



Masonry Unmasked

*An Insider Reveals the
Secrets of the Lodge*

John Salza

Book Review by David Julian

Rebuttal by John Salza

Freemason David Julian of the Grand Lodge of Washington wrote a 64-page review of John Salza's best-selling book *Masonry Unmasked: An Insider Reveals the Secrets of the Lodge* and posted it on his website www.dayjewel.com. John was alerted to the book review by a patron of www.ScriptureCatholic.com and contacted Mr. Julian about it. In the following pages, John responds to Mr. Julian's review (all 64 pages of Julian's review, unedited, are contained herein).

Warning: This dialogue is 159 pages.

J. Salza: I am honored that Mr. Julian felt it necessary to write a 64-page review of my book *Masonry Unmasked*. After all, the book is threatening to Masons like Mr. Julian, and has helped lead many Christian men out of the lodge (I receive emails from men telling me so on a monthly basis). However, I am disappointed that Mr. Julian did not initially send me a copy of his review. I had to find it on the Internet, and then contact Mr. Julian directly about it. Hopefully, Mr. Julian will be more straightforward with me and other opponents of Freemasonry in the future.

I am also not surprised by the content of Mr. Julian's review. Like most other Masonic apologists, Mr. Julian takes the same, tired approach of defending Freemasonry using *ad hominem* argumentation: Julian assails his opponent's character rather than directly answering his contentions. This is pervasive among Masonic apologists as I explain on page 190 of my book. David Julian is one of the weaker Masonic apologists I have faced.

As a preparatory measure, let me alert the readers to the ways in which Mr. Julian uses *ad hominem* argumentation throughout this dialogue:

- He says that I lack "experience" in Freemasonry (even though I have studied Masonry for ten years; was a Mason for three years; and, was authorized by the Grand Lodge of Wisconsin to teach Masonic ritual by virtue of being awarded the Proficiency Card - a credential that Mr. Julian never received from his Grand Lodge)
- He says that I "misinterpret" Freemasonry's rituals (even though my interpretations are nothing more than restatements of the Masonic rituals approved by his own Grand Lodge and the Grand Lodges throughout the country, not to mention consistent with the interpretations of the most popular Masonic authorities and commentaries, as we will see below)
- He says that I am "spiritually immature" (even though he has never met me and has no idea about my spirituality)
- He says that I am a "self-confessed liar" (even though I back up every one of my arguments with quotations from Masonic ritual, the Masonic Bible and other recognized Masonic authorities)
- He also denigrates my faith in the Catholic Church (even though I have never attacked Mr. Julian's Protestant faith)

As you will see, Mr. Julian also inundates his readers with an incredible amount of useless information as if the quantity of his writing will win his case for him. A person

has a tendency to do this when his arguments are weak. It is very difficult to dialogue with someone who does not want to address the real issues, and instead rants and raves about crusades, cosmology and corruption in the Catholic Church. By repeatedly diverting the arguments to criticisms about the Church, Mr. Julian reveals his true colors: is an anti-Catholic demagogue who has no interest in having a genuine dialogue about Freemasonry.

Here is another important fact: Mr. Julian never says that my quotations from Masonic ritual, the Masonic Bible or any other Masonic authority are fabricated or erroneous. That is because Mr. Julian knows they are accurate. Instead, because the material I present is so damning to Freemasonry, Mr. Julian is forced to accuse me of “misrepresenting” what Masonic ritual “really teaches” as he assails my character.

For example, even though Masonic ritual and many other Masonic writings teach the religious doctrine of “the resurrection of the body,” Mr. Julian denies this reality. By denying what is written in black and white, Mr. Julian reveals that he, not me, is the one misrepresenting what Masonry really teaches. This, of course, strips Mr. Julian of credibility. Because Mr. Julian denies what Freemasonry teaches (which you will see below), it is impossible to have an honest dialogue with him. Thus, this is my final correspondence with David Julian on the subject of Freemasonry.

Going forward, I will focus my efforts on Masons who profess a real love for Jesus Christ, a desire for truth, and a willingness to honestly address Freemasonry’s teachings. I also look forward to engaging Masons who conduct themselves like gentlemen when defending Freemasonry. Evidently, Freemasonry has not taught Mr. Julian the same. I hope he learns something positive from this dialogue.

The following pages will suffice to reveal the truth about David Julian – a professing Christian - and his views on Christianity and Freemasonry. In these pages, Mr. Julian reveals that he rejects the exclusive claims of Jesus Christ, the inspiration of Sacred Scripture and any type of religious authority. In fact, Mr. Julian tells us that he doesn’t believe in objective truth. These views, of course, are repugnant to the beliefs of any informed Christian, Catholic or Protestant. In short, Mr. Julian’s faith is in the religion of Freemasonry, not Jesus Christ.

About the author of the book

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian begins his review by claiming that there are three to five million Masons in the U.S.A. who understand Freemasonry and don't find a conflict between it and Christianity. Evidently, Mr. Julian believes he can speak for the individual beliefs of each of these men, even though he most certainly doesn't have a clue what most of these men believe about Jesus Christ. The fact is, many of these three to five million men are not even Christian, and yet Mr. Julian can claim with confidence that they find no conflict between Freemasonry and Christianity. For many of them, they don't find a conflict *because they don't even believe in Christianity*. As Mr. Julian must admit, you don't have to believe in Jesus Christ to be a Mason. This is one of many examples of how Mr. Julian builds his case upon unproven assumptions. Get used to this as you read Mr. Julian's review.

The other problem with Mr. Julian's argument is that of the purported three to five million Masons in America, (this statistic comes from Freemasonry and cannot be verified), most of these men are not active members in their lodges, as Mr. Julian would even admit. Most men, after being initiated into Freemasonry, never come back to participate in their lodge rituals. This means that most men do not know what Masonic ritual really teaches. Therefore, it is disingenuous for Mr. Julian to claim that all these Masons understand Freemasonry and don't find a conflict between the lodge and their faith. The fact is, most men probably do not return to their lodges *because* of the religious conflicts Masonry presents.

Mr. Julian then says, "every now and then one comes along who just doesn't seem to get it." Every now and then? Mr. Julian must not be aware of the fact that almost every single Christian church that has ever investigated the teachings of Freemasonry has not yet failed to condemn it. These include the Lutherans, Pentecostals, Christian Reformed, Church of the Nazarene, Holiness churches, Quakers, Mennonites, Methodists, Church of the Brethren, Assemblies of God, Wesleyans, Regular Baptists and the Salvation Army, to name a few. In fact, most Christian men do *not* join the lodge because they *know* about these prohibitions. Mr. Julian makes it sound like the Christian men who leave the lodge are some kind of oddballs, but if he believes that Christian opposition is rare, then we know who the oddball really is.

Mr. Julian then says, "Salza is also a self-confessed liar, although he claims he was misled into lying. So consider the source." Here is the beginning of much inflammatory language from Mr. Julian. I will not respond in kind, other than to say that the only "source" your readers should "consider" is the Masonic rituals and other authorities I present in my book and will present in this dialogue. So let us begin.

About the author of this review

D. Julian: 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.

About the author of Masonry Unmasked

J. Salza: John Salza is a former 32nd Degree Freemason and Shriner. He was a member of James M. Hays Lodge #331 and Nathan Hale Lodge #350 in Milwaukee, Wisconsin where he served as Junior Deacon, Senior Deacon and Junior Warden. The Grand Lodge of Wisconsin award Salza a Proficiency Card which authorized him to teach Masons how to perform the Three Degrees of Freemasonry. In addition to teaching Freemasonry's degrees in schools of instruction, Salza proposed many changes to Wisconsin's Masonic ritual which were adopted by the Grand Lodge of Wisconsin. Salza also performed in major degree roles in the Scottish Rite of Freemasonry and the Ritualistic Divan of the Ancient Arabic Order Nobles of the Mystic Shrine. After leaving Freemasonry in 1999, Salza devoted himself to Catholic apologetics. He is the author of *The Biblical Basis for the Catholic Faith*, *The Biblical Basis for the Papacy*, *The Biblical Basis for the Eucharist* (2008), as well as *Masonry Unmasked: An Insider Reveals the Secrets of the Lodge*. Salza is a popular speaker and writer, and has his own daily radio feature on Relevant Radio called "Relevant Answers."

A brief foreword from the reviewer

D. Julian: 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...*"

J. Salza: In the Preface to my book, I thanked a number of people who helped me sever ties with Freemasonry. One of those men was Duane Washum. Mr. Julian criticizes my book simply because I thanked Mr. Washum, even though my book has nothing to do with Mr. Washum. Mr. Julian, you can fight your battle with Mr. Washum on your own time. One thing before I leave this issue: Mr. Washum's ministry has had an open invitation for many years to publicly debate any Mason on the question of Freemasonry's compatibility with Christianity. Mr. Julian has yet to accept the challenge.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian says that the opinions he offers in his review of my book are not “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.” This is an incredible statement. Mr. Julian disclaims his entire case right from the beginning! If Mr. Julian’s opinions are not official opinions of any Masonic Lodge, then why should we believe them? What relevance are they? Why do we care at all what Mr. Julian says? And why are Mr. Julian’s opinions more valuable than mine?

Let me bring this dialogue back to where it needs to be. The Masonic material that I will present in this dialogue (as I have done in my book) *are* the official opinions of the various Grand Lodges from which I quote. Thus, unless Mr. Julian can find some other “official opinions of any Lodge or Grand Lodge” to rebut my arguments, this debate is over.

Chapter I -- My Masonic Credentials

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian argues that, because I went from an Entered Apprentice to a Shriner in six months, it is doubtful that I “would have any more than a superficial understanding of the nature of the fraternity.” Mr. Julian, such an argument shows how desperate you are to undermine my credibility to prove your case. You are a master of *ad hominem* argumentation. Your ongoing tactic is to focus on the character or purported inexperience of your opponent instead of directly answering his contentions. This will not work with me.

First, all but the offices of Worshipful Master, Senior and Junior Warden are appointed positions in Wisconsin and most other states. Masons never have to be Stewards or Chaplains or Marshals to advance in Freemasonry. Our Worshipful Master, Mr. Blair Dixon, who happens to also be a 33nd degree Mason, appointed me to the Junior Deacon’s chair. Thereafter, I advanced to Senior Deacon and Junior Warden before becoming eligible to serve as Worshipful Master. Mr. Julian, are you criticizing Brother Dixon for appointing me directly to Junior Deacon? On what grounds? And should I have Brother Dixon contact you to discuss the matter?

Second, the Grand Lodge of Wisconsin awarded me the Proficiency Card which demonstrated my knowledge of Masonic ritual. Are you saying the Grand Lodge of Wisconsin erred in conferring upon me this distinction? Doesn’t the Grand Lodge of Washington, to whom you swore an oath of fidelity, recognize the Grand Lodge of Wisconsin? Are you willing to publicize your criticism of the Grand Lodge of Wisconsin’s decision to grant me the Proficiency Card? Also, Mr. Julian, did your Grand Lodge of Washington award *you* with a Proficiency Card or any similar honor? How have you been formally recognized for *your* proficiency in Masonic ritual?

Third, as Mr. Julian knows, there is little if any correlation between the time it takes to go through the degrees of Freemasonry and the knowledge one acquires of Freemasonry. Mr. Julian, let’s stick with the objective teachings Masonic ritual and not the subjective experiences of individual Masons. I know many older Masons in their 70s and 80s who took years to go through the first three degrees and have been Masons for four and five decades. Many of these men knew much less about Freemasonry than the men with whom I was initiated. Perhaps Mr. Julian took longer to receive his degrees than I did, but does this mean he knows more about Freemasonry than me? Hardly, as even this dialogue will demonstrate. Mr. Julian, perhaps you can tell us how long one must study Freemasonry to be as knowledgeable as you? I have been studying Freemasonry for ten years, and my own Grand Lodge acknowledged by abilities while I was a Mason. But that is not enough for you? Mr. Julian, save the “inexperienced card” for someone else.

Finally, Mr. Julian says that the lodge that conferred upon me the three degrees must have been a “desperate lodge.” What kind of silly argument is this? Has Mr. Julian ever been to James M. Hays Lodge No. 331 in Milwaukee, Wisconsin? Does he even know any Masons from this lodge? Is he aware that Hays Lodge was one of the most

prestigious Blue Lodges in the State of Wisconsin? Hays Lodge is the home of many prominent 33rd degree Masons including Al Iding, the Past Grand Master of Masons in Wisconsin (who supported my candidacy for the degrees and talked to me about becoming a Grand Lodge officer).

Mr. Julian, would you care to write Past Grand Master Iding and tell him that Hays Lodge is a “desperate lodge”? If you do, please post the Past Grand Master’s response on your website for us to see. Here is Brother Iding’s contact information:

Allan E. Iding
Past Grand Master of Masons in Wisconsin
555 East Wells Street, Suite 1900
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-3800

Also, why not write the Grand Lodge of Wisconsin and tell them how they should not have granted me the Proficiency Card? Why not tell the Grand Lodge that its degree work is not up to your standards? Here is the Grand Lodge of Wisconsin’s contact information:

Grand Lodge F.&A.M. of Wisconsin
36275 Sunset Drive
Dousman, Wisconsin 53118

The only thing “desperate” is Mr. Julian’s defense of Freemasonry.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: I never said I received this information inside the lodge room. I received it outside the lodge room. When I was solicited to join Freemasonry, I was told that the Catholic Church had changed her position on Freemasonry. I was continually fed this information even after my initiation.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian says that the Catholic Church's position is of no interest to Masons, and yet half of his review of my book is devoted to interpreting the Church's position on Freemasonry! Strange.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Now the purported Garibaldi land-grab is the motivation for Pope Leo XIII's condemnation of Freemasonry, according to Mr. Julian. Mr. Julian wants to make it sound like the Catholic Church's condemnation of Freemasonry is purely political. In this way, Mr. Julian thinks he can avoid addressing the real reasons for the Church's condemnation – that Freemasonry's teachings are contrary to Christian faith and morals. Mr. Julian, that approach is not going to work for you. On pages 142-153 of *Masonry Unmasked*, I provide quotes from 23 separate papal condemnations demonstrating that the grounds for the Church's position is *faith and morals*, not politics.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian should do more homework. First, "the general law of the Roman Catholic Church, issued in 1917" does not "remain in effect." The 1983 Code of Canon Law has abrogated the 1917 Code. Second, it was precisely because of such speculations and erroneous opinions about the 1983 Code (as we see with Mr. Kelly) that the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith issued its condemnation of Freemasonry in 1983 (the evening before the 1983 Code became effective). This condemnation reiterated that the teachings of Freemasonry are irreconcilable with the Catholic faith. This is also why the Congregation declared that any Catholic who enrolls in a Masonic association is in a state of grave sin and may not receive the Eucharist. I am surprised that Mr. Julian would want to expose himself by arguing that the Church's opposition is political, for it further weakens his entire presentation.

D. Julian: 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..."

J. Salza: For a more detailed and accurate presentation of the evolution of canon law on the question of Freemasonry, please see *Masonry Unmasked*, pages 153-166.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Another digression for Mr. Julian. As you can see, Mr. Julian’s anti-Catholic bias keeps coming out. After calling Pope Benedict a former “Nazi soldier” who headed what used to be the “Inquisition,” he criticizes the Church for barring immoral politicians from receiving the Eucharist, calling it “blatant political purposes.” Mr. Julian is probably not aware of St. Paul’s warnings in 1 Corinthians 11:27-30 against making sacrilegious communions with the Body and Blood of Christ. Nevertheless, the Church’s prohibition of grave sinners from receiving the Eucharist is our house, not yours, Mr. Julian. Can you please stick to the issue of Freemasonry? Moreover, to equate Joseph Ratzinger’s forced participation in the Hitler Youth with being a “Nazi soldier” is an insult to the Vicar of Christ and shows just how low Mr. Julian is willing to go in his defense of Freemasonry (which, of course, has nothing to do with defending Freemasonry).

D. Julian: 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*.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian continues to assess my motivations for writing the book, even though he has never discussed them with me. Mr. Julian says that my “true purpose” was to “reap all the profits from the cottage industry of anti-Masonry.” More *ad hominem* argumentation from Mr. Julian. Mr. Julian, I can assure you that my motivations for revealing the heresies of Freemasonry are not financial. Nor do I enjoy receiving hate mail from Masons like you on a monthly basis, even with threats to my life. No, Mr. Julian, my motivation for unmasking Freemasonry is a love for Jesus Christ and a desire to reveal to the public how Freemasonry’s teachings about God and eternal life are incompatible with the Christian faith.

D. Julian: 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.*”

J. Salza: Mr. Julian continues to play the “inexperienced card.” After his vulgar use of the term *cajones*, he indicts me for calling myself “an expert in Masonic ritual.” Mr. Julian, it was the Grand Lecturer of the Grand Lodge of Wisconsin who called me “an expert in Masonic ritual.” By calling me an “expert,” he meant that I could perform every position of each of the three degrees of Freemasonry from memory (which I bet is much more than you can or could ever do). That means that I know what Freemasonry teaches in its rituals. If this weren’t the case, then why did the Grand Lodge of Wisconsin authorize me to teach Masonic ritual in Schools of Instruction? Would the Grand Lodge of Wisconsin have conferred upon me the Proficiency Card? And while I was a Mason, Mr. Julian, would you have recognized my Proficiency Card status? Of course you would have. In fact, if you were a Mason in my jurisdiction of Wisconsin, *you would have taken instruction in Masonic ritual from me.* Let’s quit debating credentials, Mr. Julian, and focus on what Freemasonry really teaches.

D. Julian: 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!

J. Salza: J. Salza: In my book, I mention that when I was a Mason I sought the counsel of Past Masters, the Grand Lecturer and even the Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Wisconsin, and none of them were able to reconcile the teachings of Freemasonry with Christianity. Mr. Julian responds by saying, “Does that mean that [these men] did not know the contents of the degrees? Of course not!” Once again, Mr. Julian feels confident in speaking for men he does not know and probably never met.

The fact is, when I presented these men the quote from the Third Degree, Wisconsin Multiple Letter Cipher (Wisconsin’s Masonic ritual book) that teaches Freemasonry’s “faith in the resurrection of the body,” most of these men didn’t know the ritual contained such a teaching! When I showed them the quotation in black and white (page 136), they either denied what they saw or told me not to worry about it. This ignorance is common among Masons. As I have already mentioned, most Masons do not return to their lodges after their initiation to learn its ritualistic teachings.

There was one prominent Mason who acknowledged that the Third Degree in Wisconsin Freemasonry teaches the “resurrection of the body.” That person was Richard Black, Past Grand Master of Masons in Wisconsin. In fact, Mr. Black gave an address in May, 2000 in which he described the Third Degree as “a literal three part drama of living, dying and

being raised to life eternal.” So, Mr. Julian, is Past Grand Master Black’s interpretation incorrect? Do you know more than a Past Grand Master? Would you care to write Brother Black and tell him how erroneous his interpretation of the Third Degree is, or would you like me to do it on your behalf?

D. Julian: 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*.”

J. Salza: Mr. Julian admits that the “degrees of Freemasonry are allegorical plays that teach moral lessons.” But then he says that these “moral lessons” should not be taken “literally” or “seriously.” What kind of organization says morality shouldn’t be taken seriously? What kind of man would treat morality as a joke?

