain traditional Catholic and Sedevacantist groups consider *Lumen Gentium* to be the demarcation of when the Roman Church fell into heresy, pointing to the use of "*subsistit in*" rather than "*est*" as an abdication of the Church's historic (and to them compulsory) identification of itself alone as God's church. In an interview with Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, then-Cardinal Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI) responded to this criticism as follows:

"The concept expressed by 'is' (to be) is far broader than that expressed by 'to subsist'. 'To subsist' is a very precise way of being, that is, to be as a subject, which exists in itself. Thus the Council Fathers meant to say that the being of the Church as such is a broader entity than the Roman Catholic Church, but within the latter it acquires, in an incomparable way, the character of a true and proper subject."

One can only hope that someone will eventually translate all that double-talk into understandable English because obviously much was lost in translation. One thing that isn't lost, however, is that the Catholic Church isn't catholic (universal) any more (if it ever really was). And its reactionary, anti-Semitic, holocaust-denying, and Neofundamentalist fanatics are all still with us.

Salza finally buries himself completely when he says, "*After the prayer of salvation, the candidate is raised from the grave and is immediately caused to communicate with the Worshipful Master (through the exchange of the Grand Masonic Word). If Hiram were dead, one wonders how he could communicate with King Solomon.*" At the point of "raising" three things are occurring. The candidate learns the strong grip, the temporary Grand Masonic Word, and the Five Points of Fellowship all from the Worshipful Master. The Hiram character, who was supposed to be a Grand Master, and therefore Masonically on an equal par with the King Solomon and King Hiram characters, certainly does not need to be shown the Strong Grip, told the Grand Masonic Word, or have the Five Points of Fellowship explained to him after his body is disinterred. What one wonders is how someone with such impressive academic credentials could possibly have missed the fact that this was only part of an allegorical play, and because it is only a play, real-life rules don't apply. It's like when you were a child playing cowboys and Indians. You pretend to shoot the Indian who pretends to fall down and die. Five seconds later he gets up and continues the game. If this is your first time playing this, you look at your "cowboy" friend and ask, "*Can he do that?*" as your real-life rules collide with your imagination.

And Salza finally nails his own coffin shut when he says, "*In the allegorical drama, the Masonic prayer for salvation given at the grave has been answered. Hiram is alive again. He has been raised to the celestial lodge above. If not, then Masonry's most sublime degree would be nothing more than an exemplification of a murder and funeral. What would be the point?*" This is the exact point where Freemasonry failed John Salza. The primary purpose of the Drama was not to teach the doctrine of bodily resurrection, as Salza and some others claim, but to teach *fidelity*. Or, as I explained this to his comrade and fellow self-confessed and proven liar, Duane Washum, documented in my book *David vs. Goliath?*:

The Legend of Hiram Abif was to teach you the importance of having the courage and character to face danger or even death, before you would reveal the secrets of Masonry. Basically this represents the same scenario as a Prisoner of War who states his name, rank, and serial number only, even under torture or threat of death — even if he knows the enemy already knows everything he knows. *You failed.*

Salza then says, *Hiram Abif is presented as the exemplar of how a Mason is to save himself through his own efforts...*" But in the Drama of the Third Degree, The character of Hiram Abif doesn't save himself. He gets killed and buried. He isn't resurrected back to life so he certainly doesn't resurrect himself. In fact he doesn't even lift himself out of the Mt. Moriah grave. In fact, nothing in the ritual actually indicates that Hiram Abif actually makes the transition to a future life at all. Salza then quotes Lynn F. Perkins from a book published in 1960, a little closer to contemporary, but still in Perkins' own words, "Of course, he would be naive indeed who would declare that what Masonry meant to him it would necessarily mean to every other Mason. The author does not know it all, or anywhere near the all of Masonry; his book might well be called 'What Masonry Means To Me'". For the next couple of pages, Salza attempts to denigrate Freemasonry because of some perceived similarity to ancient mystery religions -- as if all religions weren't ancient mysteries.

Then on page 101 in an equally bizarre attempt to compare the Hiramic Legend, Christianity, and other ancient mystery religions, he finally admits that the character of Hiram Abif didn't actually die to demonstrate resurrection of the body as he has been claiming for the last several pages when he says, "*Hiram dies for virtue and honor because he will not disclose esoteric Masonic knowledge.*" Even that is not quite right. What Hiram actually refuses to disclose are the architectural secrets of Master Masons "whereby we might travel in foreign countries, work and receive Masters wages." It's apparently still another subtle distinction that Salza apparently missed: the "*esoteric Masonic knowledge*" of Freemasons is not the same as the "*esoteric Masonic knowledge*" of stonemasons.

Burial Rites

In this section Salza makes a serious error when he says, "*At the conclusion of Masonic memorial services, the Worshipful Master deposits the decedent's Masonic apron in the casket (or places the apron next to the remains if his body has been cremated.) This is the apron the Mason received right after being symbolically raised to eternal life in the Master Mason degree.*" Once again Salza is trying to connect Masonic ritual to bodily resurrection. Putting aside the obvious fact that the apron was presented to the Mason in the Entered Apprentice degree, it's important to note that before one's body can be resurrected, one must have a body. That's why during the Inquisitions the Roman Catholic Church ordered the bodies of heretics to be burned, either while they were still alive, or even after they were dead. The *NIV Bible Dictionary* says:

Born in Yorkshire about the year 1320, John Wycliffe stands out as one of the most illustrious figures of the 14th century. The outstanding Oxford theologian of his day and an ardent ecclesiastical reformer, he is called the "Morning-star of the Reformation." He was convinced that the surest way of defeating Rome was to put the Bible into the hands of the common people, and he therefore decided to make such a translation available.

How did the Roman Catholic Church respond to this generous act of sharing the Gospel with his fellow Christians? In 1428, 44 years after his death, Wycliffe's bones were dug up, burned, and his ashes thrown into the River Swift to "*stamp out his unsavory memory.*" In the part of the allegorical play of the Master mason degree called the Historical Lecture, we are informed that after Hiram Abif was lifted out of the Mt. Moriah grave "Masonic tradition informs us that there was a marble monument erected to his memory consisting of ... an urn... This beautiful emblem is thus explained: ... The urn in her left [hand], that his ashes were there safely deposited to perpetuate the remembrance of so distinguished and exemplary a character..." If the "lifting of the body of Hiram Abif represents bodily resurrection, why are his ashes safely deposited in the urn? Where is the part of the ritual that explains how his ashes were "resurrected" from the urn into the Celestial Lodge Above?

Finally, I find the twisted conclusion Salza draws from his warped perceptions of the Masonic memorial service to be insulting, defaming, and assassinating the character of many Freemasons living and deceased who have committed their entire lifetimes to both Freemasonry and Christianity and found no conflict between their Masonry and their Christian Ministry, when he basely says, "*While the Masonic memorial service may give the deceased Mason's family comfort during a time of grieving, the Lodge's teaching on the decedent's eternal security in the celestial lodge without any mention of Christ are repugnant to the Christian faith and the perennial teachings of the Church.*" Salza is forced to admit that "*These services are not intended to interfere with any other religious services the family has requested.*" I don't know what the Funeral Service looks like in Wisconsin but here in Washington it contains this passage in Part III:

Master: Hear, then the conclusion of the whole matter: It is the Lord, only, who can give, and it is the Lord who hath taken away.

Chaplain: I am the resurrection and the life, saith the Lord; he that believeth in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live, and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die.

And in Part IV:

Chaplain: O Thou, Who are the Resurrection and the Life...

This is followed by the singing of the hymn "It Is Well With My Soul" which includes these lyrics: "*That Christ has regarded my helpless estate, And hath shed his own blood for my soul.*"

John 11:23-27 Jesus saith unto her, Thy brother shall rise again. Martha saith unto him, I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day. Jesus said unto her, I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die. Believest thou this? She saith unto him, Yea, Lord: I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world.

I've been a Freemason for almost 25 years, 15 of them as a Grand Lodge collared officer, and I have never, ever attended a Masonic Memorial Service that was not within a Christian context.

Chapter V -- Masonic Secrecy And Deception

Recruitment

As he starts to gain a little more experience in life, one of the things Salza will discover is that people, like him, who do too much talking and not enough listening, also reveal more about themselves than they probably should. This can be found throughout the book, but some of the most interesting are found in this subsection. Here is one example, found on page 107: *“Masons also explain to nonmembers that Freemasonry provides many advantages, particularly in the business world, as well as a social support system for wives and children. The brethren, the candidate is assured, ‘take care of their own.’”*

I don't know specifically how they do it in Wisconsin, but here in Washington it is made clear to the candidate from the beginning that he cannot expect any financial rewards whatsoever from joining the Masonic fraternity. In fact, before he can even be considered for the degrees, the candidate has to agree to give “his free and full assent” to four questions, the first two of which are:

1. Do you seriously declare, upon your honor, that unbiased by the improper solicitation of friends and uninfluenced by mercenary motives, you freely and voluntarily offer yourself a candidate for the mysteries of Freemasonry?
2. Do you seriously declare, upon your honor, that you are prompted to solicit the privileges of Freemasonry by a favorable opinion conceived of the Institution, a desire for knowledge, and a sincere wish to be of service to your fellow creatures?

“Improper solicitation of friends” means you were not coerced, convinced, or even asked to join; *“uninfluenced by mercenary motives”* means no business contacts or business networking -- no financial benefits whatsoever; *“a favorable opinion conceived of the Institution”* means that Freemasonry (who the Masons are, what they do, and what they stand for) is no secret to you; *“desire for knowledge”* means you are seeking the ultimate truth, not propaganda, vain repetitions, dogmatic credos, or a substitute religion; *“a sincere wish to be of service to your fellow creatures”* means you have to be ready, willing, and able to walk the walk, not just talk the talk, of doing everything you can for the less fortunate. I think that unequivocally demonstrates that John Salza either literally doesn't know the first thing about Freemasonry, which is not very likely considering his extensive historical research; he is intentionally misrepresenting it, which doesn't really ring true after one reads the writings posted on his website; or, he was simply improperly solicited to join to begin with.

Back on page 106, Salza said, *“... most candidates base their decision to join Freemasonry on the relationship they have with a Masonic friend or relative.”* But on the very next page he contradicts himself when he says that they join after being given pamphlets including lists *“of the famous men of Freemasonry, the various charitable activities of the organization, and all the wonderful social events the fraternity holds for Masons and their wives.”* So which is it -- they join because they read pamphlets or they join because they have real, personal relationships with Masons? Salza already answered the question himself on page 106 when he says, *“If a candidate comes upon negative information about Freemasonry, he usually decides to trust his Masonic friend rather than a source he does not personally know.”* I submit that is because much of the other negative information about Masonry is just like this book, *Masonry Unmasked*: it is full of obvious distortions, half-truths, and outright lies along with warped, personal misperceptions presented as if they were facts! And they all begin to unravel when these negative perceptions of self-confessed liars are compared to the lives of real people. Salza then says that *“In spite of all these efforts at recruitment, Freemasonry claims that candidates are not solicited to join the Lodge.”*

What planet has he been living on? Freemasonry isn't some "secret organization of society's elite." If it is a "secret organization" how could he know if any of the "famous men of Freemasonry" in the pamphlets were actually Freemasons? And if it is a "secret organization" why is every Freemason's Lodge identified by a great big sign that says "Masonic Lodge" and has a Square and Compasses emblem prominently displayed? And if it is a "secret organization", why are there 11 Masonic Lodges listed in the Milwaukee area phone book where Salza lives and works where the members openly wear hats, jackets, ties, rings, watches, and lapel pins; prominently display bumper stickers, car emblems, newsletters, and magazines -- all with Masonic emblems prominently displayed on them; and post public notices with the times, dates, and locations of their meetings? And which one of the Three Degrees of the Blue Lodge, 4th Degree and up of the Scottish Rite and York Rite, all of which are fully explained in the *Holy Bible, King James Version with Masonic References*, published by Heirloom Publishers of Wichita, Kansas, that is available at any bookstore or public library -- and from which Salza himself actually quotes -- are being kept secret? The whole idea of "secret organizations" is nonsense anyway to anyone who truly believes in an omniscient, omnipotent, and omnipresent God. It certainly would be presupposed that someone claiming to be a Bible-based, Catholic apologist would have at least stumbled upon this passage:

Jeremiah 23:23-24 Am I a God at hand, saith the LORD, and not a God afar off? Can any hide himself in secret places that I shall not see him? saith the LORD. Do not I fill heaven and earth? saith the LORD.