Also, Julian never explains what “moral lessons” are being taught in the lodge. But he knows that they include teachings on how Masons will be raised to the “celestial lodge above” by their “purity of life and conduct,” as is taught in the Entered Apprentice degree. He also knows that this moral instruction includes injunctions against having “illicit carnal intercourse with a Master Mason’s wife, mother, sister or daughter,” as is taught in the Master Mason degree.

Mr. Julian also admits that Masons swear oaths with grisly “symbolic penalties” promising to adhere to and keep secret Masonry’s code of moral conduct. Mr. Julian, do you mean that you swear oaths to God to abide by certain moral lessons, but that these lessons are not to be taken seriously? That, of course, is what you just said. Here is a real “moral lesson” for you: Swearing oaths to God about things that you are not to take seriously is rash swearing and amounts to blasphemy. Let’s see how Mr. Julian extricates himself from this moral quagmire.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian, please share with us the fruits of your research. What “members of Italian Masonic Lodges” work “directly in or for the Vatican”? Please provide us with their names, titles and the source documents from which you are getting your information. Or are you just making this stuff up as you go? Is this another example of your gross overgeneralizations and fabrications in trying to prove a point you can’t prove? We shall see.

D. Julian: 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?*

J. Salza: Again, Mr. Julian acts like there are only a “handful of departing Masons” who are trashing the lodge, even though almost every Christian church has unequivocally condemned Freemasonry. Mr. Julian, you would have much more credibility if you would at least admit the pervasive Christian opposition to Freemasonry, and then present your case. But instead, because you have no real defense of Freemasonry, you pretend that there are only a few oddball Christians out there who oppose the lodge, and then act like a real defense isn’t worth presenting. This undermines your credibility, not mine.

D. Julian: 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.”

J. Salza: As usual, Mr. Julian misrepresents the Church’s teaching. The Church doesn’t condemn Freemasonry because Masonry is a “secret society.” The Church condemns Freemasonry because its religious teachings are contrary to Christian faith and morals. Period. Mr. Julian acts like the Catholic Church doesn’t know that the Masonic Lodge advertises in public through its buildings, signs, and emblems. This is irrelevant. The Jehovah’s Witnesses and the Mormons do the same, and the Church condemns their heretical ideas as well. Moreover, it is Freemasonry’s intention to keep its rituals secret. That is why it publishes them for Masons only in ciphered format and transmits much of

its teaching through oral tradition. That is also why it requires its members to swear oaths behind the secrecy of the lodge door, promising to keep Masonry's teachings secret. To that extent, Mr. Julian, Freemasonry is a "secret society."

NB: Masonic apologists invariably try to defend Freemasonry by giving Masonry "labels." We see this with Mr. Julian's attempt to say Freemasonry is not a "secret society." Mr. Julian also does this when he argues that Freemasonry is not a "religion." He thinks that labeling something automatically provides the proper definition of what the something really is. The problem with that approach, of course, is that religious error is religious error, no matter what label you slap on it. When it comes to teachings about God and eternal life, we don't simply judge a book by its cover. We look at what the book actually teaches.

You can call Freemasonry a "fraternity," a "philanthropy," a "charity," whatever you want. This doesn't change that fact that Freemasonry's teachings about God and eternal life are incompatible with the Christian faith. Why? *Because Freemasonry teaches that a Mason can have eternal life without Jesus Christ.* This is the crux of the issue, Mr. Julian, and the basis for the Church's most severe condemnation.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: (I warned you about how Mr. Julian overwhelms his readers with lots of useless material which does nothing for his case.) I have dealt extensively with this supposed "softening" of the Church's position from 1964 to 1983 in my book on pages pages 153-166. It was precisely because of the liberal views of those like Mr. Julian that the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith issued the 1983 condemnation of Masonic associations. None of this does anything for Mr. Julian's position. Mr. Julian, do you actually want to debate whether or not the Catholic Church opposes Catholic membership in Freemasonry? This is so well-settled as to not warrant any further discussion.

Also, let us settle once and for all whether Freemasonry teaches about faith in bodily resurrection. Dear readers, please see the following:

In the Masonic ritual in Wisconsin, after the candidate is raised up, the Worshipful Master tells him on page 136: “The Second Section is of pre-eminent importance. It exemplifies an instance of virtue, fortitude and integrity seldom equaled and never excelled in the history of man. It recites the legend or historical tradition on which the degree is founded - a legend whose symbolic interpretation testifies to our faith in the resurrection of the body and the immortality of the soul.”

The Masonic Bible, from which Mr. Julian quotes in this dialogue to advance his case, also provides the following detailed catechesis on Freemasonry’s belief in the resurrection of the body:

- “A distinctive tenet of Masonry is that there remains a heaven of rest and of rewards for the good and faithful, a place of perfect happiness beyond the grave and the resurrection of the body” (p. 44).
- “The doctrine of eternal life permeates all the Mysteries of Freemasonry; it is the fundamental basis of the Third Degree in a very special emphasis. Co-equal with emphasis on this tenet of Masonic Faith is belief in the future resurrection of the body” (p. 41).
- “Foremost of all the truths taught and emphasized in [the Master Mason] degree, is the immortality of the soul of man and the certainty of the resurrection of his body to eternal life” (p. 11).
- “...there will be an awakening of the body and a resurrection of a spiritual body capable and fitted for eternal life” (p. 39).
- “[House not made with hands] comprehends the eternal dwelling place of God, and the resurrected and glorified body of the redeemed in the life beyond the grave” (p. 45).
- “This collection of metaphors is a part of the Scripture reading of the Third Degree, and forms an appropriate introduction to the sublime ceremonies whose object is to teach symbolically the resurrection and life eternal” (p. 58).
- “...the very philosophy of Masonry teaches us that there can be no death without a resurrection, no decay without a subsequent restoration, no loss without eventual recovery” (p. 49).
- his soul returns to God who gave it and his body which returns to dust shall be raised, incorruptible and glorified and qualified for entrance into the Grand Lodge of the Celestial City of God” (p. 11).

The Landmarks and a host of other Masonic authors also describe the Third Degree of Freemasonry to symbolize Masonry’s faith in the resurrection of the body. So, Mr. Julian, are you still going to publicly argue that Freemasonry does not teach bodily resurrection? It is extremely difficult debating someone who denies reality. I hope my patrons can

understand that I have much more important work to do than play in the make-believe world of Mr. Julian.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: There Mr. Julian goes again. Not only does Mr. Julian speak for the five million Masons in this country, he is now speaking for my former parish priest, whom he has never met (he doesn't even know the priest's name). Mr. Julian knows what my parish priest really meant and says that I "missed the priest's subtle message." According to Mr. Julian, the priest's message was that "we don't need to open that can of worms here," in reference to the Church's opposition to Freemasonry. What this argument does for Mr. Julian is anyone's guess. Why, Mr. Julian, do you characterize the Church's position as "a can of worms"? Again, are you arguing that the Catholic Church does not oppose Freemasonry? Do you want to debate this issue? I would be happy to open the "can of worms" for you and rub your nose in it.

Chapter II - An Introduction to Freemasonry

A Brief History of Freemasonry

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian takes issue with my statement that "the true origins of Freemasonry are debated." Mr. Julian says that "the true origins of Freemasonry are *unknown*," not debated. This is another issue that is irrelevant to Freemasonry's incompatibility with Freemasonry, but Mr. Julian feels the need to provide us with some history. That is fine with me. Actually, Mr. Julian, Speculative Freemasonry connects its origins to the operative Masons of the Middle Ages. This is why today's Freemasonry has retained the symbolism of their operative forefathers such as the square, level, plumb, and trowel. The particulars of these origins *are* debated among Masons, and Mr. Julian even admits that there is "speculation" about these connections. This is another fact that is so well-settled that it warrants no further commentary. I agree with Mr. Julian that, notwithstanding the debate, American Freemasonry can be traced to the lodge alliance that occurred in 1717.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: On page 23 of my book, I state that Freemasonry prior to the formation of the Grand Lodge of England in 1717 was Christian and cite a Masonic prayer that refers to the Father, Son and Holy Ghost to prove my case. This is seen in the Harleian M.S. No. 1942 (c.A.D. 1670) and the Antiquity M.S. (A.D. 1686). I then demonstrate that

Freemasonry after 1717 removed all references to the Blessed Trinity using, *inter alia*, the very 1723 *Constitution of the Free-Masons* by James Anderson that Mr. Julian cites. While this is a simple, historical fact, Mr. Julian calls my statements “disingenuous at best and patently false at worst.” Why? Is Mr. Julian arguing that pre-1717 Freemasonry did not offer prayers to the Trinity, even when the foregoing documents prove they did? Is Mr. Julian arguing that post-1717 Freemasonry does pray to the Trinity when modern Masonic ritual shows that it does not?

Why does Mr. Julian address what seems to be an insignificant historical detail? Because Mr. Julian is trying to distance himself from the fact that Freemasonry, as of 1717, deliberately omitted from its gatherings prayers to the Holy Trinity, which were previously a part of Masonic prayers (this change was influenced by Enlightenment Deism which rejected the Catholic doctrines of the fall, redemption, and grace in favor of Rationalism which even today pervades Masonic ritual). This is why Mr. Julian felt the need to address this issue. In fact, he admits this when he says that “modern Freemasonry (since 1717) has never made any direct references to the Roman Catholic religion, so there were no such references to be *eliminated*.” If Freemasonry really did eliminate prayer to the Blessed Trinity and other Christian practices, then Mr. Julian has to explain why, which is something he wants to avoid. Mr. Julian also refers to the “Triune God of the Church of England.” I didn’t know that the church of England had its own God.

D. Julian: 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*.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian says that “the official Great Light and Volume of the Sacred Law is the Holy Bible, King James Version.” Mr. Julian, this is deceptive and you know it. While the Holy Bible can be the Great Light for the Christian Mason, it is not the Great Light for non-Christian Masons. That is because Freemasonry does not believe the Bible is the Word of God. Because, in Freemasonry, the Bible is not the Word of God, it may be substituted for heretical books.

This is why Masonic ritual specifically says that the “Volume of the Sacred Law” is the Great Light of Masonry. Thus, *any* religious writing can be placed on the Masonic altar to accompany the Bible or *as a substitute* for the Bible if it reflects the religious views of the membership. Mr. Julian should tell his Jewish and Muslim lodge brothers that the Holy Bible, King James Version, is the Great Light of Freemasonry. They would laugh at him. In fact, they may even accuse him of un-Masonic conduct and take their case to his Grand Lodge. Mr. Julian thinks that he is such an expert in Freemasonry than he can invent the rules as he goes along.

Mr. Julian, I will take you to task. Show us where Masonic ritual says that the official Great Light and Volume of the Sacred Law is *the King James Version of Scripture*. And while you are trying to prove that the KJV is the Great Light, are you willing to publish that Freemasonry is a Christian organization? After all, if the Great Light of Freemasonry is the Holy Bible (and not the Koran, the Zend Avesta, the Upanishads or other religious writings), then Freemasonry must be a Christian organization, correct? This shows just how inaccurate Mr. Julian's view of Freemasonry really is.

D. Julian: 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?*

J. Salza: More digressions for Mr. Julian which have nothing to do with *Masonry Unmasked*. Again, Mr. Julian criticizes the Catholic Church, and again, Mr. Julian demonstrates his ignorance of what the Church actually teaches. Mr. Julian claims that Galileo and Copernicus "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 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."

Mr. Julian, you have quite a big mouth so let's see if you can back up your claims. Tell us, what popes, in what official pronouncements, taught us that the earth was flat? What popes claimed to receive this knowledge by divine revelation? And where has the Catholic Church ever declared that her teachings on Geocentrism are infallible? If you are going to make these accusations, then I will force you to prove your case. Please provide us a list of these documents. Let's see if you are a true scholar or an anti-Catholic blow-hard who is all bark and no bite. As an aside, the readers can surely see how irrelevant cosmology is to the question of Freemasonry's compatibility with Christianity. But let's see what Mr. Julian comes up with.

Also, you said that "papal infallibility fell apart." Let's save papal infallibility for another debate. Let me know when you are ready.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: More history lessons from Mr. Julian which have nothing to do with *Masonry Unmasked*. Again, Mr. Julian does not explain why these lessons help his case. None of this proves that Freemasonry is compatible with Christianity. It just shows how weak Mr. Julian's case is. He likes to write. He probably likes to hear himself talk as well. We can save the Inquisition issue for another debate. The Church that punished heretics is the same Church that preserved Christianity from the onslaught of these heresies, and to whom we owe a debt of gratitude. But I will resist from digressing into this area until we exhaust the debate on Freemasonry.

The Organization of Freemasonry

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian is desperate to defend the Shriners but does a very poor job doing so. Tell us, Mr. Julian, why does the Shrine ritual require its members (Christians included) to swear an oath to Allah on the Koran? Or are you saying that your ritual in Washington differs from the other states? I have already addressed the severity of swearing oaths to God. When you couple this oath on the Koran with the other Islamic elements in the Shriners (the Mosque, the passwords *Mecca* and *Medina*, the symbolism of the crescent and scimitar), we can safely conclude that the Shrine is either an anti-Christian organization, or its purpose is to make fun of the religion of Islam (which would be an anti-Christian activity). This is why both Christians and Muslims have adamantly opposed the Shriners in no uncertain terms. I have already addressed the supposed “charity” of the Shriners in my book on pages 75-76 so I will not deal with it here (but I do address this topic further along in the dialogue).

Who speaks for Freemasonry

D. Julian: 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.”

J. Salza: Mr. Julian just said that “no one speaks for Freemasonry,” and then he goes on to “speak for Freemasonry.” Mr. Julian, if “no one speaks for Freemasonry,” then why should we listen to you? If “no one speaks for Freemasonry,” then it certainly begs the question why you think you do.

Moreover, your statement is erroneous. As I have just mentioned, each Grand Lodge speaks for Freemasonry in its particular state, and Mr. Julian knows this (or should know this). If this weren’t the case, then Mr. Julian could alter his Grand Lodge’s Masonic ritual to say something other than what it says and the Grand Lodge of Washington could do nothing about it. The fact is, if Mr. Julian attempted to revise his Grand Lodge’s Masonic ritual to include prayers to Jesus Christ for his particular Blue Lodge, he would be prevented from doing so. Why? Because his Grand Lodge is the authority over the Masonic ritual in his state of Washington (and because you don’t have to believe in Jesus to be a Mason). When Masons argue that “no one speaks for Freemasonry,” this is simply an effort to confuse the readers. Mr. Julian, I know better than this. Either you are being deliberately disingenuous or are profoundly ignorant of Masonic law and practice.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: My "Masonic" immaturity? Somehow, Mr. Julian is judging my spiritual, moral and intellectual maturity by "Masonic" standards. Mr. Julian, in case you didn't know, as Christians we judge our maturity by the teachings of Jesus Christ, not the Masonic Lodge.

Now, let me further reveal the fallacy of Mr. Julian's argument "No one speaks for Freemasonry." Julian says that Masons "make plausible claims about the way Masonic symbols might be interpreted" and that there is a "great deal of latitude when it comes to his (a Mason's) own definitions of Masonic terms and principles." Okay, Mr. Julian, let's play by your rules. When I was a Mason, I interpreted the Third Degree to symbolize Freemasonry's faith in the resurrection of the body.

Tell me, why wasn't my interpretation "plausible" and afforded the "latitude" that your interpretation is afforded? Moreover, my interpretation of the Third Degree was supported by statements from my Masonic ritual, as well as the Masonic Bible and other Masonic "opinions" which all claimed that the Third Degree symbolized bodily resurrection. Again, why doesn't Mr. Julian provide me with the same latitude as his Masonic brothers? Because the truth hurts, and Mr. Julian feels it.

Not only is Mr. Julian's argument fallacious, it is patently false. Just because there is no authority that speaks for "worldwide" Freemasonry does not mean that there are no Masonic authorities. Mr. Julian, you would consider your Grand Lodge of Washington an "authority" on Freemasonry, wouldn't you? As you well know, each Grand Lodge in the United States is the authority for Freemasonry in that particular state. Thus, when we use the rituals to reveal the teachings of Freemasonry, we are using recognized Masonic authorities. You can call them "opinions" if you like, but you are oath-bound to follow those "opinions," since your Grand Lodge of Washington recognizes the Grand Lodge of Wisconsin's rituals (and all the other rituals cited in my book) as valid Freemasonry.

Mr. Julian, if the Grand Lodge of Washington is not an "authority" over you, then why don't you try to set up a rival Grand Lodge in that state? And while you are at it, why don't you make up different rituals for the three degrees? If you attempted such things, the Grand Lodge of Washington would kick your fanny out of Freemasonry. Why? Because the Grand Lodge of Washington *is a Masonic authority over you*. It's the same Grand Lodge that recognized my status when I was a Mason.

D. Julian: 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?

J. Salza: Mr. Julian, this is not a contradiction. My book says that Freemasonry’s teachings are “essentially” the same, even though there is no consensus as to “every single Landmark.” Teachings can be the same in essence, even though there may be minor disparities from state to state. This is another failed attempt to impugn my credibility by pretending that I don’t know what I am talking about. Your readers should be able to see right through these efforts. Mine will.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Wait a minute. Did you see what Mr. Julian just said? In interpreting Masonic ritual, Julian said, “the transition can be the resurrection of the body, but it doesn’t have to be.” Mr. Julian, if the “transition *can be* the resurrection of the body” which happens to my view, then why are you criticizing me? Why are you, out of one side of your mouth, declaring that my interpretation of bodily resurrection is preposterous, and out of the other side of your mouth saying it is a permissible interpretation? Mr. Julian is a confused man indeed.

Let me also address Mr. Julian’s statement, “The one ever-living and true God is the God of candidate’s own conscience.” Dear readers, this statement reveals why Mr. Julian has been deceived by Freemasonry. Truth is not a matter of one’s own conscience. Truth is the assent of the intellect to what has been revealed *outside* of the conscience. That is

Theology 101. Accordingly, Scripture teaches that there is one true God and many false gods. If the Grand Architect of the Universe is not the Blessed Trinity, then it is a false god.

Mr. Julian is correct that the most fundamental of Masonic teachings is a belief in “God” and an “afterlife.” These beliefs are part of the Landmarks of Freemasonry. However, requiring its members to believe in God and an afterlife to be admitted into Masonry is much different than teaching about God and an afterlife once a candidate is inside the lodge room. This is where Freemasonry gets into trouble. Freemasonry does not limit its belief about “God” and an “afterlife” to its admission requirements. Freemasonry teaches the Mason that, by his purity of life and conduct, he will gain entrance into the celestial lodge above where the Supreme Architect of the Universe provides. That is, Freemasonry teaches a man that he can obtain eternal life without faith in Jesus Christ. Moreover, Freemasonry doesn’t identify what “God” it prays to and worships. But we know that if Masonry’s “God” is not the Holy Trinity, it is a false god. Masonry’s doctrines are heretical, whether you are a Catholic or a Protestant.

D. Julian: 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.*

J. Salza: Mr. Julian, you have presented many different names for the god of the Masonic Lodge. Tell us, however, why the god of the Lodge is not called “Father, Son and Holy Spirit”? The Blessed Trinity is the only true God. So answer this question, Mr. Julian: Is the Grand Architect of the Masonic Lodge the Blessed Trinity? Yes or no? It is that simple. If your answer is “yes,” are your Christian and Muslim lodge brothers aware of this? If your answer is “no,” then the god of the lodge is of the devil, not God. Let me further illustrate the error of Freemasonry’s view of God.