So if Freemasonry is not secret from the community, not secret from God, and not secret from the millions of Masons themselves, then exactly from whom is it secret?

On page 108 he makes another equally bizarre statement, "*The Lodge seems to make special efforts to achieve a healthy Catholic representation in its ranks.*" Why would an organization that prevents any discussion of sectarian religion to occur within the confines of the Lodge care one way or the other about a particular religious denomination? I submit that Milwaukee has a particularly large population the descendants of Polish and Italian immigrants, and therefore a larger population of Roman Catholics than some other cities. In my experience, the demographic makeup of Masonic Lodges tends to mirror the demographic makeup of the geographic region where they are located.

Initiation

On page 111 Salza makes this egregious statement: "*The candidate, however, is required to remove all jewelry, including wedding ring, crucifix, scapular, and other sacramentals so that he might 'carry nothing offensive or defensive into the lodge.'*" The candidate is about to play a part in an allegorical play called the Entered Apprentice degree and he is asked to wear the appropriate costume, "and be clothed in a garment furnished by the Master of this Lodge, similar in form, character and meaning to that which has been formed by all who have gone this way before." On the previous page Salza claimed the candidate "*Without additional explanation... is told to strip down to his underwear.*" Yet my Washington Monitor and Freemasons Guide has a full half-page of explanation. Later in the play the candidate will dramatically discover the second reason why he was "divested of all metals" -- which means anything of monetary value -- and it has absolutely nothing to do with "*religious reminders so as not to offend anyone or spiritually defend himself.*" I can tell from the way Salza is presenting this degree that Wisconsin work, that I have never witnessed firsthand, is obviously very similar to the Washington work, that I have witnessed and participated in many times.

I am fascinated by his belief that the so-called “Landmarks” of Freemasonry are universal, yet he keeps focusing on parts of the ritual that are not. For example on page 112 he says, “*The Junior Deacon responds for the candidate: ‘Mr. _____, who has long been in darkness, and now seeks to be brought into light...’*” In Washington work it is the Senior Steward who responds for the candidate and says, “Mr. JD [John Doe], a poor blind candidate who desires to be brought from darkness to light...” Salza then goes on to say “*It should be offensive to any Christian to be declared to be in such a state of spiritual darkness. By virtue of baptism, all Christians have been freed from the power of darkness and made children of God. (cf. CCC 1250)*” Then he continues off on this tangent about how Christians have already received this spiritual light through Christ.

What’s wrong with this picture of course is that the candidate does not “seek” or even “desire” to be brought into “spiritual” light -- he desires to have his blindfold removed so he doesn’t remain in the dark. Salza himself quotes from the Masonic References part of the *Holy Bible, King James Version with Masonic References* that says “*darkness is a symbol of ignorance; while light is the symbol of enlightenment or knowledge.*” With the blindfold is on, the candidate might as well be outside the door. Coming into Masonic light means the candidate comes to see how Masons work (with one hand supporting the Holy Bible, Square, and Compasses and the other resting thereon). Now there’s something really sinister -- actually supporting the Holy Bible, acting on the Square, and circumscribing one’s actions within the due moral bounds of the Bible’s rule and guide with the Compasses.

Now I’m going to challenge Salza’s theology. Does he really think that by virtue of baptism, all those popes and other Roman Catholic hierarchy who ordered the murder of thousands of innocent men, women, and children during the Crusades; the murder and torture of thousands of innocent men, women, and children during the Inquisitions; the selling of indulgences (absolution of sin for money); ordered the priesthood to turn their backs on the holocaust victims of Nazi Germany (including Freemasons and other dissidents); and those that participated in and then attempted to cover up widespread homosexuality and pedophilia in the Roman Catholic priesthood were all “*freed from the power of darkness and made children of God?*” Significantly, none of these child molesters would still be Freemasons, but nearly all of the perpetrators -- along with their accessory-after-the-fact coconspirator superiors -- are still priests. Salza then quotes Freemason Allen E. Roberts (again speaking only for himself) who said, “*Your preparation for your entrance into Freemasonry began the day your mother brought you into the world. Your entrance into the lodge for initiation became, symbolically, your rebirth.*” I’d like to tell Brother Roberts to his face that I completely disagree with those statements, but I can’t. He was born in 1917 and has been dead for almost 10 years.

On page 114 Salza repeats the same lie he stated on page 43, “*If the candidate professes a belief in any deity whatsoever, he is told that his faith is well-founded.*” Hogwash. The candidate is asked, “In whom do you put your trust.” He has to give the answer “In God” without prompting. It should be pretty easy for someone who has already assented to the question “Do you believe in the existence of one everliving and true God and in a transition to a future life?” If his belief in the “one everliving and true God” didn’t matter, then why wasn’t the question simply “Do you believe in a god or gods, and do you believe in some kind of afterlife and some way to get there?” Salza continues, “*He is then caused to rise and continue his Masonic journey around the lodge room escorted by the Senior Deacon as a psalm (sic) is recited.*”

Psalms 133 A Song of degrees of David. Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity! It is like the precious ointment upon the head, that ran down upon the beard, even Aaron's beard: that went down to the skirts of his garments; As the dew of Hermon, and as the dew that descended upon the mountains of Zion: for there the Lord commanded the blessing, even life for evermore.