As Mr. Julian well knows, when a candidate for the Entered Apprentice degree is escorted into the lodge, the Worshipful Master asks him, “In whom do you put your trust?” If, for example, the candidate professes a belief in the deity of the Great Thumb, the Worshipful Master is required to tell the candidate, “Your trust being in God, your faith is well-founded. Arise, follow your conductor, and fear no danger.”

Mr. Julian, is the Worshipful Master lying to the candidate or not? Is the candidate’s “trust” really in the true “God”? Is the candidate’s faith in the deity of the Great Thumb “well-founded”? Please answer this question directly. Either the candidate believes in the true God or a false god. If Mr. Julian says that the candidate believes in the true God,

then Mr. Julian is a pagan, not a Christian. If Mr. Julian says that the candidate believes in a false god, then Mr. Julian is condoning idolatry.

D. Julian: 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

J. Salza: Yes, Mr. Julian, I know the Scriptures. I even agree with your connection of John 1:51 to Genesis 28:10-17. But what is your point? Are you saying that Freemasonry is a Christian organization? Even though it deliberately omits the name of Jesus from its prayers and Scripture references? Tell your Jewish and Muslim brothers that and see what they say. You also say that Freemasonry does not “guarantee” immortality (which is not true as I will prove later). Yet Freemasonry teaches that a man can have the hope of eternal life without the grace of Jesus Christ. This is in profound conflict with the Christian faith.

Christianity teaches that we are born under the curse of eternal death for our sins. It is only through the grace of Jesus Christ which we initially receive at baptism which removes us from the condemnation of the law and gives us hope in eternal life. Jesus said, “He who believes and is baptized will be saved; he who does not believe will be condemned” (Mk 16:16). Freemasonry says nothing about baptism or the need to have faith in Jesus Christ as it teaches its members that their heavenly reward awaits them. This view of the ability to gain eternal life, whether it is a “hope” or a “guarantee,” is heretical. You can respond to these facts only by claiming that “Freemasonry is not a religion.” But religious error is religious error, no matter what you call it.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Again, Mr. Julian tells us half the story. As I explain on page 77, the “physical and mental defects” I refer to deal with those defects which would prevent a man from swearing his Masonic oaths. Every Grand Lodge has a requirement that a man must have the physical and mental capacity to swear the Masonic oaths or he cannot be admitted into the moral system of Freemasonry. That is why Mr. Julian’s own Grand Lodge will

not accept petitions from “senile old men” and “raving lunatics.” This is a universal practice of Freemasonry. While I was a Mason, our law prohibited lodges from accepting petitions from the blind or from men who did not have their limbs (because they couldn’t make the secret signs of self-mutilation that they swear in the oaths). Perhaps Mr. Julian can write the Grand Lodge of Wisconsin and tell them how wrong they were in imposing these requirements.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian keeps harping on the Landmarks. First, he says that belief in God and eternal life (with or without Christ) are “fundamental and unalterable principles that define a Masonic lodge.” But then he says that no one knows what a Masonic Landmark really is. So which one is it, Mr. Julian? Is the belief in God and eternal life a Masonic Landmark or not? And if no one really knows what a Landmark is, then why does Freemasonry teach that there are Landmarks at all? Has it just made up the concept of Landmark to confuse us all? Perhaps Mr. Julian can give us his list of Landmarks. And while he is at it, he can write to all the Grand Lodges who have adopted Mackey’s Landmarks and tell them that they are wrong.

D. Julian: 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.*”

J. Salza: Mr. Julian does not know Masonic ritual like he thinks he does. Mr. Julian, can a man be a Mason *without* receiving the degrees? Other than a Grand Master making a Mason on sight (which is extremely rare), the answer to this question is a resounding “No.” That means a man becomes a Mason *by receiving the degrees*. Hence, my statement is true and your rebuttal is false. To be specific, a man becomes a Mason as soon as he takes his Masonic oath (also called “obligation”). As Mr. Julian alluded to (but did not cite correctly), when the Worshipful Master asks the Senior Warden, “What makes you a Mason?,” the Senior Warden responds, “My obligation.” The Senior Warden took his obligation *during his reception of the particular Masonic degree*. So, Mr. Julian, you are once again incorrect in your understanding of Masonic ritual and practice.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: No, Mr. Julian, you are the one who missed what the ritual actually says. I am surprised, since you must have heard the Senior Warden's response "My obligation" hundreds of times during your more than 20 years as a Mason. It is Mr. Julian who has taken on "too much, too fast" in his critique of my book, for he is unable to muster any credible rebuttals to my arguments without stepping on himself at every turn.

Chapter III - The Ideology of Freemasonry

Introduction to the Problem of Indifferentism

D. Julian: 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.*"

J. Salza: Now I don't know much about the Catholic faith? Even Protestant apologists with whom I interact on a weekly basis would laugh at that statement.

D. Julian: I have already shown that the RCC has taken ten steps backward in that regard, by reactivating it's condemnation of Freemasonry and denial of the Eucharist to Freemasons and certain politicians.

J. Salza: Here is more of Mr. Julian's anti-Catholic bias. Mr. Julian says that the Catholic Church has "reactivated" its condemnation of Freemasonry. But, before, Mr. Julian argued that the Church no longer opposed Freemasonry. Again, which one is it, Mr. Julian? If you want to argue that the Church "reactivated" her condemnations, please show us where it overruled its condemnations in the first place. Of course, Mr. Julian can do no such thing because the Church has always condemned Freemasonry. Moreover, the Church has always prohibited grave sinners from receiving the Eucharist so as to prevent sacrilege from occurring. The Church has done this since St. Paul's warning in 1 Corinthians 11:27. These positions are certainly not new, and yet Mr. Julian acts like they are recent shifts in Catholic teaching. Mr. Julian does not have a clue what the Catholic Church teaches.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian, you were not permitted to receive Holy Communion because you are not in communion with the Catholic Church and do not believe that the Eucharist is the flesh and blood of Jesus Christ (which Catholics have believed for 2,000 years). Receiving Communion in the Catholic Church is a public declaration that you are in communion with Christ and the teachings of His Church. This prohibition safeguards the integrity of the sacrament and prevents scandal. Again, this goes all the way back to St. Paul's injunctions in his first letter to the church at Corinth. Again, what does this have to do with *Masonry Unmasked*?

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian continues his anti-Catholic ranting and raving. Now he has a problem with Mel Gibson's wonderful movie *The Passion of the Christ*. It was probably "too Catholic" for Mr. Julian. Why does Mr. Julian digress with so many side issues that are not relevant to this debate? It just shows how emotional Mr. Julian is about Freemasonry and his inability to defend the Lodge against sound argumentation. He is a cross-examiner's dream.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Again, more anti-Catholicism. I am the first person to declare that the pedophile priests and bishops who covered for them acted reprehensibly and should be severely punished. But this has nothing to do with the debate at issue. God will be their judge.

Also, Mr. Julian, do you criticize the religion of your fellow Catholic Masons? Do you denigrate their religion as you do mine? If not, why not? Is it because they are current Masons and I am a former Mason? If Freemasonry supposedly teaches religious tolerance, then why don't you follow its teachings in this regard? Especially when you swore an oath to do so? I will tell you why: You are a hypocrite of the first order.

D. Julian: "*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 -- it's membership fees and dues are not even tax-deductible -- because Freemasonry is a philanthropic fraternity, not a path to salvation.

J. Salza: Your welcome, David Julian, for telling the truth. Masonry does not define for its members the religious truth it seeks because it ultimately leaves the question of "truth" to the subjective whim of its members. Religious relativism *is the religion of Freemasonry*, as Mr. Julian has even argued for. Anything goes. Believe in Christ? Fine. Reject Him? That is okay, too. All you need is "purity of life and conduct" to gain admission into the "celestial lodge above." So, Mr. Julian, Freemasonry *does* have a religious doctrine: belief in God and immortality, no matter what god, and no matter what faith. This fits right in with Mr. Julian's theology that "religious truth" is a matter of the "individual conscience."

D. Julian: 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...*"

J. Salza: But if Freemasonry tells both the Christian and the Zoroastrian that their "purity of life and conduct is essentially necessary to gaining admission into the celestial lodge above," then isn't that what Freemasonry is really saying? Both the Christian and the Zoroastrian viewpoints are seen as competitive attempts to express the truth about God because neither view is held to be exclusive, even though Jesus said that He was the only way to eternal life. If Freemasonry tells both the Christian and the Hindu that their "trust is in God," then Masonry views Christianity as nothing more than an attempt to explain the truth about God, but not the one and true religion. It is that simple.

And Mr. Julian, don't come back with the common Masonic rebuttal that "Freemasonry doesn't make a doctrinal statement about God." It certainly does. If the candidate for the Entered Apprentice degree professes a belief in any deity whatsoever, Freemasonry tells him that his trust *is in the one true God*. Freemasonry's doctrinal statement, then, is that any belief in deity is a belief in the true God. *Freemasonry's doctrine is that there is one*

God for all religions. Freemasonry's God is non-sectarian. For Freemasonry, a profession of faith in Vishnu *is* faith in the true God. For the Christian, a profession of faith in Vishnu is *not* faith in the true God. This is why Christianity and Freemasonry are diametrically opposed to each other.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: No reasonable person would have a problem with this statement from the Entered Apprentice degree. No one is arguing that every single statement in Masonic ritual is problematic. But neither is every single statement from the Koran problematic from a Christian perspective. Mr. Julian needs to focus on the problematic teachings of Freemasonry, not the unproblematic ones.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: The problem with Mr. Julian's remark is that the very Masonic ritual that Mr. Julian participates in embodies Hall's philosophy. When Mr. Julian took the Entered Apprentice degree and the Worshipful Master asked Mr. Julian in whom he put his trust, Mr. Julian could have said, "Christ," or "Buddha," or "Mohammed." It would not have mattered. To Freemasonry, "the name means little." No, Mr. Julian, Manly Hall wasn't speaking for you. He was speaking for Freemasonry. The sooner you realize that Freemasonry has its own beliefs independent of yours, the sooner you will realize that Freemasonry is incompatible with Christianity.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: What does any of this have to do with Masonic ritual and the teachings of Freemasonry? Mr. Julian continues to inundate his readers with useless information as an effort to subterfuge the real issues. It is quite predictable to watch Masons squirm when their lodge brothers' anti-Christian books are quoted by Christians.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian, thank you for admitting that I share the same views about Freemasonry with "Brothers Albert Pike, Albert Mackey and Henry Wilson Coil." Now tell me, have you accused these "Brothers" of "Masonic immaturity and ignorance" as you have done to me? Have you denounced the writings of these "Brothers" as you have done to my book? If not, why not? Your duplicity is quite telling, as I am sure those reading this dialogue can plainly see. Also, of those supposed "2000 different authors," how come there is not a single Masonic author who has written a defense against the problems of indifferentism, syncretism, and the lodge's doctrine of the resurrection of the body?

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Then why are my views wrong but Mr. Julian's views right? Mr. Julian's argument would be credible if he would just admit that my views, while a Mason, were perfectly admissible, most especially because they were taken directly from the plain language of the rituals. Mr. Julian does not have the courage to make this admission, however, because he is threatened by what I have revealed about his organization.

When I was a Mason and looked at page 136 of Wisconsin's Masonic ritual, I discovered the statement that says the Third Degree "testifies to Freemasonry's faith in the resurrection of the body and the immortality of the soul." When I had to orally recite, from memory, the nearly 200 pages of Masonic Ritual to the Grand Lecturer's Deputy to become a Proficiency Man, I had to include this quotation. I also interpreted "resurrection of the body" to mean just what it says: "resurrection of the body." The Masonic Bible confirmed it. The Landmarks confirmed it. Mackey, Coil and Pike confirmed it. And the Past Grand Master of Masons in Wisconsin, Richard Black, confirmed it. When I realized that Freemasonry believed in bodily resurrection without a concomitant belief in the need to accept Jesus Christ, I left the Lodge. Tell us, Mr. Julian, how do you interpret "resurrection of the body"?

D. Julian: 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 its 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.

J. Salza: Let me prove right here and now that Mr. Julian is either completely ignorant of Masonry's teachings or is lying to us.

Henry Wilson Coil uses the word "guarantee" when he says that, in getting to heaven, many Freemasons may have "*no other guarantee of a safe landing than their belief in the religion of Freemasonry*" (Coil's Masonic Encyclopedia, page 512).

The Masonic Bible, from which Mr. Julian himself quotes to prove his case, says this:

"By the practice of Freemasonry, its members may advance their spirituality, and mount by the theological ladder from the Lodge on earth to the Lodge in heaven" (p. 26).

Mr. Julian, do you care to recant your misrepresentation that "Freemasonry never claims its principles will guarantee the advance of its members to the 'heavenly Lodge above'"? I hope you do lest you lose credibility even among your Masonic brethren.

D. Julian: I submit that Salza missed still another very subtle but nonetheless very important distinction: that's a *Hope in*, not a *Guarantee of*, immortality.

J. Salza: I have already demonstrated that Coil uses the word "guarantee" so Mr. Julian is wrong again. Further, the quote from the Masonic Bible says nothing about "hope." It simply says that a Mason may advance his spirituality and mount by the theological ladder from the Lodge on earth to the Lodge in heaven. These are quite the statements from an institution that Mr. Julian says is just a fraternity. Moreover, any distinction between "hope" and "guarantee" is meaningless from a Christian perspective if Jesus Christ is omitted from the picture. Even though a Mason may reject Jesus Christ who is

the only “way, truth and life,” Freemasonry tells that man that he may nevertheless advance to the heavenly lodge by his practice of Freemasonry. Again, this is a heresy that is staring Mr. Julian right in the face, but he doesn’t have the courage to honestly address it.

As I have already explained, the Christian religion teaches that there is no “hope” without Jesus Christ. In fact, Jesus Christ is our only “hope” (2 Cor 1:10; 1 Tim 1:1; 4:10). Jesus has told us that He alone is the way to the Father (Jn 14:6). Without Christ, we have no hope. Without the grace which comes from Christ, we remain eternally condemned for our sins. Even if Masonry is only giving its members “hope” in eternal life, it is a false hope without Jesus Christ. This is why Freemasonry is a lie.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian, Christians do not define terms of religion using secular sources like Masons do. But let’s not even use Christian sources and practice. Let’s use Masonic practice. Sectarianism in Freemasonry essentially means elevating one doctrinal view of God over another. Outside of a generic belief in God and eternal life, Masonry does not engage in sectarianism. That is, it does not elevate one doctrinal belief or religion over another. Instead, it places the true religion of Jesus Christ along side the false religions of

Islam, Buddhism, Shintoism, Sikhism and Zoroastrianism. This is the heart of the non-sectarian religion of Freemasonry and why it is incompatible with Christianity.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Readers, Mr. Julian has revealed something very important about his religious philosophy in the above paragraph. My fellow Christians (Masons included), please pay attention to this. Mr. Julian says that whether or not Allah is the same God as Pater Nostra (sic) is “trivial and unresolvable.” Mr. Julian believes that the true identity of God is a “trivial and unresolvable” issue that regards nothing more than “phony-baloney, holier-than-thou separatist dogma.”

Mr. Julian believes that the identity of God is “trivial and unresolvable” because his religion is Freemasonry, not Christianity. Christians believe that the true identify of God is *not* “trivial and unresolvable,” but *the most important and knowable reality that God Himself has given us*. That is why many millions of Christians have chosen martyrdom rather than put the Blessed Trinity on the same level as Brahma, Vishnu and Shiva. But Mr. Julian would call these Christians “sectarian Neofundamentalists.” Mr. Julian, your true beliefs about God and Christianity come out more and more explicitly as we proceed with this dialogue.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Now Mr. Julian quotes from a “former nun.” He has all the authorities, doesn’t he? Moreover, if a former Catholic is an expert on Catholicism, why can’t I, a former Freemason, be an expert on Freemasonry? Again, Mr. Julian’s argumentation is the model of inconsistency and arbitrariness.

D. Julian: 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*.

J. Salza: Remember when I said that Masons invariably attempt to define Freemasonry by slapping a label on it? Mr. Julian does it again here. Even though Masonic ritual teaches that Masons can have eternal life by their “purity of life and conduct,” and will be “resurrected to the celestial lodge above,” Mr. Julian can ignore this religious teaching because he says that “Freemasonry is a philanthropical fraternity, not a religion.” In this way, Mr. Julian thinks he doesn’t have to address Masonry’s religious teachings head-on. He simply slaps the “fraternity” label on it and moves on. This is Mr. Julian’s way of conveniently skirting the issues of the debate. The problem, of course, is this: *Errors about God and salvation are still errors, no matter what the context or situation.*

D. Julian: 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).

J. Salza: Dear Christian readers, please pay attention to this. Mr. Julian has just accused St. Paul of being a “separatist Neofundamentalist” because he penned the words of 2 Cor 6:14-17. Of course, Mr. Julian’s charge is against God Himself, for God inspired St. Paul to write these words. Mr. Julian has revealed himself to be a blasphemer and is self-condemned.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Now Mr. Julian is a student of hermeneutics? I wish he would apply his knowledge of hermeneutics by exegeting the passages of Masonic ritual that teach about Freemasonry’s belief in the resurrection of the body. I wish he would share with us his

hermeneutical approach to interpreting how the purity of a Mason's life and conduct is necessary to his gaining admission into the celestial lodge above.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: First, I never said 2 Corinthians 6 is about "withdrawing into protected Christian communes and monasteries," so Mr. Julian is putting words in my mouth. Second, 2 Corinthians 6:14-18 is about avoiding religious communion with unbelievers. Why? Because this was leading the Corinthians into idolatry. I think Mr. Julian gets this because he mentions the Corinthians' worship of false gods like Venus, but I am not sure. Sexual orgies were part of the pagan worship that Paul tells the Corinthians to renounce. While Masons do not engage in sexual orgies in the lodge room, Paul's injunction to avoid being yoked together with unbelievers applies to all "Christian" Masons. Christians become "yoked" together with unbelievers when they worship with them around the common altar of Freemasonry and swear their covenant oaths to the Lodge.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: The Greek word is *heterozugeo* which literally means “diversely yoked.” It means that Christians should not have communion (Greek, *koinonia*) with non-Christians when worshiping God. It means that Christians should not accept Freemasonry’s invitation to meet “upon the level” when it comes to worshiping God and swearing oaths. It means that Christians should not worship God at a common altar around which Buddhists, Hindus and Shintoists also worship.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: If Mr. Julian really understood *Dignitatis Humanae*, he would know that the Church’s condemnations have nothing to do with the civil right to religious freedom, which is precisely what I explain in *Masonry Unmasked*. But Mr. Julian missed it. The Church’s condemnations are based on the moral law and the fact that Christians, nay all people, have a moral obligation to worship the Triune God and to bear witness to Jesus Christ, inside or outside the Masonic Lodge. This is because Jesus Christ is the only way to salvation, and without Christ, we stand condemned before God. No one has a moral right to adhere to error. This does not make any sense to those who accept Julian’s Kantian view of truth.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: I can see why Ms. Armstrong became an apostate. She should join the Order of the Eastern Star.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Although this is another irrelevant digression, Mr. Julian is wrong again. The Establishment Clause is not about “Freedom from Religion” or “not guaranteeing someone a right to worship in the church of his choice.” To the contrary, the Establishment Clause secures a person's legal right to worship “in the church of your choice” by virtue of the free exercise clause. The Establishment Clause also prevents the government from enacting a law that respects an establishment of religion. If Mr. Julian would read the Constitutional debates, he would discover that the Founding Fathers were not anti-religionists like he is.