Note that it is not just any Psalm, it's Psalms 133. This Psalm is about the first of the three great principles of Freemasonry, Brotherly Love. Also note that it is not a quote from the holy writings of any other religion that Salza claimed could be used as the Great Light. Charles H. Spurgeon, in *The Treasury of David*, explains the significance of Psalms 133 like this:

The visitors to Zion were about to return, and this may have been their hymn of joy because they had seen such union among the tribes who had gathered at the common altar... “

Then Salza makes a statement he has to know it patently untrue. This is not a mistake, or simply the failure to understand a subtle but significant message. He says, “...each officer asks the candidate if his participation is of his own free will and accord. Since the candidate does not really know what will be further required of him, the question is unfair.” Once again Salza is deliberately misrepresenting what is occurring. Salza knows full well that the Senior Deacon, Junior Warden, Senior Warden, and Worshipful Master each verify personally that the candidate was not coerced or improperly solicited to become a Mason -- that he is going through the initiation process because it is his expressed wish to do so. The Senior Deacon at each officer station then certifies that the candidate is a man, freeborn, of good report, and well recommended. Salza continues his deliberate deceit when he says, “*The Worshipful Master then asks whether the candidate wishes to proceed. Again, under pressure of the moment, most candidates consent.*” Salza knows full-well that the candidate standing there has just “seriously declared” five times that this is what he wants to do “of his own free will and accord” -- in fact, his whole reason for showing up at all was to become initiated into the Fraternity. In my almost 25 years as a Freemason, participating in the Entered Apprentice degrees of hundreds of men, I have never seen a candidate who not only did not consent, but one who was not actually eager to proceed.

On page 115 Salza says “*The candidate is asked to kneel at the altar and place his hands in a particular position on the Holy Bible (or whatever book he deems sacred), left hand underneath and right hand over the top of the book.*” Salza also knows full-well that the candidate is placed “your left hand supporting the Holy Bible, Square and Compasses and your right resting thereon.” And his right hand is resting on the Holy Bible, Square and Compasses, not just laying over the top of the book. And in case you missed it, as Salza apparently did, with his left hand the candidate is “supporting the **Holy Bible**”, not supporting “*whatever book he deems sacred.*” The other important thing that Salza missed is that this is occurring to a candidate, dressed in a costume, in the middle of an allegorical play.

Covenant Oaths

In this section Salza disingenuously makes this false statement: “*The Masonic oath is distinguishable from licit oaths because it is sworn in secret.*” The Oath of Obligation for each degree -- which, you remember, is from start to finish, an allegorical play teaching a moral lesson, not “real life” -- is not “*sworn in secret.*” It is sworn “In the presence of God and this Worshipful Lodge...” I attended one Entered Apprentice degree where the candidate recited his oath of obligation where “this Worshipful Lodge” included more than 75 men in an announced location with a giant Square and Compasses emblem. Ironically, the Great Light of Freemasonry, the *Holy Bible, King James Version with Masonic References* tells us that certain things, like charitable works, are actually *supposed* to be done in secret.

Matthew 6:3-4 But when thou doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth: That thine alms may be in secret: and thy Father which seeth in secret himself shall reward thee openly.

On page 119 Salza says, “*Either the oaths mean what they say, or they do not.*” Once again Salza has missed another subtle but important distinction. The oaths mean what they say but only within the context in which they are presented. Salza himself recognizes that the penalties of the obligations are only symbolic, so why would he assume the rest of the obligations are to be taken literally? Or to put it more bluntly, why would he assume anything in the degrees, which are allegorical plays filled with symbolic representations, should be taken literally? His answer, of course, is that a handful of others, out of the millions of past and present Masons, have taken various parts of the degrees to be literal simply because they felt it corresponded to their personal belief systems. But each and every one of them, including me, has to put that disclaimer in the preface of their books and papers:

...the opinions expressed herein that are not directly quoted from others are my own; nor are they the official opinions of any Lodge or Grand Lodge that I have ever attended, been a member of, or been an elected or appointed officer in; nor are they necessarily the opinions of any other Freemason, living or dead, in this or any other part of the world.

I'm going to end this book review here because it should be painfully clear by now that in *Masonry Unmasked: An Insider Reveals the Secrets of the Lodge*, John Salza missed the whole point of Freemasonry entirely and fails to reveal anything except his own spiritual immaturity. The key to all this is the question Salza refuses to ask, so I'll ask it for him: *If the Church is doing what it is supposed to be doing, why was there and is there any need for Freemasonry?* The answer, of course, the objective truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth is that Freemasonry started back when the Christian Church was a cesspool of hypocrisy, known for its cruelty, intolerance, immorality, and extravagance. Freemasonry continues today for much the same reason.

Matthew 23:1-36 Then spake Jesus to the multitude, and to his disciples, Saying, The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not. For they bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders; but they themselves will not move them with one of their fingers. But all their works they do for to be seen of men: they make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge the borders of their garments, And love the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues, And greetings in the markets, and to be called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi. But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted.

But woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in.

Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation.

Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves.

Woe unto you, ye blind guides, which say, Whosoever shall swear by the temple, it is nothing; but whosoever shall swear by the gold of the temple, he is a debtor! Ye fools and blind: for whether is greater, the gold, or the temple that sanctifieth the gold? And, Whosoever shall swear by the altar, it is nothing; but whosoever sweareth by the gift that is upon it, he is guilty. Ye fools and blind: for whether is greater, the gift, or the altar that sanctifieth the gift? Whoso therefore shall swear by the altar, sweareth by it, and by all things thereon. And whoso shall swear by the temple, sweareth by it, and by him that dwelleth therein. And he that shall swear by heaven, sweareth by the throne of God, and by him that sitteth thereon.

Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithes of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone. Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel.

Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess. Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first that which is within the cup and platter, that the outside of them may be clean also.

Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity.

Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous, And say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets. Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers. Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell? Wherefore, behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes: and some of them ye shall kill and crucify; and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city: That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. Verily I say unto you, All these things shall come upon this generation.

If the Great Light of Freemasonry, the *Holy Bible, King James Version* with its 17th-Century grammar is too difficult to follow, here is the same passage as interpreted by Eugene Peterson in *The Message: The Bible in Contemporary Language*:

Now Jesus turned to address his disciples, along with the crowd that had gathered with them. "The religion scholars and Pharisees are competent teachers in God's Law. You won't go wrong in following their teachings on Moses. But be careful about following them. They talk a good line, but they don't live it. They don't take it into their hearts and live it out in their behavior. It's all spit-and-polish veneer. Instead of giving you God's Law as food and drink by which you can banquet on God, they package it in bundles of rules, loading you down like pack animals. They seem to take pleasure in watching you stagger under these loads, and wouldn't think of lifting a finger to help. Their lives are perpetual fashion shows, embroidered prayer shawls one day and flowery prayers the next. They love to sit at the head table at church dinners, basking in the most prominent positions, preening in the radiance of public flattery, receiving honorary degrees, and getting called 'Doctor' and 'Reverend.' Don't let people do that to you, put you on a pedestal like that. You all have a single Teacher, and you are all classmates. Don't set people up as experts over your life, letting them tell you what to do. Save that authority for God; let him tell you what to do. No one else should carry the title of 'Father'; you have only one Father, and he's in heaven. And don't let people maneuver you into taking charge of them. There is only one Life-Leader for you and them — Christ.

"Do you want to stand out? Then step down. Be a servant. If you puff yourself up, you'll get the wind knocked out of you. But if you're content to simply be yourself, your life will count for plenty. "I've had it with you! You're hopeless, you religion scholars, you Pharisees! Frauds! Your lives are roadblocks to God's kingdom. You refuse to enter, and won't let anyone else in either.

"You're hopeless, you religion scholars and Pharisees! Frauds! You go halfway around the world to make a convert, but once you get him you make him into a replica of yourselves, double-damned.

"You're hopeless! What arrogant stupidity! You say, 'If someone makes a promise with his fingers crossed, that's nothing; but if he swears with his hand on the Bible, that's serious.' What ignorance! Does the leather on the Bible carry more weight than the skin on your hands? And what about this piece of trivia: 'If you shake hands on a promise, that's nothing; but if you raise your hand that God is your witness, that's serious'? What ridiculous hairsplitting! What difference does it make whether you shake hands or raise hands? A promise is a promise. What difference does it make if you make your promise inside or outside a house of worship? A promise is a promise. God is present, watching and holding you to account regardless.

"You're hopeless, you religion scholars and Pharisees! Frauds! You keep meticulous account books, tithing on every nickel and dime you get, but on the meat of God's Law, things like fairness and compassion and commitment — the absolute basics! — you carelessly take it or leave it. Careful bookkeeping is commendable, but the basics are required. Do you have any idea how silly you look, writing a life story that's wrong from start to finish, nitpicking over commas and semicolons?

"You're hopeless, you religion scholars and Pharisees! Frauds! You burnish the surface of your cups and bowls so they sparkle in the sun, while the insides are maggoty with your greed and gluttony. Stupid Pharisee! Scour the insides, and then the gleaming surface will mean something.

"You're hopeless, you religion scholars and Pharisees! Frauds! You're like manicured grave plots, grass clipped and the flowers bright, but six feet down it's all rotting bones and worm-eaten flesh. People look at you and think you're saints, but beneath the skin you're total frauds.

"You're hopeless, you religion scholars and Pharisees! Frauds! You build granite tombs for your prophets and marble monuments for your saints. And you say that if you had lived in the days of your ancestors, no blood would have been on your hands. You protest too much! You're cut from the same cloth as those murderers, and daily add to the death count.

"Snakes! Reptilian sneaks! Do you think you can worm your way out of this? Never have to pay the piper? It's on account of people like you that I send prophets and wise guides and scholars generation after generation — and generation after generation you treat them like dirt, greeting them with lynch mobs, hounding them with abuse. You can't squirm out of this: Every drop of righteous blood ever spilled on this earth, beginning with the blood of that good man Abel right down to the blood of Zechariah, Barachiah's son, whom you murdered at his prayers, is on your head. All this, I'm telling you, is coming down on you, on your generation."

V.W. David S. Julian
in Seattle, WA, USA October 24, 2006

A Postscript from the Reviewer

Although the rest of the book is essentially just a rehashing of the same drivel presented in the first half, there is once concept that I simply could not let go by -- Salza's page 168 statement about the "Establishment Clause" of the First Amendment to the US Constitution: "*The Founding Fathers intended that the clause preclude the federal government's establishing a single religion and enforcing the observation of it.*"

The US Constitution and Separation of Church and State

Article VI.

The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States.

Amendment I.

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

It is important to note that minutes of the entire proceedings of the 1st Congress were taken and all of the discussion surrounding the Bill of Rights was carefully recorded. You can read them yourself at the Library of Congress, online at <http://memory.loc.gov>. Simply query for "establishment of religion". These minutes include the original drafts of the amendments, and most importantly show two things: (1) the current wording of Article VI and Amendment I -- demanding that the Government remain neutral, neither respecting (giving advantage to) nor prohibiting (giving disadvantage to) *any religious establishment* -- was in fact the intention of the majority of the framers of the Constitution; and (2) those asserting otherwise cannot claim ignorance, but are obviously and intentionally distorting and misrepresenting the true facts for their own aggrandizement. Christian Nation advocate David Barton made this same mistake in his original presentations when he misquoted the amendment to say "*Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of a religion...*"

On Friday, August 21, 1789 it was proposed (as the Third Amendment) like this: "Congress shall make no law establishing religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, nor shall the rights of conscience be infringed." But it's obvious from the content of the August 21 presentation that the amendment was not to prevent the creation a national religion (primarily because no one made such a proposition), but it was to protect the rights of each citizen to his own Freedom of Conscience. And Salza's subsequent attempt to rewrite history by claiming that the concept of the Separation of Church and State and the secularization of the public schools was a Masonic conspiracy begun in 1915 is just more nonsense. What actually happened is that Freemasonry, especially the Scottish Rite, began to defend the US from a sectarian religious onslaught that continues to this day.

It should be noted here that references to God in our official government documents are all very recent additions. For example, the original Pledge of Allegiance, adopted by President Benjamin Harrison for Columbus Day, October 12, 1892 was: "I pledge allegiance to my flag and to the republic for which it stands: one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." The phrase "to my flag" was replaced with "to the flag of the United States," on Flag Day, June 14, 1923. The phrase "of America" was added to that on June 14, 1924, by the American Legion and the Daughters of the American Revolution. The phrase "under God" was not included in the Pledge of Allegiance until June 14, 1954, 62 years after the original Pledge was written, and 165 years after the Constitution was first ratified (1789).

Penned in 1814 by Brother Francis Scott Key, "The Star Spangled Banner" (including the lyric "And this be our motto: In God is our trust") did not officially become our National Anthem until March 3, 1931, two years into the Great Depression. Prior to that, our official anthem was *My Country 'Tis of Thee*, also known as *America*, and sung to the tune of the British national anthem, *God Save The King*, already noted as written by Brother Thomas Arne, Freemason and Roman Catholic.