D. Julian: 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.*]

J. Salza: No one, including me, is arguing against “freedom of conscience.” But Mr. Julian must understand that conscience is not the arbiter of truth. Truth exists outside of the conscience. Truth is independent of the conscience. Conscience must be properly formed in order to properly respond to God’s truth. Unlike what Freemasonry teaches, truth is not “in the eye of the beholder.”

D. Julian: 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.*”

J. Salza: Obviously, Mr. Julian rejects or ignores Jesus’ words in John 8:32: “you will know the truth, and the truth will make you free.”

One cannot truly be free unless He has the truth. And this truth is Jesus Christ, “the way, the truth and the life” (Jn 14:6). Mr. Julian would be better off admitting that he doesn’t follow the teachings of Christ instead of trying to reinvent them.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Again, Mr. Julian has no idea what he is talking about. The distinction between a civil right and a moral right is not “bizarre doublespeak.” Let me again prove Mr. Julian wrong. The civil law allows people to divorce and remarry. But the moral law does not. After Jesus acknowledged the civil law of divorce under Moses, Jesus said “For your hardness of heart Moses allowed you to divorce your wives, but from the beginning it was not so” (Mt 19:8). Then Jesus said: “Every one who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery, and he who marries a woman divorced from her husband commits adultery” (Lk 16:18; cf. Mt 5:32; 19:9; Mk 10:11-12). So Mr. Julian, are you accusing Jesus Christ of “bizarre doublespeak”? Scripture gives many other examples of the distinction between civil and moral rights, but this should suffice.

D. Julian: 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).*”

J. Salza: Mr. Julian doesn’t get it. It is not a contradiction to say there is some level of goodness in non-Christian religions, even though there are grave deficiencies as well. I am sure that Hitler, Hussein and other mass murderers had a scintilla of goodness them, even though their understanding of God was gravely deficient. The Church recognizes that there is a level of goodness and truth in all of God’s creation, at the same time boldly proclaiming that God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost is the ultimate Good and Truth. Mr. Julian doesn’t have the guts to make that proclamation.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Thank you, Mr. Julian, for identifying the problem with Freemasonry: “The typical church member will die without leading a single person to a lifesaving knowledge of, and relationship with, Jesus Christ” if that church member is told that he can have eternal life in the celestial lodge above without Christ. Mr. Julian also reveals

his pessimism and utter lack of faith in Jesus Christ. Mr. Julian, please read the Apocalypse written by the Apostle John. It is the last book in your King James Version of Scripture. Those who are with Christ have already won the battle.

D. Julian: 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).

J. Salza: Mr. Julian's short-term memory is failing him. He just cited the Catechism of the Catholic Church which teaches that the Church *does* recognize the moral truths of other religions (the Church recognizes truth wherever it is found). But now he contradicts himself. This, Mr. Julian, is "bizarre doublespeak." Further, Julian's statement is fallacious. He advances a premise that he has not proven (that Freemasonry is not a religion), and then forms a conclusion based on the unproven premise (the Church is required to...).

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Now I am an advisor to Pope Benedict? No one told me that!

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: What God, Mr. Julian? The Blessed Trinity? Or the Grand Architect of the Lodge?

Indifference Toward God and Jesus Christ

D. Julian: 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).

J. Salza: My Christian friends, I don't mean to sound uncharitable, but Mr. Julian has again demonstrated that he is a liar. He says I "misrepresented" the ritual. Well, here is

the ritual from the Grand Lodge of Wisconsin (note that this particular ritualistic exchange is almost identical throughout the United States):

WM - [Rises, recovers, places left hand on the Cn's head.] In whom do you put your trust?

Cn - [Responds unsolicited. A confession of any deity suffices.]

WM - Your trust being in God, your faith is well founded. Arise [WM assists Cn from kneeling position], follow your conductor and fear no danger.

[SD conducts Cn once around the Lodge clockwise; Ss follow, dropping off at positions in the East directly East of the Altar, facing South. Lesson is given during movement. As Cn passes JW, JW gives (*); Ss face West; as Cn passes SW, SW gives (*); Ss take one step back; as Cn passes WM, WM gives (*).]

Did I “misrepresent” the ritual? No. Did Mr. Julian falsely accusing me of misrepresenting the ritual? Yes.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian’s desperation continues. Julian, answer this question: Can a Buddhist be a Mason? How about a Shintoist? If the answer is “yes,” then you owe me an apology. The fact is, any man who believes in pantheism can be a Mason. That is because Freemasonry requires only that a man “believe in deity.” Does this “intentionally inflame the passions of Christians”? Well, it should, because it means that Freemasonry puts false gods on the same level as the Blessed Trinity in the Masonic Lodge.

D. Julian: 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)...

J. Salza: First, there is no such thing as a “Christian denomination” that believes the Trinity is pantheistic. If a person does not believe in the Trinity, he is not a Christian. Period. Second, for you to accuse some Roman Catholics of pantheism is the nadir of your ignorance which does not dignify any more of a response. Third, why are we talking about these other issues? What does this have to do with *Masonry Unmasked*?

D. Julian: ...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.

J. Salza: "My" concept? I truly am beginning to feel sorry for Mr. Julian, and I mean it. I don't mean to denigrate him, but here is a man who does not believe in objective truth. If he does not believe in objective truth, then we should be debating epistemology, not Freemasonry. Julian is a disciple of Immanuel Kant, not Jesus Christ.

D. Julian: 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).

J. Salza: Funny thing, isn't it, Mr. Julian? Even though Catholics and Protestants have major disagreements, we agree on one thing for sure: Freemasonry is incompatible with the Christian faith.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Again, Mr. Julian does not understand the meaning of "truth." In Mr. Julian's world, "truth is what's in one's head."

D. Julian: 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."

J. Salza: Are you ready for another digression for Mr. Julian which has nothing to do with *Masonry Unmasked*? Here goes.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Now Mr. Julian reveals that he doesn't believe in the inerrancy of Scripture. That is because Mr. Julian's religion is not Christianity, but Freemasonry. Mr. Julian, you would do well to read Cornelius a Lapide's reconciliation of all these purported contradictions in Scripture. Once you do, you may even have the hope of becoming a “fledgling Bible student.”

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Yes, Mr. Julian, you are finally correct about something. There were thirteen apostles. What does this have to do with *Masonry Unmasked*? Oh, yeah, nothing.

D. Julian: *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?

J. Salza: You will never find out if you are shooting for the “celestial lodge above” and not the kingdom of Jesus Christ.

D. Julian: ***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.

J. Salza: Who says the sun doesn’t move? Mr. Julian? Now Mr. Julian is an authority on cosmology? If he believes the sun doesn’t move, he contradicts just about every heliocentrist and geocentrist (including a unanimity of the early Church Fathers) who ever lived (not to mention Sacred Scripture, which Julian doesn’t believe in any way). Science proves that the sun either rotates in its orbit or is embedded in a rotating aether shell of plank particles. Scripture also affirms the motion of the sun (Jos 10:12-14; 2 Kings 20:11; Psalm 19:5-6; Eccles 1:5; Sir 43:2,5; 46:4; Isaiah 38:7-8; and Hab 3:11. See also Gen. 15:12,17; 19:23; 28:11; 32:31; Ex. 17:12; 22:3,26; Lev. 22:7; Num. 2:3; Deut. 11:30; 16:6; 23:11; 24:13; 24:15; Josh. 1:4; 8:29; 10:12,13,27; 12:1; Judges 5:31; 9:33; 14:18; 19:14; 2 Sam. 2:24; 3:35; 23:4; 1 Kings 22:36; 2 Chron. 18:34; Psalm 50:1; 104:22; 113:3; Isa. 13:10; 41:25; 45:6; 59:19; 60:20; Jer. 15:9; Dan. 6:14; Amos 8:9;

Jonah 4:8; Mic. 3:6; Nah. 3:17; Mal. 1:11; Matt. 5:45; 13:6; Mark 1:32; 4:6; 16:2; Luke 4:40; Eph. 4:26).

D. Julian: 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.*

J. Salza: Looking beyond his anti-Catholicism, I note that Julian’s asks the most important question: how do we sift truth from falsehood? After all, truth leads to salvation and falsehood leads to damnation. Truth and error have eternal consequences. That is why we are having this discussion. Julian asks the right question, but he doesn’t provide an answer. Why? Because Mr. Julian doesn’t believe there *is* an answer. As a Mason, Julian has been conditioned to believe that truth is subjective and in eye of the beholder. Mr. Julian’s religious subjectivism will continue to come out even more forcefully as we proceed.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: More anti-Christian rhetoric from a man who rejects the inerrancy of Sacred Scripture and everything else that God has supernaturally revealed through Christ and His apostles. Mr. Julian’s beef is really not with me. His beef is with Christianity and the exclusive claims of Jesus Christ. Mr. Julian should actually learn something about the book (the Bible) that he has toted around while wearing his Masonic apron.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian argues for religious subjectivism throughout this dialogue, and then claims that my statement is “false” and “insulting.” Incredible.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: So, Mr. Julian, let me get this straight. Are you saying that Jesus Christ is not objectively true right now, but He will be objectively true at His Second Coming? This is *the most bizarre thing I have ever heard a Christian argue.* Such a definition of “truth” is not only contrary to the nature of truth, but of God’s revelation in Sacred Scripture which says “Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today and for ever” (Heb 13:8). Mr. Julian, that means if Jesus Christ is objectively true at His Second Coming, He is objectively true today. And note well: At Christ’s Second Coming, you will not have a chance to repent. When Christ comes a second time, He will come in judgment.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian, why don't you write The Phi Beta Kappa Society and tell them that truth is not objective? See what they say. Moreover, your entire presentation is nothing more than your "opinion," which, by the way, is at odds with both Catholic and Protestant Christianity. Finally, the difference between fact and opinion is the difference between what Masonic ritual teaches (fact) and Mr. Julian's denial of these teachings (opinion).

Indifference Toward the Holy Bible

D. Julian: 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.*"

J. Salza: Mr. Julian, are you saying that Freemasonry does *not* view other religious writings as equally legitimate expressions of God's will as found in the Holy Bible? Then tell us, why will Freemasonry put any religious writing (Koran, Upanishads, Book of Mormon, etc.) on the Masonic altar along side the Holy Bible? Further, if that is what you are saying, then are you also arguing that Freemasonry views the Holy Bible as superior to other religious writings?

Which one is it, Mr. Julian? In the Lodge, is the Bible superior to other religious writings or not? If it is superior, please provide us a statement from Masonic ritual saying so. I have provided copious quotations from your own Masonic brothers who say that the Bible is nothing more than a symbol for God's will, but not the written Word of God. Moreover, based on your own views of the inspiration of Scripture, you too hold the Masonic position, all the while you claim you are a Christian.

D. Julian: 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?*”

J. Salza: Mr. Julian, you are not fooling me or anyone else. Just become some American lodges refer to the Holy Bible as a Great Light of Masonry, those same lodges are required, by Masonic law, to put the Koran on the Masonic altar if a Muslim Mason is present and so requests. Further, when a Muslim man is initiated, he can substitute the Bible for the Koran on which to swear his oath (just like “Christian” Shriners are caused to do). This is why most Masonic rituals, and the many Masonic authorities I quote from in *Masonry Unmasked*, refer to the Great Light of Masonry as the “Volume of the Sacred Law,” not the “Holy Bible.”

So Mr. Julian, the truth is that Freemasonry does not view the Holy Bible as the Great Light in an exclusivistic sense, but in an inclusivistic sense, along with heretical writings. But if you really want to push your argument, why don’t you write your Grand Lodge and tell them to adopt your position? Tell them to adopt the position that the Holy Bible is the *only* “Volume of the Sacred Law” that can be used in the Lodge. And please post the Grand Lodge of Washington’s response to your request on your website so that we can all see it, okay?

Also, if the Holy Bible is one of the Great Lights of Masonry, why are the Square and Compasses considered the other two Great Lights? Why does Sacred Scripture need further illumination from Freemasonry? Why does the written Word of God need to be supplemented by the working tools of a Mason? I will tell you why: Because Freemasonry doesn’t believe the Holy Bible is God’s Word.

D. Julian: 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?

J. Salza: As I have already shown, both in my book and in this dialogue, this is true only for the Christian initiate. If the candidate is a Muslim, a Hindi or a Buddhist, he would not be taking his obligation on the Holy Bible. Why? Because in Freemasonry, the Bible is merely symbolic, not the divinely inspired Word of God. For Mr. Julian to deny this universal precept of Freemasonry is to reveal his complete ignorance of Freemasonry. But if he wishes to continue to deny this reality, let him have the courage to come out and

say that the Masonic fraternity is a Christian organization. If it is not Christian, then the Holy Bible is not the Great Light of Freemasonry.

D. Julian: I can't speak for Wisconsin's ritual...

J. Salza: Mr. Julian has been speaking for Wisconsin's ritual throughout his presentation! (not to mention that he speaks for all U.S. Masons, Christians and even my parish priest).

D. Julian: ...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!*

J. Salza: Mr. Julian, show me where the Grand Lodge of Washington would refuse to place the Koran, the Upanishads or any other religious writing on the Masonic altar if a Mason requested it, okay? Just show me from your Grand Lodge's code of Masonic law or ritual where such a request would be denied. Your limited, personal experiences with Freemasonry are irrelevant to Masonry's teachings about the Volume of the Sacred Law.

Also, let me tell you a story. When a Muslim was initiated into Freemasonry in Wisconsin, he requested that the Koran be placed along side the Holy Bible. The lodge agreed. During the initiation, the Muslim swore his oath on the Koran, the Worshipful Master said that the Koran was one of the three Great Lights in Masonry, and the Koran remained on the Masonic altar through the entire initiation ceremony as well as during the lectures and the ceremonial closing of the lodge. Tell me, Mr. Julian, did Wisconsin do something wrong? If it did, based on what? Are you disagreeing with your Grand Lodge of Washington that the Grand Lodge of Wisconsin is practicing valid Freemasonry? If you are, are you going to publicize your objections to the Grand Lodge of Washington? Let's see how far Mr. Julian is willing to go with his complete lie about Masonry's view of the Bible, or should I say "the volume of the Sacred Law."

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: I thought Mr. Julian didn't believe in "objective truth"? Maybe his denial of objective truth relates only to Jesus Christ.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: What "fraternity" has its own Bible? What "fraternity" places an insert in the Bible describing its own religious doctrines? And if the 1988 edition of the Masonic

Bible is so out-of-date, why is it used and distributed by Grand Lodges throughout the country? No answers from Mr. Julian.

D. Julian: 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.”*

J. Salza: Thank you for highlighting my point, Mr. Julian. As everyone can see, the Charge says “volume of the Sacred Law,” not the Holy Bible. That is because Freemasonry accommodates other religious writings, which is one of the most basic and fundamental precepts of Freemasonry. Yet, Mr. Julian has the unmitigated gall to deny this reality. I am sure there are Masons who are embarrassed by Mr. Julian’s defense of the Craft.

D. Julian: 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 (sic) 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian completely ignores Brother Chase’s statement that *“Blue Lodge Masonry is nothing whatsoever to do with the Bible; it is not founded on the Bible,”* and then argues that the “Great Light” in Masonry is the Bible! Which one is it, Mr. Julian? Has Masonry nothing to do with the Bible? Or is one of the Great Lights of Masonry the Bible? What a strange world in which Mr. Julian lives.

D. Julian: Next Salza identifies Oliver D. Street as a *“renowned Masonic scholar,”* but he neglects to mention Brother Street was born in 1866.

J. Salza: So what? Can’t a man be a renowned Masonic scholar even if he was born in 1866? Mr. Julian, what is the cut-off point in order to be a renowned Masonic scholar? 1900? 1950? 2005? And according to whom? You? Mr. Julian, don’t you know that the rituals used by the Grand Lodge of Washington came *before* Brother Street’s writings? Let’s just stick with Washington’s rituals. I will see if I still have Washington’s ritual book. But if I don’t, could you send me one? I would like to respond to your arguments using your own rituals exclusively. That should satisfy you, correct? Let’s see if you have the courage to do this.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian argues that just because something didn’t happen “on his watch,” Masonry doesn’t permit it. This, of course, is a ridiculous argument, especially when Mr. Julian claims that he doesn’t speak for Freemasonry. Any honest Mason would admit that any religious book can be placed upon the Masonic altar. That I have to even argue this point with Mr. Julian shows how little he knows about Freemasonry.

Right now, I am dialoguing with several Christian Masons who are troubled by the fact that Freemasonry accommodates heretical books on its altar. This is one of the major reasons why they are considering leaving the lodge. Since I am no longer a Mason (and thus don’t have credibility with Mr. Julian), I will make him this offer. Mr. Julian, can I have these Masons contact you to discuss their concerns? Perhaps you can tell them that they really didn’t see the Koran on the altar in the Lodge when they actually did. Otherwise, you can publicly declare that the Grand Lodge of Wisconsin is running a heretical operation. Which one will you choose to do?

Final Thoughts

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: I don’t want to sound polemical and uncharitable, but I have already shown who the liar really is. Further, Mr. Julian claims he is charged by the “Master” of his lodge to defend the character of his brother Masons. Actually, Masonic ritual taught Mr. Julian *not* to enter into argument with those who criticize Freemasonry. The ritual says, “Neither are you to suffer your zeal for the institution to lead you into argument with those who, through ignorance, may ridicule it,” and to practice the virtues of “silence and circumspection” when encountering the “enemies of Freemasonry.” Yet, even though Mr. Julian swore to God to uphold these precepts, he has decided to go against his oath and publicly defend Freemasonry, all the while making an ass of himself as he argues that truth is subjective.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Freemasonry repeatedly requires the candidate to orally affirm that what he is experiencing is of his free will and accord. Why? Because Masonry wants to condition its members to accept that which is happening to them, even though they have no idea what is going to happen. When a man is asked to affirm that it is his free will and accord, he does not know that he is later going to participate in a death-and-resurrection ceremony that mocks Jesus Christ. Moreover, he is blindfolded and is bound by a noose. Mr. Julian can refer all he wants to these lame affirmations, but it does nothing for his case. In fact, it just highlights how weak his case is.

Further, did you say only a “handful” of men have left Freemasonry? This is a blatant misrepresentation and Mr. Julian knows it. There have been thousands of Christian men who have left the lodge, not a “handful.” Mr. Julian has engaged in this exercise because those Christian men who leave are so threatening to him and his organization. But none of that really matters. When Mr. Julian learns what “truth” really is, he will know that it doesn’t depend upon numbers. Truth is truth, for all times and places.

D. Julian: “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.

J. Salza: Another example of Mr. Julian picking at semantics which proves nothing for his case. Further, one must first define equality before asserting that it “is an absolute value.” Mr. Julian obviously cannot distinguish between the equality of persons and the equality of religious ideas, just like he cannot distinguish between objective truth and “subjective truth.”

D. Julian: 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?

J. Salza: Mr. Julian just doesn’t get it. No one is debating our rights to “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.” We are talking about religious indifferentism. In fact, on page 50, I write: “While Christians declare that all men are equal, we emphatically proclaim that all religions are not.” This discussion has nothing to do with our rights under the U.S. Constitution. It has everything to do with the revealed truth of Almighty God in Jesus Christ which is above the Constitution and every other man-made law that Mr. Julian may wish to cite.

D. Julian: 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!

J. Salza: Interesting commentary. Mr. Julian recognizes that the religion of Islam held by jihadist Muslims should not be put on the same level as Christianity. Then why, Mr. Julian, do you support an organization that tolerates the Koran to lie side by side with the Holy Bible on the Masonic altar? Mr. Julian lives in a world of duplicity and self-contradiction.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: This commentary demonstrates that Mr. Julian never read Luther’s 95 Theses.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian continues to demonstrate his ignorance of history and his anti-Catholic bias. Mr. Julian is ignorant of the fact that the Catholic Church determined the canon of Scripture, that the Catholic Church was the first to translate the Scriptures and make them available to the public, that the Catholic Church preserved and defended the Scriptures in the face of bloody persecutions, and that the Catholic Church has the highest and most exalted view of Scripture of any Christian community. Mr. Julian, can you please stick with Freemasonry? Rant and rave about the Church who gave you the Bible with someone else.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: I have already proven Julian wrong.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: I thought Mr. Julian didn’t believe in “objective truth”? Once again, Mr. Julian labels Freemasonry, hoping that his label will be sufficient for us to dismiss our case, but we know better. When Freemasonry tells its members that their “purity of life and conduct is essentially necessary to gaining admission to the celestial lodge above,” it is giving them a path to salvation – purity of life and conduct, no matter what religion they profess, and no matter what they believe about Jesus Christ.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: It doesn’t matter “within the confines of the Lodge” because the Lodge is indifferent to the truth that God has revealed. Thank you, Mr. Julian, for pointing this out for us. God has not revealed that there is a “Nirvana,” and yet that terminology is perfectly acceptable to Mr. Julian, a professed Christian. God has told us that we are to come to Him in the name of Jesus His Son, but for Mr. Julian, “one name or another” will do just fine. Further, Freemasonry tells the believer in Nirvana, even though he is not baptized and in a state of sin, that he will “gain admission to the celestial lodge above” by his “purity of life and conduct.” None of this poses any problems for Mr. Julian.

D. Julian: Outside the Lodge room, the Christian Freemason is free to evangelize all he wants -- even to other Freemasons.

J. Salza: But the “Christian” Freemason is *not free* to bear witness to Jesus Christ inside the lodge. Thank you again, Mr. Julian, for your honesty. Jesus said, “So every one who acknowledges me before men, I also will acknowledge before my Father who is in heaven, but whoever denies me before men, I also will deny before my Father who is in heaven” (Matt. 10:32; cf. Luke 12:8-9). Mr. Julian, Jesus didn’t carve out an exception for the Masonic lodge.

When a Christian binds himself by an oath to an organization that teaches its members that they may have eternal life by their “purity of life and conduct” and not by the grace of Jesus Christ, that man is denying Christ before his Masonic brothers. That man denies Jesus’ own words, “I am the way, the truth, and the life; no one comes to the Father except through me” (Jn 14:6). If not, then that man is lying to his fellow lodge brothers by allowing them to believe that they can go to heaven without Christ. Mr. Julian, what good is it to deny Christ in the lodge and profess him outside the lodge? In the words of Mr. Julian, this is “bizarre doublespeak.”

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: So, Mr. Julian, are you saying that God did give the Catholic Church divine teaching authority (which is true), but then removed it? When did He remove it? From whom did he remove it? What pope? What year? What were the circumstances? What did He say? And who are these “RCC priests and monks” who received this revelation? Mr. Julian, your arguments defy reason.

D. Julian: 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.*

J. Salza: Mr. Julian, if Christ has not been removed, then where is He? When Freemasonry tells a man that his purity of life and conduct is necessary to get to heaven, why doesn’t it mention Jesus? When the Worshipful Master raises up the man in the Third Degree and tells him the raising represents the resurrection, where is Jesus? In fact, why is the name of Jesus carefully excised from Masonic ritual if Jesus is really

important to Freemasonry? Spare us your deceptions, Mr. Julian, and have the courage to face what Freemasonry really teaches.

Chapter IV - Specific Masonic Doctrines and Practices

Overview of Masonic Syncretism

D. Julian: Once again Salza gets bogged down in the semantics of his own perceptions, when he says, “*The Masonic Lodge’s pursuit of creedal 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.

J. Salza: It is no surprise that Mr. Julian takes this position, for he is a Freemason and not a Christian. His view allows me to further expose the errors of Freemasonry. If two Masons believe in eternal life after death but only one of them believes in the need for faith in Jesus Christ, then their beliefs about eternal life are incompatible. One is true and the other is false. Yet, in the lodge, both views are compatible because Freemasonry teaches both men that they may reach the celestial lodge above.

Since the claims of Jesus Christ are exclusive (that He is the only way to heaven), the only way Freemasonry can tell the unbeliever about gaining admission into heaven is to *deny* the exclusive claims of Christ. If Freemasonry accepted Christ’s teachings, then it would not tell the unbeliever that his purity of life and conduct is necessary to go to heaven. That is because, without the grace of Jesus Christ, neither his purity of life and conduct nor anything else that he does makes him fit for heaven.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: First, is Mr. Julian putting the Lord Jesus Christ on the same level as Confucius and Mohammed? I bet he is, because he is a Freemason, not a Christian, and that is exactly what the Lodge does. It is no surprise that Julian incorporates Masonry’s view of Jesus Christ – that He was a good teacher but nothing more - into his argumentation.

Second, as I said before, no one is arguing that all of Freemasonry’s teachings are false. Goodness and truth can be found in all religions. But if Mr. Julian is going to quote Christ, then He can start with these quotes: “I am the way, the truth, and the life; no one comes to the Father but through me” (Jn 14:6); or “Truly, truly, I say to you, before Abraham was, I am” (John 8:58); or, “I and the Father are one,” (John 10:30). What about these, Mr. Julian? If Jesus is God, then He cannot be put on the same level as Confucius and Mohammed. If Jesus Christ is the only way to the Father, then Freemasonry is lying to its members by telling them that they can get to heaven, even if they don’t believe in Jesus.

D. Julian: 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?”*

J. Salza: Wrong again. First, Mr. Julian says that Masonry has a “belief in one, true and living God.” Yet Freemasonry tells the man who believes in Brahma that his “trust is in God” and his faith “is well-founded.” This is a lie. That man’s faith is not in the “one, true and living God.” The man’s faith is in a false god, and we are morally bound to tell him so, so that he can save his soul from eternal damnation.

Second, Mr. Julian says Masonry has a “belief in a transition to a future life.” Yet, objectively speaking, there can be no hope of a “transition to a future life” without faith in Jesus Christ. Every Christian should know that we are all born in a state of original sin and are subject to eternal death. There is no hope of eternal life without the grace of God which comes to us through Jesus Christ. God may certainly save non-Christians by a special act of His grace, but this does not mean that Christians can belong to an organization that preaches about eternal life in the celestial lodge above without ever mentioning the need for the Savior of the world.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: More irrelevant material from the reviewer of *Masonry Unmasked*.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian should tell that to the millions of Catholic martyrs who chose death rather than put Christ along side the Roman gods of hearth and home. Mr. Julian does not understand what a commitment to Jesus Christ really means.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: What a history lesson from Mr. Julian! We Christians should be ashamed of ourselves! And what about those "secret financial documents" of the Church? Ask Mr. Julian!

D. Julian: *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.

J. Salza: The problem with Mr. Julian's argument is that Freemasonry does not require a belief in Genesis 1:1. A man who rejects the divine revelations in the book of Genesis – like a Hindu, Buddhist, or Shintoist - can still be a Mason. Mr. Julian thinks that just because a person “believes in deity,” he believes in the “one, true and living God.” I have news for you, Mr. Julian: The entire Christian tradition, including Scripture itself, disagrees. Just because a person believes in a creator doesn't mean he believes in the Trinity.

St. Paul taught that “although there may be so-called gods in heaven or on earth . . . yet for us there is one God, the Father, from whom are all things and for whom we exist, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things and through whom we exist” (1 Cor. 8:5-6). David reveals that “all the gods of the peoples are idols, but the Lord made the heavens” (Psalm 96:5). According to divine revelation, there is a distinction between the True God (the Holy Trinity) and false gods. In Freemasonry, there is no such distinction. Error is error, no matter what label we put on it.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Not only does this statement further demonstrate Mr. Julian's ignorance of Scripture (not all these names are “in the Bible”), but it continues to prove my point that Mr. Julian doesn't believe in the existence of false gods. Whether we call God the Blessed Trinity or the Great Thumb, it makes little difference to Mr. Julian. Again, Julian is a Freemason, not a Christian.

D. Julian: *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.

J. Salza: First, Muslims don't call Allah “Father God,” which shows that Mr. Julian doesn't know what he is talking about. Second, Freemasonry's view of god is not limited to the monotheistic beliefs of Christianity, Judaism and Islam, so Julian's focus on these religions only exposes him even more. Is Mr. Julian arguing that the Hindu Mason who believes in 33 million gods believes in the “one, true and living God”?

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: This again is way off base. What does the purported commonality between Christianity, Judaism and Islam have to do with Freemasonry? Freemasonry does not limit its membership to men of these religions, so why does Mr. Julian continually refer to them? Mr. Julian, tell us, is one of the three religions superior? Or is God equally pleased no matter which of the three we choose? Does your answer depend on whether you are inside or outside of a lodge room?

D. Julian: 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.*” 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.

J. Salza: Sure, Mr. Julian. On page 54 of *Masonry Unmasked*, I describe the similarities between Freemasonry and Occultism. On pages 100-102, I demonstrate the connection between the Hiram Legend and the ancient pagan mystery religions. Instead of addressing my claims, you simply allege that I have no “academic credibility.” Amazing. Also, keep looking for the words “King James Version” in your Washington manual of Masonic ritual. The words “King James Version” appear no where in the rituals of Freemasonry.

Now, let me provide you with a bit of history. King James was an anti-Catholic sodomite who had no authority to translate the Scriptures. He created the KJV by modifying (no, ripping off) the Douay-Rheims version which is a word-for-word translation of the Latin Vulgate compiled by St. Jerome under the direction of Pope Damasus. If you want the real thing, Mr. Julian, read the Douay-Rheims. And by the way, King James’ wife eventually got it – she converted to the Catholic and Apostolic Faith.

D. Julian: 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 Airal 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.

J. Salza: Dear readers, do you see how Mr. Julian continues to attack the character of former Freemasons instead of answering their contentions? He calls Bill Schnoebelen an imposter because he is embarrassed that Mr. Schnoebelen was a Freemason and a Satanist at the same time. Mr. Schnoebelen's belief in Lucifer as god undermines Mr. Julian's entire argument about how the "one, true and living God" is honored in the Masonic lodge. So what can Julian do? Nothing, accept to call Mr. Schnoebelen an imposter, even though Mr. Schnoebelen is not an imposter. Mr. Schnoebelen is a real person who has given his testimony publicly at the Ministry to Masons Conferences (a friend of mine was his roommate at the 1996 convention in Columbus, Ohio). Mr. Julian, instead of engaging in the sin of detraction, why don't you produce that tape you referred to where Mr. Schnoebelen supposedly admits that he was not a Satanist?

D. Julian: 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.”*

J. Salza: Great quotation, Mr. Julian. As any honest reader can plainly see, the real “dumb jackass” is the one who denies what Freemasonry teaches in black and white.

D. Julian: Freemasonry doesn’t involve worship in any way, shape, or form...

J. Salza: Really? In describing the Fellowcraft degree, Mr. Julian previously wrote the following: *“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.”*

As Mr. Julian explains, after the Letter G is presented to the candidate (and in many lodges, illuminated), all the Masons *bow down before it*. Mr. Julian, are you saying that bowing before the Letter G which represents deity “doesn’t involve worship in any way, shape or form”? Can you really argue this with a straight face? If bowing before a symbol of God is not an expression of worship, then what is it? Is it just Masonic playtime?

D. Julian: ...it does not dictate a specific path to salvation...

J. Salza: Really? What about a couple of quotes from Masonic ritual:

“The lamb has in all ages been deemed an emblem of innocence; he, therefore, who wears the lambskin as a badge of Masonry is thereby continually reminded of that purity of life and conduct, which is essentially necessary to his gaining admission into the Celestial Lodge above, where the Supreme Architect of the Universe presides.”

“That All-Seeing Eye, whom the sun, moon and stars obey, and under whose watchful care even Comets perform their stupendous revolutions, pervades the inmost recesses of the human heart and will reward us according to our merits.”

While Mr. Julian says that Masonry “does not dictate a specific path to salvation,” he is contradicting Masonic ritual which tells us that “purity of life and conduct” and “our merits” provide the path to salvation. Who are we to believe? Masonic ritual or Mr. Julian?

D. Julian: ...nor does it require a belief in bodily resurrection – no matter how many times Salza continues to repeat it.

J. Salza: Let me “repeat it” again right here, with emphases added:

- Wisconsin’s Masonic ritual says: “The Second Section is of pre-eminent importance. It exemplifies an instance of virtue, fortitude and integrity seldom equaled and never excelled in the history of man. It recites the legend or historical tradition on which the degree is founded - a legend whose symbolic interpretation testifies to our faith in the resurrection of the body and the immortality of the soul” (p. 136).

The Masonic Bible says:

- “A distinctive tenet of Masonry is that there remains a heaven of rest and of rewards for the good and faithful, a place of perfect happiness beyond the grave and the resurrection of the body” (p. 44).
- “The doctrine of eternal life permeates all the Mysteries of Freemasonry; it is the fundamental basis of the Third Degree in a very special emphasis. Co-equal with emphasis on this tenet of Masonic Faith is belief in the future resurrection of the body” (p. 41).
- “Foremost of all the truths taught and emphasized in [the Master Mason] degree, is the immortality of the soul of man and the certainty of the resurrection of his body to eternal life” (p. 11).
- “...there will be an awakening of the body and a resurrection of a spiritual body capable and fitted for eternal life” (p. 39).
- “[House not made with hands] comprehends the eternal dwelling place of God, and the resurrected and glorified body of the redeemed in the life beyond the grave” (p. 45).
- “This collection of metaphors is a part of the Scripture reading of the Third Degree, and forms an appropriate introduction to the sublime ceremonies whose object is to teach symbolically the resurrection and life eternal” (p. 58).
- “...the very philosophy of Masonry teaches us that there can be no death without a resurrection, no decay without a subsequent restoration, no loss without eventual recovery” (p. 49).
- his soul returns to God who gave it and his body which returns to dust shall be raised, incorruptible and glorified and qualified for entrance into the Grand Lodge of the Celestial City of God” (p. 11).

In a court of law, I would now move for Summary Judgment, and it would be granted to me. I would also move for attorneys’ fees, since Mr. Julian’s position is frivolous and arbitrary. In short, Mr. Julian has lied to all of us.

Great Architect of the Universe

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Here we go again. Let's hope that we can define Freemasonry by labeling it. Let's ignore Freemasonry's teachings. No, let's deny Freemasonry's teachings. The ignorant public will be all too happy to simply accept Mr. Julian's labels.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Salza's understanding of Freemasonry is taken from the plain meaning of the rituals, the Masonic Bible, the writings of the Encyclopedists of Freemasonry (Mackey and Coil), the Landmarks, and Past Grand Masters.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: More *ad hominem* arguments. Mr. Julian would rather speculate about why Christian men leave Freemasonry than actually read rituals which made them leave. No, Mr. Julian, your speculations are not accurate. Nor does Freemasonry owe me an apology. The reason for my position is that *I actually read what the ritual teaches.* You don't. It is as simple as that.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Unfortunately for Mr. Julian, Masonic ritual does not say that the god of the Lodge is the God that has been revealed in Sacred Scripture (the same Scriptures that Mr. Julian believes are errant and fallible). If it were, then Hindus, Buddhists, and Shintoists would not become Masons, because they don't believe in the God of Genesis 1:1. Is Mr. Julian arguing that Freemasonry is limited to Christians, Jews and Muslims? This, of

course, is not true. Moreover, even some monotheists, like Unitarians and Muslims, don't believe in the divine revelations of the book of Genesis or any other book in Sacred Scripture. Mr. Julian is arguing that the God of Sacred Revelation is the god of the Lodge, but Masonic ritual says no such thing. All it asks of the Mason is to "believe in deity."

Granted, many Masons may believe in the God of Genesis 1:1. But Freemasonry does not hold that position, at least exclusively. Masonry allows a belief in any "deity" as a belief in the "one, true and living God." If the candidate for the Entered Apprentice degree puts his trust in the Great Thumb (who is *not* the God of Genesis 1:1), the Worshipful Master tells him "Your trust *being in God*, your faith *is well-founded*. Arise, follow your conductor, and fear no danger." In short, the god of the Lodge is not the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Period. End of story. If a Mason wants to believe the GAOTU is the Trinity, fine. But if the Mason rejects the Trinity, that is fine too. In either case, the Worshipful Master tells him, "Your trust being in God, your faith is well-founded." This is a lie, which comes from "the father of lies" (Jn 8:44).

D. Julian: 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...*"

J. Salza: Mr. Julian, do you believe "the Trinity is of the Devil"? Why would you dare to repeat such blasphemy?

D. Julian: 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?

J. Salza: Why does Mr. Julian make Reverend Grigor-Scott the standard by which Freemasonry is judged? This "Reverend" has nothing whatsoever to do with this discussion. Mr. Julian, I don't have to abide by the strange and irrelevant parameters you arbitrarily set. But since you asked the question, here is the answer: *Christians cannot be Masons because the Trinity is not the God that is worshiped in the Masonic lodge.*

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian is really a confused man. First, is Julian disagreeing with Claudy? Is Julian saying that all paths in the Masonic lodge do *not* meet “at the top”? If not, which ones don’t? Which Masons are in error? Will Mr. Julian tell us? And what is Mr. Julian going to do about it? Julian has argued for precisely what Claudy proposes here, namely, that there is one God, no matter what you call him.

Second, the term “Trinitarian Christian” that Mr. Julian uses is redundant. All Christians believe in the Trinity. If not, they are not Christians. There is no such thing as a “non-Trinitarian Christian.” Jesus said, “Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit” (Mt 28:19). The Blessed Trinity is the most fundamental dogma of the Christian faith.

Third, Mr. Julian says that “Great Architect of the Universe” is revealed in the King James Version of his Bible, yet the King James Version never uses the term “Great Architect of the Universe” to describe God, and Freemasonry never claims that its god is taken from the King James Version of Scripture. Mr. Julian is simply forcing a connection that doesn’t exist.

Fourth, what about the Koran, the Upanishads and other religious writings that may lie alongside the Bible on the Masonic altar? Why does Freemasonry allow these heretical books to take an equal place with the written Word of God?