Although the phrase "In God We Trust" appeared on some two-cent coins as early as 1864, it was not officially established as the National Motto until July 30, 1956. It has appeared on the one-cent coin since 1909, on the ten-cent coin since 1916, the five-cent and all other coins since 1938. The motto was printed on paper money beginning with the first one-dollar silver certificates in 1957, and was added to the design of the 1935-G series (actually printed in 1957), and all subsequent designs. In fact, the only direct reference to God in the original Constitution of the United States of America is in the date of the document, designated as "in the year of our Lord" indicating use of the Roman Catholic Gregorian Calendar (with its designations of AD and BC) that was reluctantly adopted by the Church of England (and therefore the American Colonies) in 1752.

The Bill of Rights is a list of the Federally guaranteed civil rights of the individual citizen, regardless of the will of the majority. Most reasonable Americans have no problem separating their religious beliefs from their patriotic duty, just as most Freemasons have no problem separating their religious beliefs from their participation in a philanthropic fraternity. But every now and then one comes along who just doesn't get it. The book clearly indicates John Salza is one of those.

And as a final postscript, on page 191, Salza quotes Steven Knight, who claimed to have "interviewed hundreds of Masons in his study of Freemasonry, reports: 'It has been said that these issues are of no concern to Freemasons, but hundreds of members of the brotherhood have spoken to me of the turmoil they experience in attempting to reconcile their religious views with the demands of Masonic ritual.'" Putting aside that Stephen Knight's book was exposing Freemasonry in the United Kingdom (I thought we were limiting the discussion to US Freemasonry and the quotes were supposed to be from US Masonic materials), we learn from the Southern Baptist Convention that he eventually rejected the Christian faith, became a Sannyasin, and changed his name to Swami Puja Deval in 1983, and then died of a brain tumor in 1985. The book Salza quotes from was the follow-up to his previous book claiming the infamous Jack-The-Ripper was a Freemason. It was easy for Knight to make these claims because British Freemasonry *is* a secret society where publicly disclosing your Masonic membership without permission from the Grand Lodge, especially for personal gain, is grounds for expulsion. So all of Knight's sources, including these supposed *hundreds of members of the Brotherhood* -- all supposedly sworn to secrecy, mind you -- conveniently continue to remain anonymous.

Nevertheless it is a good question that deserves a good answer. The truth is, that the most devout fundamentalist followers of all religions discover they all have something in common: the belief that their path to salvation is the only true path to salvation. So Osama bin Ladin is firmly convinced his Islamic way is the only way (supported by the Koran) and he is willing to die for that belief. Duane Washum believes his separatist "personal relationship with Jesus" is the only way and he uses the Protestant Bible to support his beliefs. John Salza believes the Roman Catholic Church is the only way, and he uses the Roman Catholic Bible, the infallibility of the Pope, and the traditions passed down from the original Apostles to support his beliefs. So while they all sit around and argue about who has the real, one-and-only path to salvation, the real enemies of Christian salvation, which are hunger, disease, poverty, violence, and ignorance run rampant all over the world. Freemasonry therefore offers what no religion can -- a temporary respite from that sectarian religious separatism.

Freemasons recognize that the dam is breaking. And we realize that, right now, it is more important to pass the sandbags than to waste time and resources quibbling about whether the guy passing the sandbag to you has been circumcised or baptized yet...

DJ

[NOTE: *John Salza responded to this review by publishing a 160 page diatribe against me personally that you can read at his oxymoronically named scripturecatholic.com website. My response to his response follows.]*

Salza Unmasked

David Julian's Response to John Salza's
160-Page "Rebuttal" to his 65-Page Review of

Masonry Unmasked

By John Salza

©2007 David S. Julian



DAY JEWEL PUBLICATIONS

16052 - 46th Ave S

Seattle, WA 98188

(206) 246-6460

www.dayjewel.com

dsjulian@comcast.net

I wrote my original review of John Salza's book for three reasons:

- His perception of Freemasonry, as presented in the book, was in diametric opposition to my own perception, and I thought he should hear that from me directly
- So that non-Masons who read his book would understand that there are many differing opinions concerning how Masonic symbols could be interpreted
- So that Freemasons could see firsthand what happens when they fail to screen a candidate thoroughly and admit a man to the Fraternity who misrepresents his motives and joins for the wrong reasons

And I want the reader to understand, right up front, that I am not selling books, tapes, radio programs, *etc.* I have nothing to "prove" to Freemasonry, to the Church of Jesus Christ, to myself, or to John Salza's readers. This is not a "case", or a "debate", "damage control" or even a healthy exchange of ideas. Basically it comes down to this:

1. Salza falsely claims Freemasonry is *syncretistic*, in that it incorporates a number of different religions into a single "worship" service.

Then he proceeds to quote from a ritual that repeatedly says that Masonic Lodges are erected to God, are dedicated to St. John the Baptist and St. John the Evangelist, and whose "Great Light" and "Rule and Guide to our Faith" is the *Holy Bible*.

The candidate is told right from the beginning on a portion the Petition that he is required to read and sign his name to, that specifically says: "*Freemasonry strives to teach a man the duties he owes to God, his neighbor and himself. It has for its foundation the great basic principles of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man, and requires a belief in the immortality of the Soul. It interferes neither with religion nor politics.*"

Before the Entered Apprentice (First) Degree begins, the candidate is asked four questions, the fourth of which is: "*Do you believe in the existence of one ever-living and true God and in a transition to a future life?*"

Right from the beginning of the First Degree, the candidate is asked "*In whom do you put your trust?*" His response (without prompting) must be "*In God.*" Salza erroneously claims the Candidate can respond with any answer he wants. Yet my *Washington Monitor and Freemason's Guide* (available to anyone from the Grand Lodge office) clearly shows at that point in the ritual what the answer is. On page 16 there is a representation of a Glory cloud containing the words "*Trust in GOD*".

In the Obligation Salza quotes from, the candidate is required to repeat these words: "*...in the presence of Almighty God and this worshipful Lodge, erected to Him and dedicated to the Holy Saints John...*"

In the Third Section of the Lecture to the Entered Apprentice we find that "*the Holy Bible is dedicated to God because it is the inestimable gift of God to man, and on it we obligate a newly admitted Brother...*"

The Washington Masonic Code (available for free on line from the Grand Lodge web site) says specifically:

Sec. 6.01 Const.

Standard Work. The master copy of the combined Esoteric Work, together with the Monitorial Work and amendments thereto adopted by the Grand Lodge, shall be the Standard Work of this Grand Jurisdiction. The Grand Lodge shall print the Esoteric Work in cipher, but with the essential secrets excluded. Every Lodge shall practice that Standard Work and no other.

Wisconsin has a similar specific requirement in its Constitution:

88.02 **Work Shall Not be Altered.** The work and lectures of the three degrees as given to the Grand Lecturer and District Lecturers by the Custodian of the Work and by the Grand Lecturer to the Craft, is the pure work of this jurisdiction, and all interpolations, additions, embellishments or deviations therefrom are forbidden, except such as maybe adopted at an annual communication of the Grand Lodge by a four-fifths vote.

Even though both Constitutions clearly indicate both what constitutes the Standard Work of their respective jurisdictions -- and most importantly -- *that any deviation from the Standard Work is expressly prohibited*, Salza would have you believe that a candidate can be obligated on any "holy" book and that he does not have to put his trust in the One, True and Living God of the *Holy Bible*. What is most significant here is that there is absolutely nothing in the ritual that refers to any God other than the God of the *Holy Bible*. There is no reference in the ritual to any Volume of the Sacred Law other than the *Holy Bible*. To my knowledge, *The Holy Bible, King James Version with Masonic References* is the only book of its kind.

And the only instance of "worship" he cites is when for one moment in one degree, everyone is asked to bow in an acknowledgment that Almighty God is present everywhere, including Masonic Lodges. And I will publicly state unequivocally and for the record that if John Salza can give me incontrovertible proof that the Grand Lodge of Wisconsin is admitting men to its membership who do not believe in Almighty God, the Architect, Creator and Sustainer of the Universe and in a transition to a future life -- I will personally submit a resolution to rescind Fraternal Recognition by the Grand Lodge of Washington.

2. Salza falsely claims that Freemasonry practices *indifferentism* because Masonic degrees do not mention Jesus Christ by name, and therefore, he concludes, that in Masonic Lodges all gods, and therefore all paths to God, are equal. Then he proceeds to cite the works of a handful of Masons, nearly all deceased, most for more than a century, whose opinions do not represent the official position of any Lodge or Grand Lodge, who claim Freemasonry is the epitome of what they thought religion should be.

And in that regard Salza asks a very interesting question: Is Freemasonry (in the USA) a Christian organization? No it is not. A man may join the Masonic fraternity who is not a Christian, but he must be warned in advance that the Lodges are erected to God and dedicated to St. John the Baptist and St. John the Evangelist, and the Great Light and Rule and Guide to our Faith is the *Holy Bible*. Most significantly, all of the symbolism of the Masonic Lodge revolves around the building of King Solomon's Temple. Neither the Biblical account of the Temple, nor the Masonic Legend, ever mentions Jesus by name.

When I was the Deputy of the Grand Master, a Wiccan minister joined one of my Lodges, and quite frankly I was surprised. So I consulted with the Grand Secretary and the Grand Chaplain as to how to handle this. Our Grand Secretary was an Episcopal Priest and the Grand Chaplain was an Archbishop of the Anglican Church in America. Both of them assured me that it was important that, since he professed both a belief in God and the transition to a future life, I had to take him at his word. Needless to say, after just a few months, the Wiccan resigned. He told me his reason was that he found Freemasonry to be "thinly veiled Christianity."

3. Salza made the preposterous claim that the Drama section of the Third Degree was a symbolic enactment of bodily resurrection. In that regard he quoted some notable Masonic authors, once again nearly all of which are deceased, some more than a century, who agreed with that assessment. I still don't see how you can make that connection. The body is lifted from the grave by two people and reburied. Salza claims he addresses this by claiming it is a symbolic bodily resurrection.

Then he quotes Masonic ritual that indicates that Hiram eventually resides in Heaven -- and then he expects his readers to make the connection to bodily resurrection. But nothing in Masonic ritual indicates that Hiram's body ascended into heaven as he was lifted from the grave by human hands, or that his body *ascended* into heaven -- ever! That's because the moral lesson of the Third Degree is *Fidelity*, not *resurrection*.

Let's compare Biblical bodily resurrection to what happened to Hiram in the Drama. According to the *Holy Bible*, four people bodily ascended into heaven: Moses, Enoch, Elijah, and Jesus. We know Moses ascended into heaven because he descended, bodily, with Elijah (Elias) at the Transfiguration.

Luke 9:28-36 And it came to pass about an eight days after these sayings, he took Peter and John and James, and went up into a mountain to pray. And as he prayed, the fashion of his countenance was altered, and his raiment was white and glistening. And, behold, there talked with him two men, which were Moses and Elias: Who appeared in glory, and spake of his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem. But Peter and they that were with him were heavy with sleep: and when they were awake, they saw his glory, and the two men that stood with him.

And it came to pass, as they departed from him, Peter said unto Jesus, Master, it is good for us to be here: and let us make three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias: not knowing what he said.

While he thus spake, there came a cloud, and overshadowed them: and they feared as they entered into the cloud. And there came a voice out of the cloud, saying, This is my beloved Son: hear him.

And when the voice was past, Jesus was found alone. And they kept it close, and told no man in those days any of those things which they had seen.

Enoch and Elijah didn't even have to die before ascending bodily into heaven.

2 Kings 2:11 And it came to pass, as they still went on, and talked, that, behold, there appeared a chariot of fire, and horses of fire, and parted them both asunder; and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven.

Hebrews 11:5 By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and was not found, because God had translated him: for before his translation he had this testimony, that he pleased God.

We also know that before Jesus, three other people were bodily resurrected from the dead: Jairus' daughter, the son of the widow from Nain, and Lazarus.

Luke 8:41-42, 51-55 And, behold, there came a man named Jairus, and he was a ruler of the synagogue: and he fell down at Jesus' feet, and besought him that he would come into his house: For he had one only daughter, about twelve years of age, and she lay a dying. But as he went the people thronged him... And when he came into the house, he suffered no man to go in, save Peter, and James, and John, and the father and the mother of the maiden.