Fifth, Julian says that the way in which other men define god “is not my concern.” Julian says it is not his concern because he is not a true disciple of Jesus Christ. If Julian really loved his lodge brothers, he would tell them to convert to Jesus Christ to save their souls. But, instead, Julian says that the eternal fate of his Masonic brethren “is not my concern.” Mr. Julian ignores Jesus Christ’s great commission to make disciples of all nations, because Julian is a Freemason, not a Christian.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Readers, do you see Mr. Julian’s desperation? He denies my claim that all faiths in the lodge are “equal,” and then says that these faiths are all “equally unique”! What kind of nonsense is this? The faiths are not equal in se, but they are equal in uniqueness? And all these different faiths are “extraordinary” as well? Mr. Julian, if a faith denies that Jesus is the Son of God and the only way to salvation, then that faith is extraordinarily wrong.

D. Julian: 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?

J. Salza: It is quite simple. Because the institution of Freemasonry is indifferent to God's supernatural revelation, it precludes Masons from discussing their individual beliefs in the lodge room. If individual Masons were given the opportunity to speak about their individual beliefs in the lodge, this would run afoul of the institution's own religious ideology of indifferentism. Most Mason confuses the issue of individual beliefs vis-à-vis the beliefs of Freemasonry. We are talking about the teachings of Freemasonry, not the beliefs of Mr. Julian or any other Mason. After all, Mr. Julian didn't write the rituals. Freemasonry, as an institution, has its own teachings about God and eternal life that are independent of the beliefs of its individual members. Masonry's teaching on bodily resurrection is a perfect example. Not all men who believe in "deity" believe in bodily resurrection, yet Freemasonry also teaches these men about bodily resurrection. This proves, unequivocally, that Freemasonry *has its own beliefs independent of the beliefs of its members*.

D. Julian: I submit that the reason is because many Freemasons, myself included, are as passionate about our religion as we are about our Freemasonry.

J. Salza: Julian is so "passionate" about his religion that he is willing to leave his lodge brothers in a state of ignorance about their need to repent of their sins and be baptized into Jesus Christ who died for their sins. He is content with allowing the Worshipful Master to teach them that their purity of life and conduct, irrespective of their faith in the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, is what they need to make it to heaven. Some passion.

D. Julian: "*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".

J. Salza: The issue is not whether GAOTU is a formal name. The issue is what the GAOTU *represents*. As we have demonstrated, the GAOTU of the Masonic Lodge represents the supposed deity of all religions, and not the "one, true and living God" that has been revealed to us in the Person of Jesus Christ.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Another irrelevant digression. Nevertheless, Masonic authorities use the appellation GAOTU, and so that is what I have used as well. If Mr. Julian wants me to use GAU instead of GAOTU, I have no problem with that. The issue is not with the title, but with the *meaning* of the title.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: I never said that God is “limited to revealing Himself only through geometry.” What I have said and proven is that Freemasonry does not hold God’s revelation in Jesus Christ to be unique or superior to other religions.

D. Julian: 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.*”

J. Salza: I am not “alleging” anything more that Freemasonry has stated about its own symbols. For example, the Masonic Service Association says that “Geometry...produces the nearest possible ‘proof’ of His existence” (*Short Talk Bulletin, Behind the Symbol, Vol. 32, July 1954, No. 7*).

D. Julian: 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.*]

J. Salza: Note that Julian again refers to the point in the Fellowcraft degree where all the Masons *bow down in worship* before the deity of the lodge, even though Mr. Julian claims that Masons don’t worship inside the lodge room. Which one is it, Mr. Julian? Do you bow in worship or don’t you? Note also that the letter G represents “the sacred name

of deity.” In Christianity, the name of Jesus “is above every name that is named, not only in this age, but also in that which is to come” (Eph. 1:21). In Freemasonry, the name of Jesus is deliberately omitted from its references to “deity,” because Jesus’ name is *not* above every other name. As Mr. Julian has himself confessed, it matters little what you call God, because there is “one, true and living God” for all religions. As Julian’s brother, Manly Hall, has written, to the true Mason, “Christ, Buddha, or Mohammed, the name means little.”

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: And the passions of Christians should be inflamed indeed, against the errors and perversions of Freemasonry. If Mr. Julian is so “passionate” about Christianity, then his passions should be inflamed as well. If Mr. Julian would do a little research, he would discover a multitude of Masonic brothers who use the word *Gnosis* to describe the esoterica of the Lodge.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: We do know why, Mr. Julian: because they could not defend the indefensible, just like you cannot. When I presented my former lodge brothers with Freemasonry’s teachings on “bodily resurrection” on page 136 of our ritual book, and on pages 11, 39, 41, 44, 45, 49 and 58 of the Masonic Bible, they looked the other way. They had no explanations. They knew how to read English, but they could not bring themselves to admit that Freemasonry was teaching religious doctrines which had nothing to do with Jesus Christ. So they either denied reality and remained in Masonry, or accepted reality and left Freemasonry. We know what choice Mr. Julian has made to date.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Now Mr. Julian argues that the god of the Lodge is the same God that is professed in the Apostles' Creed? Where, Mr. Julian, does Masonic ritual teach this? Where does Masonic ritual ever refer to the Apostles' Creed? I will tell you: Nowhere. If Mr. Julian would have continued to read the Apostles' Creed, he would have seen that the same creed also professes a belief in "Jesus Christ, His only Son, Our Lord," and in the "Holy Spirit." Does Freemasonry profess the Son of God? No. What does Mr. Julian's "Bible, King James Version" say about that? The Apostle John tells us: "No one who denies the Son has the Father. He who confesses the Son has the Father also." (1 John 2:23).

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Wait a minute. Is Mr. Julian using the Masonic Bible as his authority? If so, then why doesn't Mr. Julian acknowledge that the same Masonic Bible repeatedly teaches about Freemasonry's faith in the resurrection of the body on pages 11, 39, 41, 44, 45, 49 and 58? Not only does Mr. Julian not acknowledge this fact, *he denies it*. In so doing, he has stripped himself of all credibility.

You can't have it both ways, Mr. Julian, and I will be happy to play by your rules. You see, I take an honest approach to this subject, unlike yourself. On pages 59-60, I acknowledge that some Masonic authorities say Masonry believes in monotheism. I even quote from the Indiana Monitor to support the same. But, on page 60, I write:

"Even if Grand Lodges were to require a belief in monotheism, this hardly mitigates the errors of Freemasonry. Masonry would still regard a deistic or unitarian understanding of God as a plausible alternative to the Trinity. Those who defend the monotheism of the Lodge must also contend with the fact that no Grand Lodge in the United States limits its membership to Jews, Moslems, and Christians. All men who believe in a supreme being are welcome into Masonry's hospitable bosom, including Hindus, Buddhists, and Shintoists."

The foregoing is self-explanatory. A purported belief in monotheism doesn't exonerate the lodge from its religious errors. If it did, we could all become Unitarians and God would be just as pleased. Moreover, Freemasonry accepts the polytheistic beliefs of

Hindus and Buddhists because they too can and do become Freemasons. This is another fact that Mr. Julian cannot bring himself to admit.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: The foregoing piece, which does *not* come from Masonic ritual, is about Jesus Christ. Mr. Julian, are you arguing that the god of Freemasonry is Jesus Christ? I believe you are because you just said that this piece is “about the one, true and living God of Freemasonry.” Tell us, where in Masonic ritual does it say that the god of Freemasonry is Jesus Christ? Where does your Grand Lodge of Washington teach this? Please provide us

with chapter and verse from the Grand Lodge of Washington's ritual book. And do your Jewish and Muslim lodge brothers know this?

D. Julian: 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).

J. Salza: Mr. Julian, the passages have to do with putting God – the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit – above all, whether it is money or anything else. During its prayer and worship, does Freemasonry put the Blessed Trinity above Brahma, Vishnu and Shiva? Does Masonry put the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ above the false prophets Mohammed, Confucius and Zoroaster? Does the Lodge put the religion of Jesus Christ above the false religions of Islam, Hinduism and Buddhism? The answer is a resounding “No.”

In Freemasonry, a profession of faith in any “deity” is faith in the “one, true and living God.” In the lodge room, any false book may take an equal place with the Holy Bible in the Masonic altar. In the lodge, a member of any “sectarian” faith is told that through a life of “purity” (not grace) he may attain to the celestial lodge above. In Masonry, a member of any false religion is told that by imitating the fidelity of Hiram Abif (not Jesus Christ), he can have faith in the resurrection of the body. In the lodge, men are told that their “trust is in God,” even if they reject the Holy Trinity. Mr. Julian, you cannot serve God and mammon.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian, true charity is not about selling Vedalia onions at K-Mart or giving scholarships to children of Freemasons. True charity is about giving someone the *truth*. True charity is about telling your lodge brothers that there is nothing that they can do to attain to the “celestial lodge above” outside of the grace of Jesus Christ. Jesus is the only “way, truth and life.” While Freemasonry does do good things, so do many other false religions, like the Mormons and the Jehovah’s Witnesses. We wouldn’t dare tell the Mormons or the JW’s that they are in a pleasing relationship with God because of their charitable works, would we? No, we wouldn’t, and neither can we say the same to Freemasons. Absent invincible ignorance, those who reject Jesus Christ can have no hope of eternal life, no matter what Freemasonry teaches.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian thinks that sweeping statements and emotionally-charged words will win his case. This is just more *ad hominem ad nauseam*. Given his public denial of Masonry’s explicit and pervasive teaching about bodily resurrection, we know who is really advancing “distortions, half-truths and outright lies.” Also, since Mr. Julian doesn’t know “where to begin,” I will tell him: Begin by reading Masonic ritual.

D. Julian: Continuing with his *argumentum ad nauseum*, (sic) 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian still doesn’t get it. The generic symbolism used in the lodge is precisely what facilitates the syncretism Mr. Julian denies. Freemasonry uses the symbol of the All-Seeing Eye in order to accommodate non-Christian religions in the lodge. By using generic symbols that are not unique to any particular religion, Freemasons are able to pray around a common altar as they are taught about bodily resurrection and eternal life. This is syncretism, *par excellence*. Any “deity” can be found under the umbrella of the All-Seeing Eye. For Mr. Julian, this is just fine because he believes that there is only one God. For the Christian, we know that there are “many gods and many lords, but only one true God and one Lord Jesus Christ” (1 Cor 8:5-6).

A few more comments are also in order. First, the All-Seeing Eye is not a Christian symbol; it is a pagan one. Second, God does not “reside in us in the form of the Holy

Spirit” as Mr. Julian asserts. The Holy Spirit is not a “form.” He is the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity. He is God. Third, Freemasonry does not equate the All-Seeing Eye with the Holy Spirit as Mr. Julian alleges. Again, Mr. Julian attempts to force a connection between Masonry and Christianity that doesn’t exist.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian, thank you for pointing out another one of Freemasonry’s religious teachings. Here, the Lodge tells the Mason that the All-Seeing Eye “will reward us according to our merits.” This is a soteriological teaching (that is, a teaching dealing with salvation). Remember, Mr. Julian said that Freemasonry is not a religion, and yet, right here, we see Freemasonry teaching religion – namely, that individual merits will be rewarded by the All-Seeing Eye.

What does Jesus say about salvation? Jesus said: “He who believes and is baptized will be saved; but he who does not believe will be condemned” (Mk 16:16); “Truly, truly, I say to you, unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God” (Jn 3:5). Based on Jesus’ words, the Church has taught for 2,000 years that one must be baptized in order to be saved. Prior to baptism, a man is under God’s condemnation and has no hope of eternal salvation. Prior to baptism, a man has no “merit” before God. It is only through the waters of baptism that man is removed from the condemnation of the law and placed in a gracious relationship with God.

Yet, in the lodge, Masons are told nothing about the need for baptism. They are simply told that God will reward them for their merits. They are given the impression that they are already in a right relationship with God, and their merits are efficacious for their salvation. This is not true. Such a teaching is in profound conflict with the plain words of Jesus Christ and the entire Christian tradition. We have no merit before God until we are living a life of grace which comes through baptism (I am not addressing baptism of desire or invincible ignorance because they are irrelevant to this discussion). It is only after God has infused our souls with His sanctifying grace that our merits can have any favor with Him. Again, Freemasonry’s teachings are incompatible with the Christian faith.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Julian continues to quote from the Old and New Testaments to explain Freemasonry's teachings, but he is avoiding one very important fact: *Freemasonry does not require a Mason to believe in the Old and New Testaments.* If Masonry does not require a Mason to accept these divine revelations, why is Mr. Julian using them to prove his case? Mr. Julian continues to force a connection that doesn't exist.

Further, Mr. Julian quotes from the Apostles Paul and John who taught that salvation is obtained through faith in Jesus Christ. Freemasonry does not teach that salvation comes from Jesus Christ. If it does, let Mr. Julian provide us with the quotation and page number from his Washington ritual book. Quoting from the New Testament to defend Freemasonry only highlights Mr. Julian's desperation in trying to defend the Lodge from a Christian perspective. Again, is Mr. Julian arguing that Freemasonry is a Christian organization? If so, why has every Christian church who has studied Freemasonry condemned it?

Finally, Mr. Julian doesn't need to cite the Psalms, the Proverbs and the Gospels to show us that God will reward faithful Christians for their good deeds. What in the world does

this have to do with Freemasonry? Freemasonry doesn't teach that God will reward Christians for their merits as they live a life of grace which they initially receive in baptism. Freemasonry teaches that the All-Seeing Eye will reward Masons for their merits, irrespective of grace, baptism or faith in Jesus Christ. Freemasonry is indifferent to these divinely revealed truths and Mr. Julian's presentation only further reveals these errors.

D. Julian: 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."

J. Salza: As I am sure you can see, it is hard to follow Mr. Julian's line of argument. This is probably another reference to the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. Perhaps Mr. Julian is arguing in favor of Deism? I don't know. What I do know is that this is another irrelevant digression.

D. Julian: 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 Salsa (sic) 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.*"

J. Salza: Really? Then tell us, Mr. Julian, what type of "believer" in deity does Freemasonry reject? What religious "stripe" will be denied admission into the lodge? The answer, of course, is "None," so long as a man "believes in deity." Mr. Julian, why is that so embarrassing for you? Why deny it?

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: No, I have also quoted from Richard Black, the Grand Master of Masons in Wisconsin, from his May, 2000 address about how the Third Degree represents life, death and resurrection. I have also quoted from various ritual books from the 1980s and 1990s, including Wisconsin's Multiple Letter Cipher from 1999. I have further quoted from the Masonic Bible, published in 1988. So Mr. Julian, I am not quoting from "the Theosophists of yesterday's Freemasonry," but from the men of today's Freemasonry, *which your own Grand Lodge of Washington recognizes.*

Notice also that Mr. Julian has failed to prove that Masonic teachings from the 1930s differ from the Masonic teachings of today. Of course, if such a difference existed, Mr. Julian would be citing book, chapter and verse. Mr. Julian has failed to prove any

difference because there are no differences. In short, Mr. Julian's attempt to defend Freemasonry against the Christian position is a complete failure.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Okay, Mr. Julian, let me once again take you to task. Please explain to us why the 1999 Multiple Letter Cipher of the Grand Lodge of Wisconsin, which on page 136 teaches Freemasonry's belief in bodily resurrection, is not an "official interpretation of the rites and ceremonies of today's Freemasonry." Are you saying that Wisconsin's teaching on resurrection is just an "opinion"? How come Masonic ritual never calls any of its teachings "opinions"?

Also, are you honestly saying that Wisconsin's ritual is different from all of the other states' rituals? And are you saying that the Grand Lodge of Wisconsin's ritual is heretical? Let's see what kind of guts Mr. Julian really has. Will he say Wisconsin's ritual is heretical, will he deny what the ritual says, or will he claim that he hasn't read the ritual so he doesn't really know? Mr. Julian, I will email you a PDF of the ritual so that you can read it yourself.

By the way, as we have stated, the Grand Lodge of Washington recognizes Wisconsin's ritual as valid Freemasonry. Remember that Julian swore an oath of fidelity to the Grand Lodge of Washington on his Volume of the Sacred Law, the Holy Bible. He swore to God that he would obey all the laws and edicts of the Grand Lodge of Washington, which would include its recognition of Wisconsin as practicing valid Freemasonry. He also swore that he would be worthy of having his body severed in twain and his bowels burned to ashes if he ever violated the oath.

So Mr. Julian, what are you going to do? Admit that the Wisconsin ritual which teaches bodily resurrection in the Third Degree is valid (in which case you are admitting that Freemasonry teaches resurrection without the need to have faith in Jesus Christ)? Or are you going to violate the oath you swore to your Grand Lodge by claiming that Wisconsin's ritual is not valid (in which case you would be worthy of death)? What are you going to do? We shall see.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: These statements, of course, demonstrate that Mr. Julian doesn't have the faintest idea what he is talking about. We have already covered this before. If one doesn't believe in the Trinity, one is not a Christian. Also, Mr. Julian's assertion that the "concept of the Trinity isn't even introduced to Christianity until the 4th Century" shows once again his ignorance of Christian history. It is true that the Catholic Church defined the first Trinitarian dogmas at the First Council of Nicea in 325 A.D. (the same Church Mr. Julian attacks throughout his presentation). However, the "concept of the Trinity" was a part of the Catholic and Apostolic Tradition of the Church from the very beginning. Here are just a few quotes from the Fathers during the first three centuries:

Our teacher of these things is Jesus Christ, who also was born for this purpose, and was crucified under Pontius Pilate, procurator of Judea, in the times of Tiberius Caesar; and that we reasonably worship Him, having learned that He is the Son of the true God Himself, and holding Him in the second place, and the prophetic Spirit in the third, we will prove." *Justin Martyr, First Apology, 13 (A.D. 155).*

"[T]he ever-truthful God, hast fore-ordained, hast revealed beforehand to me, and now hast fulfilled. Wherefore also I praise Thee for all things, I bless Thee, I glorify Thee, along with the everlasting and heavenly Jesus Christ, Thy beloved Son, with whom, to Thee, and the Holy Ghost, be glory both now and to all coming ages. Amen." *Martyrdom of Polycarp 14 (A.D. 157).*

"For God did not stand in need of these [beings], in order to the accomplishing of what He had Himself determined with Himself beforehand should be done, as if He did not possess His own hands. For with Him were always present the Word and Wisdom, the Son and the Spirit, by whom and in whom, freely and spontaneously, He made all things, to whom also He speaks, saying, 'Let Us make man after Our image and likeness;' He taking from Himself the substance of the creatures [formed], and the pattern of things made, and the type of all the adornments in the world." *Irenaeus, Against Heresies, 4,20:1 (A.D. 180).*

"And first, they taught us with one consent that God made all things out of nothing; for nothing was coequal with God: but He being His own place, and wanting nothing, and existing before the ages, willed to make man by whom He might be known; for him, therefore, He prepared the world. For he that is created is also needy; but he that is uncreated stands in need of nothing. God, then, having His own Word internal within His own bowels, begat Him, emitting Him along with His own wisdom before all things. He had this Word as a helper in the things that were created by Him, and by Him He made all things. He is called governing principle' (arche), because He rules, and is Lord of all things fashioned by Him. He, then, being Spirit of God, and governing principle, and wisdom, and power of the highest, came down upon the prophets, and through them spoke of the creation of the world and of all other things. For the prophets were not when the world came into existence, but the wisdom of God which was in Him, and His holy Word which was always present with Him. Wherefore He speaks thus by the prophet Solomon: When He prepared the heavens I was there, and when He appointed the foundations of the earth I was by Him as one brought up with Him.' And Moses, who lived many years before Solomon, or, rather, the Word of God by him as by an instrument, says, In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.'" *Theophilus of Antioch, To Autolycus, II:10 (c. A.D. 181).*