And all wept, and bewailed her: but he said, Weep not; she is not dead, but sleepeth.

And they laughed him to scorn, knowing that she was dead.

And he put them all out, and took her by the hand, and called, saying, Maid, arise.

And her spirit came again, and she arose straightway: and he commanded to give her meat. And her parents were astonished: but he charged them that they should tell no man what was done.

Luke 7:11-15 And it came to pass the day after, that he went into a city called Nain; and many of his disciples went with him, and much people. Now when he came nigh to the gate of the city, behold, there was a dead man carried out, the only son of his mother, and she was a widow: and much people of the city was with her.

And when the Lord saw her, he had compassion on her, and said unto her, Weep not. And he came and touched the bier: and they that bare him stood still. And he said, Young man, I say unto thee, Arise.

And he that was dead sat up, and began to speak. And he delivered him to his mother.

John 12:9-11 Much people of the Jews therefore knew that he was there: and they came not for Jesus' sake only, but that they might see Lazarus also, whom he had raised from the dead. But the chief priests consulted that they might put Lazarus also to death; Because that by reason of him many of the Jews went away, and believed on Jesus.

<i>Action</i>	<i>Bible</i>	<i>Masonic Drama</i>
Ascended into heaven before death	Moses, Enoch, Elijah (Elias)	
Confirmed dead	Moses, Jairus' daughter, Nain widow's son, Lazarus, Jesus	Hiram
Bodily resurrected from the dead	Jairus' daughter, Nain widow's son, Lazarus, Jesus	
Appeared to others in the flesh after resurrection	Jairus' daughter, Nain widow's son, Lazarus, Moses, Elijah (Elias), Jesus	
Physically lifted from the grave by human hands		Hiram
Ascended or reascended into heaven after bodily resurrection	Moses, Elijah (Elias), Jesus	
Reburied ASAP because they are still dead		Hiram

Why do Salza and even some Masonic authors claim that the Drama is a symbolic representation of bodily resurrection? The only remote similarity I could find between the bodily resurrections of the Bible and the Masonic Drama is that at some point most of the principal characters are confirmed to be dead. In the Biblical resurrections, they all come back to life and are seen by other people -- Hiram does not.

And the final piece of the puzzle is this: Since before his admission, the candidate has to affirm that he already believes in a "transition to a future life", why would Freemasonry need an allegorical drama to symbolically represent what he already believes?

4. John Salza's character. Salza claims that I assassinate his character even though I don't even know him. But I do know him -- intimately. Salza admitted on page 138 of his rebuttal, that in Wisconsin, they ask the same four questions of a prospective candidate, the first of which is:

1. Do you seriously declare, upon your honor, that unbiased by the improper solicitation of friends and uninfluenced by mercenary motives, you freely and voluntarily offer yourself a candidate for the mysteries of Freemasonry?

On the very next page Salza admits that he was improperly solicited to join by a friend who told him it would be a good career move. Even though he said he "*questioned why the Lodge was now asking for such a promise*" still he answered the question in the affirmative. Who, exactly, did he question, before he lied and gave his assent to something he knew to be untrue?

In example after example Salza says the ritual or the Code said one thing, but he, as a Wisconsin Freemason actually did something else. There is something radically wrong with that picture.

Salza accuses me of anti-Catholic bigotry, just because I find it ironic that his so-called infallible pope is a former Nazi soldier who condemns Freemasons and liberal American politicians as being in grave sin while he holds Holy Communion with known homosexual pedophiles. Go figure.

In his rebuttal Salza claims he found out about my 65-page book review from one of his readers. I did a short review of his book on Amazon.com and Salza emailed me saying he was going to respond to it on scripturecatholic.com and asked me to respond to that. I emailed Salza back stating I would be happy to respond if he would put the entire 65-page review on his website -- and I attached it to that email. It wasn't posted on my dayjewel.com website until the day before I sent it to him. His claim that one of his patrons alerted him to the 65-page review by seeing it on my website first is an outright lie.

Finally, Salza placed his hands on the *Holy Bible* and swore an oath of Fidelity to the principles of the Masonic Fraternity -- an oath he violated. Now everyone knows his word is worthless and his oath sworn on the *Holy Bible* is meaningless. His rebuttal is just like his book: hogwash from start to finish...

V.W David S. Julian

p.s. This preliminary statement is attached to every Petition here in Washington State. I'll be happy to explain to your readers any part they don't understand...

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

Concerning Freemasonry

This Statement must be read before Signing Petition

Having expressed a desire to become a Freemason, we presume you have thoroughly considered the step you propose to take. The exact nature of our Institution being unknown to you, we consider it advisable that you should be informed on certain points, the knowledge of which might affect you decision to apply for membership.

Freemasonry strives to teach a man the duties he owes to God, his neighbor and himself. It has for its foundation the great basic principles of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man, and requires a belief in the immortality of the Soul. It interferes neither with religion nor politics. Admission to the Institution must not be sought from mercenary or other unworthy motives, nor from hope of personal gain or advancement. Anyone so actuated will be disappointed, and in all friendship we warn you.

Freemasonry is not a benefit society. We do not subscribe so much a year to entitle us to draw financial relief; or to make provision for those we leave behind, or to admit us to the Masonic Retirement Center. Its charity is intended for those who, through no fault of their own, have met with misfortune.

Freemasonry has in all ages insisted that men shall come to its door entirely of their own free will; not as a result of solicitation; not from feelings of curiosity; but from a favorable opinion of the Institution and a desire to be ranked among its members.

We think it is advisable to inform you that should you be admitted, it will entail certain financial obligations, which you should be able to afford without detriment to yourself or those dependent on you. In addition to the fees payable with your petition, there will be an annual subscription for the support of your Lodge, as provided by the By-Laws of that Lodge.

We trust you will consider these statements in the same spirit of honesty and friendship in which they have been presented. It is of the utmost importance to you as well as to Freemasonry that the motives and ideals governing your daily life be in substantial accord therewith.

After reading the foregoing statement and answering all questions in the petition and signing it, detach this statement at the perforated line and retain in your possession.