"In the course of time, then, the Father forsooth was born, and the Father suffered, God Himself, the Lord Almighty, whom in their preaching they declare to be Jesus Christ. We, however, as we indeed always have done and more especially since we have been better instructed by the

Paraclete, who leads men indeed into all truth), believe that there is one only God, but under the following dispensation, or oikonomia, as it is called, that this one only God has also a Son, His Word, who proceeded from Himself, by whom all things were made, and without whom nothing was made. Him we believe to have been sent by the Father into the Virgin, and to have been born of her--being both Man and God, the Son of Man and the Son of God, and to have been called by the name of Jesus Christ; we believe Him to have suffered, died, and been buried, according to the Scriptures, and, after He had been raised again by the Father and taken back to heaven, to be sitting at the right hand of the Father, and that He will come to judge the quick and the dead; who sent also from heaven from the Father, according to His own promise, the Holy Ghost, the Paraclete, the sanctifier of the faith of those who believe in the Father, and in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost. That this rule of faith has come down to us from the beginning of the gospel, even before any of the older heretics, much more before Praxeas, a pretender of yesterday, will be apparent both from the lateness of date which marks all heresies, and also from the absolutely novel character of our new-fangled Praxeas." *Tertullian, Against Praxeas, 2 (post A.D. 213).*

"Bear always in mind that this is the rule of faith which I profess; by it I testify that the Father, and the Son, and the Spirit are inseparable from each other, and so will you know in what sense this is said. Now, observe, my assertion is that the Father is one, and the Son one, and the Spirit one, and that They are distinct from Each Other. This statement is taken in a wrong sense by every uneducated as well as every perversely disposed person, as if it predicated a diversity, in such a sense as to imply a separation among the Father, and the Son, and the Spirit. I am, moreover, obliged to say this, when (extolling the Monarchy at the expense of the Economy) they contend for the identity of the Father and Son and Spirit, that it is not by way of diversity that the Son differs from the Father, but by distribution: it is not by division that He is different, but by distinction; because the Father is not the same as the Son, since they differ one from the other in the mode of their being. For the Father is the entire substance, but the Son is a derivation and portion of the whole, as He Himself acknowledges: My Father is greater than I.' In the Psalm His inferiority is described as being a little lower than the angels.' Thus the Father is distinct from the Son, being greater than the Son, inasmuch as He who begets is one, and He who is begotten is another; He, too, who sends is one, and He who is sent is another; and He, again, who makes is one, and He through whom the thing is made is another." *Tertullian, Against Praxeas, 9 (post A.D. 213).*

"Happily the Lord Himself employs this expression of the person of the Paraclete, so as to signify not a division or severance, but a disposition (of mutual relations in the Godhead); for He says, I will pray the Father, and He shall send you another Comforter. ...even the Spirit of truth,' thus making the Paraclete distinct from Himself, even as we say that the Son is also distinct from the Father; so that He showed a third degree in the Paraclete, as we believe the second degree is in the Son, by reason of the order observed in the Economy. Besides, does not the very fact that they have the distinct names of Father and Son amount to a declaration that they are distinct in personality? For, of course, all things will be what their names represent them to be; and what they are and ever will be, that will they be called; and the distinction indicated by the names does not at all admit of any confusion, because there is none in the things which they designate. "Yes is yes, and no is no; for what is more than these, cometh of evil." *Tertullian, Against Praxeas, 9 (post A.D. 213).*

"[T]he statements made regarding Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are to be understood as transcending all time, all ages, and all eternity. For it is the Trinity alone which exceeds the comprehension not only of temporal but even of eternal intelligence; while other things which are

not included in it are to be measured by times and ages." *Origen, First Principles, 4:28 (A.D. 230).*

""Next, I may reasonably turn to those who divide and cut to pieces and destroy that most sacred doctrine of the Church of God, the Divine Monarchy, making it as it were three powers and partitive subsistences and god-heads three. I am told that some among you who are catechists and teachers of the Divine Word, take the lead in this tenet, who are diametrically opposed, so to speak, to Sabellius's opinions; for he blasphemously says that the Son is the Father, and the Father the Son, but they in some sort preach three Gods, as dividing the sacred Monad into three subsistences foreign to each other and utterly separate. For it must needs be that with the God of the Universe, the Divine Word is united, and the Holy Ghost must repose and habitate in God; thus in one as in a summit, I mean the God of the Universe, must the Divine Triad be gathered up and brought together. For it is the doctrine of the presumptuous Marcion, to sever and divide the Divine Monarchy into three origins,--a devil's teaching, not that of Christ's true disciples and lovers of the Saviour's lessons, For they know well that a Triad is preached by divine Scripture, but that neither Old Testament nor New preaches three Gods." *Pope Dionysius [regn. 260-268], to Dionysius of Alexandria, fragment in Athanasius' Nicene Definition 26 (A.D. 262).*

“Equally must one censure those who hold the: Son to be a work, and consider that the Lord has come into being, as one of things which really came to be; whereas the divine oracles witness to a generation suitable to Him and becoming, but not to any fashioning or making. A blasphemy then is it, not ordinary, but even the highest, to say that the Lord is in any sort a handiwork. For if He came to be Son, once He was not; but He was always, if (that is) He be in the Father, as He says Himself, and if the Christ be Word and Wisdom and Power (which, as ye know, divine Scripture says), and these attributes be powers of God. If then the Son came into being, once these attributes were not; consequently there was a time, when God was without them; which is most absurd...Neither then may we divide into three Godheads the wonderful and divine Monad; nor disparage with the name of 'work' the dignity and exceeding majesty of the Lord; but we must believe in God the Father Almighty, and in Christ Jesus His Son, and in the Holy Ghost, and hold that to the God of the universe the Word is united. For 'I,' says He, 'and the Father are one; 'and, 'I in the Father and the Father in Me.' For thus both the Divine Triad, and the holy preaching of the Monarchy, will be preserved." *Pope Dionysius [regn. 260-268], to Dionysius of Alexandria, fragment in Athanasius' Nicene Definition 26 (A.D. 262).*

"Now the person in each declares the independent being and subsistence. But divinity is the property of the Father; and whenever the divinity of these three is spoken of as one, testimony is borne that the property of the Father belongs also to the Son and the Spirit: wherefore, if the divinity may be spoken of as one in three persons, the trinity is established, and the unity is not dissevered; and the oneness Which is naturally the Father's is also acknowledged to be the Son's and the Spirit's." *Gregory the Wonderworker (Thaumaturgus), Sectional Confession of Faith, 8 (A.D. 270).*

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Finally, Mr. Julian and I agree on something! The Masonic understanding of God is indeed “demeaning, distasteful and extremely insulting” to the pious ears of all faithful Christians. Of course, if Julian really wants to take exception, then he has to

explain why truth doesn't begin and end with the GAOTU in the lodge. He has to explain what "truth" Freemasonry teaches about God other than His existence. Does Freemasonry teach about God's love for humanity? No. Does Freemasonry teach that God became Incarnate in Jesus Christ? No. Does Freemasonry teach that there is a hell where unrepentant sinners will spend their eternity? No.

If Mr. Julian knew a little theology, he would understand that all heresies are based on truth. If Freemasonry is going to give a little "truth" about God, then it must give the *entire* truth about Him. It cannot teach Masons about God, resurrection, morality and eternal life without also teaching about the only source of these blessings – the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. Anything less is not only deceptive, but heretical.

D. Julian: 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.*"

J. Salza: Based on Mr. Julian's erroneous understandings of the Trinity, Jesus Christ, and truth, we know who has the real "distorted perception" of the Christian faith.

D. Julian: 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:

J. Salza: Remember, Julian is going to tell us where in Masonic ritual it says that the King James Version of Scripture is the Great Light of Freemasonry.

D. Julian: *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.

J. Salza: C'mon, Mr. Julian. What kind of silly argument is that? Would you like to tell us who all these "pastors" and "ministers" are? I can simply respond by asking you the opposite question: Why have all the Christian churches that I have already cited formally condemned Freemasonry and forbid its members from joining the Lodge? Why? Are all these churches wrong, but you are right? If you want to use the "many" people argument, then you lose because there are innumerable more Christians who believe Masonry is incompatible with their faith than those who don't.

Prayer and Worship

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: More inconsistent argumentation. I said "Christ is omitted from Masonic prayers." By claiming I committed the sin of omission, Julian says my statement is false. But then Julian says "all other names for god are *also* omitted." By saying "also," Julian admits what he just denied, that Christ's name is omitted. But let's ask Mr. Julian again. Which one is it? Is Jesus Christ's name omitted from Masonic prayers or not? If Jesus' name is not omitted, then Mr. Julian must prove it by citing the prayer and page number from his Masonic ritual. If Jesus' name is omitted, then Freemasonry has "committed the sin of omission."

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Wrong. In fact, it is almost the exact opposite of what Mr. Julian alleges. If each Mason were able to petition his "deity" in the lodge by name, one could argue that no syncretism existed. Such a practice would acknowledge the differences and even the disagreements among the brethren. This is not the practice of Freemasonry. In the lodge, a man is *precluded* from calling upon his "deity" because Masonry believes the "sectarian" beliefs of its members are irrelevant and cause division. This is premised

upon Mr. Julian's own belief that there is "one, true and living God" for all religions. When you couple Freemasonry's practice with its own unique names and symbols for its "deity," you have the greatest manifestation of syncretism possible.

D. Julian: 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.*"

J. Salza: Another fallacious argument. First, Julian's argument is premised on the false presupposition of *sola Scriptura* – that it must be in the Bible for it to be true. If Julian knew Christian history, he would know that the faithful prayed to, in and through the name of Jesus from the very beginning of the Church. Second, Julian's assertion is simply wrong. Scripture does in fact direct us to pray in Jesus name (John 14:11,13). Third, Julian's attempt to use the New Testament to defend Freemasonry only reveals his desperation, since that same New Testament claims that Jesus Christ is the only way to salvation and Freemasonry does not.

Also, since I have only a "cursory knowledge of the Bible," perhaps Mr. Julian can send me complimentary copies of all of the books *he* has written on Sacred Scripture.

D. Julian: 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...*"

J. Salza: This is a perfect example of how Freemasonry deliberately omits the name of Jesus Christ. It was Jesus who said, "where two or three are gathered in my name, I am in the midst of them" (Mt 18:20). Why would Masonry quote from Jesus but not mention His name? Because Freemasonry views Jesus as a good teacher, but not the Word of God made flesh. Masonry sprinkles a little bit of Christianity here and there, but never proclaims that salvation is found in Christ alone. It does this to deceive the Christian membership. If Freemasonry wants to quote from Jesus, then why won't it tell its members what Jesus said about salvation: "I am the way, the truth and the life; no man comes to the Father but through me" (Jn 14:6). We know the answer: *Freemasonry does not teach that Jesus is the only path to salvation.*

D. Julian: 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 anything 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.

J. Salza: Julian's emotions are getting the best of him. That is because Julian's views of Freemasonry are being proved wrong in this dialogue. David Julian has been exposed. Now, let me "put to bed" Mr. Julian's line of argumentation. Mr. Julian, are you saying Freemasonry is a Christian organization? Yes or no? If it is a Christian organization, then it must declare that Jesus Christ is the only way to salvation. Does it? Where? Give us the quotations and page numbers from your ritual book.

Or are you saying that Freemasonry is a "Christianity plus..." organization? A little bit of Christianity? Perhaps a dash of Judaism? A sprinkle of Islam? A touch of Deism? A pinch of Eastern mysticism? A smidgen of Wicca? Something for everyone? Bottom line: *Freemasonry teaches that a man can be saved without Jesus Christ.* That "puts to bed once and for all" the nonsense of Freemasonry.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Again, does that mean that your Buddhist lodge brother is worshiping the "one, true and living God"? If Julian answers "yes," then he believes that there is one God for all religions (which is contrary to Scripture and the entire Christian tradition). If Julian answers "no," then he admits that Freemasonry is lying to all non-Christians and promoting idolatry. What a quandary for Freemason David Julian.

D. Julian: 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...

J. Salza: What? Freemasonry is "primarily" a fraternity? Does that mean it is "secondarily" a religion? If Freemasonry is only "primarily" a religion, what else is it? Faithful Christians and their churches already know the answer. Moreover, Julian once again speaks out of both sides of his mouth. First, he says that "Masons are welcome to approach God in any way they choose." But then he says that the approach must be "appropriate" and not "sectarian" or divisive. In other words, faithful Christians *cannot approach God in any way they choose.* If a Christian wants to pray in the name of His

Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, the lodge would view such prayer as “inappropriate” and “fundamentalist.” So Julian has deceived us once again.

For the man in love with Jesus, being prevented from confessing His name before men is absolutely unacceptable. Brotherly love is important, but truth is more important. Confessing Christ before men is not just a matter of evangelization; it is necessary for our salvation. Jesus said, “So every one who acknowledges me before men, I also will acknowledge before my Father who is in heaven, but whoever denies me before men, I also will deny before my Father who is in heaven” (Matt. 10:32; cf. Luke 12:8-9). This is not the same salvation that is taught in the lodge.

D. Julian: ...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.

J. Salza: Would a religiously mature person accuse a person he doesn't know of “religious immaturity”? Perhaps I was too theological for Mr. Julian. Yes, God is “omnipotent, omnipresent, and omniscient,” and yes He is “the Architect, Creator, and Sustainer of the Universe.” These are all characteristics of God. But these characteristics do not help us understand the essence, or being of God. They do not tell us *who God is*. God is, first and foremost, a Trinity of divine Persons – Father, Son and Holy Spirit. If Freemasonry is going to teach about God and salvation, then it must start by telling its membership *who God really is*. God is not just a distant and remote All-Seeing Eye who created the universe. God is love who has taken flesh in the Person of Jesus Christ in order to atone for our sins so that we can live with Him forever in heaven. This is the Gospel. If Freemasonry dares to teach about resurrection and eternal life, then it must teach about Jesus Christ. If not, it is teaching heresy.

D. Julian: 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 (sic).

J. Salza: Mr. Julian, can you tell us where in Scripture Christians are commanded or even allowed to offer generic prayers with unbelievers on a regular basis? I will tell you: Nowhere. Why? Because such a practice is offensive to God and runs afoul of the Christian's commission to preach Jesus Christ to the world. If the Christian knows the truth, then he must share that truth with others. He is not to suppress the name of Jesus Christ for the greater goal of brotherly fellowship. The salvation of souls is the supreme law of God. Moreover, the regular and continuous exposure to the faith of unbelievers does pose a risk to the average Christian, particularly those who are not well-formed in their faith. For these reasons, the Church has always forbidden regular, common prayer with unbelievers.

Certainly, there may be infrequent occasions where Christians are praying among those of different faiths (e.g., weddings, funerals). But such occurrences can hardly be compared with the prayers offered in the Masonic Lodge. Freemasonry is not an occasional gesture of goodwill. Masonry is a permanently established institution that requires its members to swear oaths under symbolic death penalties. Freemasonry also has created its own unique names and symbols for God and heaven to facilitate its syncretistic worship. This has nothing to do with "immaturity." It has everything to do with love for Jesus Christ and the courage to proclaim him before men, inside or outside of the Masonic Lodge.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: The foregoing Scriptures have nothing to do with praying with unbelievers, so Julian's reference to them is misplaced. Further, no where does Jesus or Peter command or allow Christians to pray regularly with unbelievers. Such a practice is not found anywhere in the Christian tradition. To the contrary, as we see in Acts 17, those who pray but have not yet accepted Jesus Christ must be exhorted to do so, for God has fixed the day on which He will judge them.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Really? Then why have all the “Gentile churches” condemned Freemasonry? More rash statements from Mr. Julian. Further, we have not criticized the occasional silent prayer that occurs in Mr. Julian’s lodge room. I even point out in the book on page 69 that silent prayer may be appropriate where Christians and non-Christians are present. Freemasonry’s prayers, on the other hand, are principally oral petitions to the GAOTU, formalized by rituals (bowing before the letter G; praying around a common altar) and symbols (letter G; All-Seeing Eye). This is an entirely different matter. Mr. Julian is trying to confuse the issue.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian is confusing “exposure to people of other religions” with “prayer.” They are two totally different things. Mr. Julian most likely confuses these separate things because he doesn’t understand the theology of prayer. Prayer is a sacred form of interpersonal communion between God and those in covenant with Him. Only those who have been baptized into Christ share this intimate, personal, covenant relationship with God. In fact, the traditional Christian view, which was held by St. Thomas Aquinas, is that God hears the prayer of unbelievers only if it is a prayer of repentance for salvation. As St. Paul teaches in Acts 17, authentic prayer must include the proclamation of Jesus Christ *because of God’s ensuing judgment*. Again, we are talking about the salvation of souls.

This has nothing to do with “exposure to people of other religions.” Christians live, work, recreate, and do business with unbelievers every day. Christians must welcome the exposure to those of other faiths in order to bring them the truth of Jesus Christ. If not, we would never have the opportunity to evangelize them. But in so doing, we must always distinguish between the sacred and the profane. Prayer is sacred and must be treated as such.

D. Julian: And did you get the not-so-subtle message about when Masons are supposedly bowing “*before the letter G?*”

J. Salza: “Supposedly” bowing? Mr. Julian, you yourself have revealed that Masons bow before the Letter G! You do so again immediately below. Why do you say “supposedly” bowing when that is exactly what you do? What are you embarrassed of?

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Did you notice that Julian never says Masons bow before the Blessed Trinity? Why is that?

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: I wish Mr. Julian would tell us what the cut-off date is for a book to be admitted into evidence. Of course, Julian's argument is completely bogus and shows how desperate he is. He pretends that the "older" books on Freemasonry don't reflect "current" Masonic teaching and practice, even though he also argues that Freemasonry is an "ancient" organization made up of "ancient" teachings. Freemasonry must not be any more ancient than 1875. I will be happy to dismiss every book I have cited in *Masonry Unmasked* and focus *only* on the Masonic Bible (published in 1988) and Wisconsin's Masonic ritual (published in 1997 and 1999). These two books *alone* prove my case, as I have already demonstrated (e.g. they teach the "purity of life and conduct" doctrine to get to heaven; the "resurrection of the body" doctrine, etc).

Mr. Julian, let's stick with these two books, okay? In fact, I am willing to stick just with Wisconsin's ritual book, since it is the most recently published of the books I cite, and also because you recognize the Grand Lodge of Wisconsin as practicing valid Freemasonry. How does that sound, Mr. Julian? Or perhaps you want to focus solely on Washington's ritual book? That is fine with me as well. I will look to see if I have a copy. Otherwise, please send it to me.

D. Julian: 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*.

J. Salza: No it isn't. It is the *Volume of the Sacred Law*. This *could* be the Holy Bible, but it could *also* be the Koran, the Book of Mormon or any other religious writing that is desired by a Mason.

D. Julian: And in the ritual we learn what that meant to Hiram (and therefore should mean to Masons):

J. Salza: Yes, most U.S. Lodges are dedicated to the Sts. John. Is this because Freemasonry teaches that Jesus Christ is the only way to salvation, as the Sts. John proclaimed? No. Since preaching salvation through Jesus Christ alone was what defined these men, but Freemasonry doesn't preach the same thing, it is clear that Masonry's dedication to these great saints is nothing but lip service. In fact, it is outright deception. When I was a Mason, I too took comfort in the fact that my lodge was dedicated to these saints. John the Baptist is even my patron saint, and I wear a medal of him around my neck.

Yet, on the evening of my initiation, the lodge told me to remove the medal (along with my crucifix and wedding ring) in order to receive the Entered Apprentice degree! The lodge is dedicated to St. John the Baptist, but I had to remove my medal of St. John the Baptist from my person to become a Mason? No better example of hypocrisy can one imagine. And later, in the same degree, it was explained to me that I was divested of the medal so that I would "bring nothing offensive or defensive into the lodge." Somehow, my medal of John the Baptist would have been "offensive" to the Lodge and my Masonic brothers? Julian's claim that Masonry promotes its members' religious faiths while divesting its members all reminders of their faith is not only completely inconsistent but offensive to the intellect.

D. Julian: 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."

J. Salza: I am not sure why any of this is relevant. Mr. Julian's description of the degree is accurate. What he fails to tell you, however, is that the candidate then goes through an allegorical drama of life, death and resurrection which I describe in detail on pages 86-93.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Notice that Mr. Julian’s authority for resting on Sunday is his Grand Lodge, not God the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Further, none of Mr. Julian’s extracurricular activities have anything to do with the rituals of the Three Degrees of Freemasonry. Mr. Julian, we are focusing on the rituals of the three degrees, not your “joint church services,” whatever those are.

System of Morality

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: I thought Mr. Julian said that Freemasonry was “just a fraternity”? But now Julian acknowledges that Freemasonry defines itself as “a peculiar system of morality, veiled in allegory, and illustrated by symbols.” What “fraternity” has its own “system of morality”? And what “morality,” Mr. Julian? The morality of swearing not to have sex with a Master Mason’s wife, mother, sister or daughter lest you have your body severed in twain and your bowels taken thence and burned to ashes?

Further, Julian avoided answering the question. If Freemasonry really is a “system of morality” as it claims to be, then why does it hide its moral teachings behind the lodge door? Is *that* moral? Why does it require its members to swear oaths to keep these moral principles secret? No answers from Mr. Julian. And, no, it is not my “unique perception of Freemasonry,” but the perception of every Christian man who has had the guts to leave the Lodge, not to mention your own Masonic Grand Lodges and authors.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Whether the adjective “peculiar” modifies the noun “system” is completely irrelevant to whether Masonry is in fact a “system of morality.” The point is that Freemasonry *is* a system of morality, and even Julian agrees, and yet it keeps its “system of morality” behind the secrecy of the lodge doors. Further, Mr. Julian, are you saying Masonry’s universal definition of itself – a system of morality veiled in allegory and illustrated by symbols – is not a landmark? Are you really challenging the most common, universal, well-known definition of Masonry? I wouldn’t doubt it because you make up your own rules as you go.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Again, if Mr. Julian is going to use the Masonic Bible as an authority, then why doesn’t he acknowledge that the same Bible teaches Freemasonry’ faith in the resurrection of the body on pages 11, 39, 41, 44, 45, 49 and 58? Because that would be much too embarrassing for Mr. Julian. Moreover, Julian fails to quote from other Masonic authorities who say that Freemasonry is a religion. For example, Henry Wilson Coil, one of modern Masonry’s top scholars and whose books are recommended by Mr. Julian’s own Grand Lodge of Washington, commented on this inconsistency:

Some attempt to avoid the issue by saying that Freemasonry is not a religion but is religious, seeming to believe that the substitution of an adjective for a noun makes a fundamental difference. It would be as sensible to say that a man had no intellect but was intellectual or that he had no honor but was honorable. The oft repeated aphorism ‘Freemasonry is not a religion’...has been challenged as meaningless, which it seems to be.

But let’s not take Coil’s word for it. Let’s have the readers decide for themselves. Religion is generally defined as a belief in a superhuman power to be obeyed and worshiped as the creator of the universe, which is expressed in conduct or ritual. I am sure Mr. Julian would have no problem with this definition of religion. In light of this definition, let us summarize some of the Lodge’s characteristics that we have studied thus

far. In the words of Mr. Julian, let's "put to bed" the issue of whether or not Freemasonry is a religion. Freemasonry has its own:

- religious doctrines (*immortality of the soul; bodily resurrection*);
- rituals which exemplify these doctrines (*Hiramic legend; apron presentation*);
- prayers (*with special terminology such as "so mote it be"*);
- names and symbols for God (*GAOTU; letter G; All-seeing Eye*);
- names and symbols for heaven (*celestial lodge above; clouded canopy*);
- soteriology (*purity of life and conduct necessary to gain admission into heaven*);
- burial rites (*prayers, depositing apron and sprig of acacia*);
- altar (*lodge furniture; displays religious writings; oaths sworn here*);
- covenants (*the oaths with conditional self-curses*);
- chaplain (*a Blue lodge officer responsible for Masonic benediction*);
- vestments (*aprons; white gloves; jewels; collars; hats*);
- meeting places (*lodges; also called temples*);
- consecration rites for lodges (*prayer; pouring oil over the Northeast corner*);
- music (*organist or soloist adds music to certain parts of the rituals*);
- calendar (*6007 A.L. "Anno Lucis" versus 2007 A.D. "Anno Domini"*);
- feast days (*St. John the Baptist on June 24; St. John the Evangelist on Dec. 27*);
- Masonic authorities who say it is a religion (*books recommended by Grand Lodges*).

In light of these characteristics, we consider Coil's question and conclusion:

Does Freemasonry continually teach and insist upon a creed, tenet, and dogma? Does it have meetings characterized by the practice of rites and ceremonies in and by which its creed, tenet, and dogma are illustrated by myths, symbols and allegories? If Freemasonry were not a religion, what would have to be done to make it such? Nothing would be necessary or at least nothing but to add more of the same.

In the words of Albert Pike, “Every Masonic lodge is a temple of religion, and its teachings are instruction in religion.” Thus, on the evidence of its own rituals, practices and spokesmen, Freemasonry is, objectively speaking, a religion.

D. Julian: On page 74 Salza (sic) 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*”?

J. Salza: Mr. Julian does not have very good grasp of the English language. He misunderstands the words “predominantly” and “syncretism.” First, American Freemasonry can be *predominantly* made up of Christian and Jewish members while also being composed of Unitarians, Deists, Hindus, Buddhists and Zoroastrians *to a lesser degree*, which it is. There is no inconsistency in my statement whatsoever.

Second, the danger of syncretism can exist even among Monotheistic religions. Anyone with a rudimentary understanding of the history of Christianity knows that the early Christians fought against those who sought to combine the practices of Monotheistic Judaism with those of the Church. Freemasonry “is a syncretistic haven for all kinds of monotheistic” beliefs when it puts Judaism, Islam, Deism and Unitarianism on the same level as the religion of Jesus Christ. That is why faithful Christians don’t make it a habit of praying with Jews and Muslims, most especially on a regular and systematic basis as is done in the Masonic Lodge.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Yes, and that is because Mr. Julian’s religion is Freemasonry, not Christianity. Julian would rather teach the precepts of Freemasonry than the Ten Commandments in his “peculiar system of morality.” Peculiar indeed. Now, readers, buckle up for another one of those irrelevant digressions that have nothing to do with *Masonry Unmasked*.

D. Julian: *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:

*17 Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, ... nor his manservant, nor his X
 maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbour's.*
17 Thou shalt not covet... thy neighbour's wife... IX X
16 Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour. VIII IX
15 Thou shalt not steal. VII VIII
14 Thou shalt not commit adultery. VI VII
13 Thou shalt not kill. V VI
*12 Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land IV V
 which the Lord thy God giveth thee.*
*8 Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. 9 Six days shalt thou labour, and III IV
 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.*
*7 Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not II III
 hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain.*
*4 Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing II
 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.*
*2 I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out I I
 of the house of bondage. 3 Thou shalt have no other gods before me.*

Protestant

/Masonic

Catholic/

Lutheran

Commandments Exodus 20:1-17

So we can see that even in Christendom, there is no universal agreement as to which are the “Ten” Commandments.

J. Salza: Says who? Evidently, in Mr. Julian’s Protestant community, they don’t know which are the Ten Commandments. Incredible. This is what happens when you are outside of Christ’s true Church. Everything is questioned. Everything is up for grabs. Everything is confused. Skepticism pervades. This is the philosophy of Freemasonry. Confusion is from the devil, Mr. Julian, not God. If you want to contact me privately, I will tell you which are the Ten Commandments. The Catholic Church resolved this for us by the time of St. Augustine.

Also, Julian’s classification system is wrong. He suggests that “Catholics, Lutherans and Protestants” follow the same classification. This is not true. The Catholic Church has always held Exodus 20:1-6 and Deuteronomy 5:6-10 to be the First Commandment. Even Martin Luther, the Catholic priest who was excommunicated from the Church for heresy, held this view. However, Luther’s Protestant offspring later decided to make Exodus 20:4-6 and Deuteronomy 5:8-10 a separate commandment from Exodus 20:1-3 and

Deuteronomy 5:6-7. So non-Lutheran Protestants do not have the same classification as Lutheran-Protestants and Catholics.

It is also interesting how Mr. Julian identifies the “Masonic” classification with the “Catholic, Lutheran, and Protestant” classifications. Julian identifies Freemasonry with these other religions. I would have done exactly the same thing, because Freemasonry is a religion.

D. Julian: 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:

26 The first of the firstfruits of thy land thou shalt bring unto the house of the X - Lord thy God. Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother's milk.

25 ...neither shall the sacrifice of the feast of the passover be left unto the IX - morning.

25 Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leaven; ... VIII -

23 Thrice in the year shall all your men children appear before the Lord God, VII - 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.

22 And thou shalt observe the feast of weeks, of the firstfruits of wheat VI - harvest, and the feast of ingathering at the year's end.

III

/IV

21 Six days thou shalt work, but on the seventh day thou shalt rest: in earing V time and in harvest thou shalt rest.

19 All that openeth the matrix is mine; and every firstling among thy cattle, whether ox IV - 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.

18 The feast of unleavened bread shalt thou keep. Seven days thou shalt eat III - unleavened bread, as I commanded thee, in the time of the month Abib: for in the month Abib thou camest out from Egypt.

17 Thou shalt make thee no molten gods. II I/II

14 For thou shalt worship no other god: for the Lord, whose name is Jealous, is a I I 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.

J. Salza: In his irrelevant digression, Mr. Julian says that God didn't just give the Israelites Ten Commandments, He gave them 613. He then says that the first ten are "presumably" the most important. Mr. Julian once again demonstrates a poor understanding of Scripture and Christianity. He fuses together the Decalogue with the Torah as if there is no meaningful difference and attributes the Decalogue with only a presumption of superiority. This is erroneous.

The Decalogue represents the eternal laws of God, while the Torah primarily represented temporary, pedagogical instructions that were meant to lead the Jews to the Messiah. Scripture also reveals that the Jews made a significant distinction between the Decalogue and the book of the law. For example, the Ten Commandments were kept inside the ark of the covenant (Deut 10:5), while the book of the law was kept beside the ark (Deut 31:26). But Mr. Julian doesn't base his assertions on Scripture (or Masonic ritual, for that matter). He makes up his own rules and definitions.

D. Julian: *The Ten Commandments Exodus 34:14-28 Second First*

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.

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.

J. Salza: Are we still discussing *Masonry Unmasked*?

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: While Mr. Julian is correct if he is arguing that the New Covenant has replaced the Old Covenant, he has made a big, theological blunder by claiming that “Christians are no longer to required to live under it or be judged by it” (referring to the Ten Commandments). That is because Julian doesn’t actually read the Bible; he only carries it around in Masonic processions.

Paul exhorts the Roman Christians to keep the commandments against stealing and adultery (Rom 2:21-22) and refers to these commandments as the law of God (v.23). Paul even says that “the law is holy, and the commandment is holy and just and good” (Rom 7:12). James also exhorts the New Testament Christians to keep the commandments against adultery and murder (James 2:11).

While the Old Covenant as a legal entity has been abolished, its godly principles have been incorporated into the New Covenant. Thus, notwithstanding what Mr. Julian teaches, all Christians are bound to follow the Ten Commandments. In fact, our obligations under these divine laws are even greater in the New Covenant than in the Old.

This is why Jesus said, “You have heard that it was said, ‘You shall not commit adultery.’ But I say to you that everyone who looks at a woman lustfully has already committed adultery with her in his heart” (Mt 5:27-28). In the New Covenant, God goes beyond the letter of the law and peers into our hearts. Perhaps Mr. Julian’s Protestant community doesn’t place itself under the laws of the New Covenant.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Really? Here is a part of the oath that the Master Mason candidate swears in Wisconsin’s Masonic ritual:

“Further, *I will not have illicit carnal intercourse with a Master Mason's wife, mother, sister or daughter, nor suffer the same to be done by others, if in my power to prevent...All this I most solemnly and sincerely promise and swear with a firm and steadfast resolution to keep and perform the same, without any hesitation, mental reservation or secret evasion of mind whatever, binding myself under the symbolic penalty of having my body severed in twain, my bowels taken thence and burned to ashes, the ashes scattered to the four winds of heaven, that no more remembrance might be had of so vile a wretch as I should be to knowingly violate this, my Master Mason obligation. So help me God and keep me steadfast in the due performance of the same.*”

Mr. Julian, how far “from the truth” is that?

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Fine. Wisconsin says “illicit carnal intercourse” and Washington says “violating the chastity.” The problem is not with the terminology. The problem is with the subject matter that the terminology addresses. Since fornication is already prohibited by God’s divine laws (the laws that Julian says are no longer binding on Christians), swearing to avoid such a sin is not the proper subject matter of an oath. If Mr. Julian would study just a little bit of moral theology, he will learn about what is proper and improper subject matter for swearing an oath to God.

Moreover, Freemasonry puts Masonically-affiliated women in a different class than non-Masonically affiliated women. Masonry only addresses violating the chastity of a Mason’s “wife, mother, sister or daughter.” What about other women? What about godly Christian women? Can a Mason violate their chastity without breaking his Masonic oath? The technical answer is “Yes.” What kind of impression does this give the Master Mason

candidate about Freemasonry's view of women in general? Such subject matter is not only grossly offensive to pious ears, but blasphemous.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: No, Mr. Julian, the oath is not about conduct in front of any "lady." The oath is about lewd conduct in front of only certain ladies -- a Master Mason's wife, mother, sister or daughter. Read what the rituals actually say.

D. Julian: 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.)

J. Salza: First, I thought "no one speaks for Freemasonry"? Mr. Julian, you are quoting from the Constitution and By-laws of the Grand Lodge of Washington. Does that mean that the Grand Lodge of Washington *does* speak for Freemasonry, even though you say that "no one speaks for Freemasonry"? And if the Grand Lodge of Washington does speak for Freemasonry, are you acknowledging that the Grand Lodge of Washington recognizes Wisconsin's Masonic ritual which teaches Masonry's belief in the resurrection of the body? Again, what a dilemma for Mr. Julian.

Mr. Julian swore an oath to uphold the edict of his Grand Lodge, which includes the recognition of the Grand Lodge of Wisconsin as practicing valid Freemasonry. Mr. Julian also swore an oath not to "sit in a clandestine lodge, or converse upon the secrets of Masonry with a clandestine Mason." The only way Mr. Julian can know whether or not a lodge is "clandestine" is to listen to his Grand Lodge of Washington who tells Julian what lodges are "clandestine" and what lodges are not. The Grand Lodge of Washington recognizes the Grand Lodge of Wisconsin as valid, and *not clandestine*. Thus, Mr. Julian is oath-bound to recognize Wisconsin Masonic ritual, including its teachings on bodily resurrection on page 136. More dilemmas for Mr. Julian.

Also, who says Ronayne's Handbook is "obsolete"? What authority made this declaration? What year? And by what action? The answers: David Julian, 2006, in his review of *Masonry Unmasked*.

D. Julian: 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)!

J. Salza: Wait a minute. Julian just said that my claim that Masonry evaluates "the physical and mental faculties" of the candidate for admission into Freemasonry was a "distortion of the truth." Now Julian says 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." Which one is it, Mr. Julian? Is my claim that Masonry evaluates the "physical and mental faculties" of its candidates for admission "a distortion of the truth"? Or is my claim true because, in Washington, "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"?

Mr. Julian, when I was a Mason, the Wisconsin Masonic Code provided the following:

“A lodge shall not receive a petition for the degrees from one who cannot read or write, nor from one who is unable to speak and understand the language of the ritual” (Section 66.04, Regulations for Lodges, 1997).

Mr. Julian, this was the law of the Grand Lodge of Wisconsin in 1997. Is the year 1997 recent enough for you?

As I explain in *Masonry Unmasked*, the reason why men are required use of their “physical and mental faculties” is so they can swear the Masonic oath. This is because, notwithstanding Julian’s claims to the contrary, the oath is what makes a man a Mason. When the candidate swears the oath, he is required to position his hands and feet in a particular way as he kneels at the Masonic altar. Throughout Masonic ritual and at every lodge meeting, Masons are also required to make secret signs of self-mutilation with their arms and hands. These signs evoke the penalties for breaking the Masonic oaths and constantly remind the Mason of his sacred tie to Freemasonry. If a man is physically or psychologically challenged and cannot perform these gestures, he is not allowed into Freemasonry’s system of morality.

D. Julian: On page 78 Salza tries to play the race card, except that his obvious lack of knowledge of American history is showing.

J. Salza: More blatant misrepresentations from Mr. Julian. Let’s again take Julian to task. Mr. Julian, will you deny any of the following claims?

- Confederate General Nathan Bedford Forrest, the founder of the Klan and its first Imperial Wizard, was a Freemason.
- Colonel William J. Simmons, who in 1915 reestablished the Klan at Atlanta, where he became Imperial Wizard, was a Mason and a Knight Templar.
- Dr. Hiram Evans, who succeeded Colonel Simmons as Imperial Wizard, was a 32nd-degree Mason.
- Albert Pike held the office of Chief Justice of the Ku Klux Klan at the same time as he was the Sovereign Grand Commander of the Scottish Rite, Southern Jurisdiction.

Mr. Julian, have I misrepresented who were Freemasons and Klansmen? Let’s have Mr. Julian put his money where his big mouth is.

D. Julian: 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.”

J. Salza: What does this have to do with Freemasons who were members of the Ku Klux Klan? Nothing. It is just more anti-Catholic nonsense from David Julian, an anti-Catholic. I have shared Julian's assertions with several black priests who are personal friends of mine and much more versed about this issue than Mr. Julian (I can provide Julian the names if he so desires) and they would love to speak to Julian about it. In fact, by pointing the finger away from Freemasonry and back to the Catholic Church, Mr. Julian is implicitly admitting that his Masonic brothers have been Klansmen.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Perhaps Mr. Julian can explain why the Scottish Rite of Freemasonry of today has retained, with only minor modifications, the degree work that was composed by Albert Pike, while Pike was both a member of the Ku Klux Klan and the Sovereign Commander of the Scottish Rite, Southern Jurisdiction? Perhaps Julian can explain why the Masonic oaths that were initially composed by Pike are still sworn by American Masons today? Perhaps Julian can explain why the bloody penalties of the Masonic oaths mirror the penalties of the oaths of the Ku Klux Klan, also devised by Albert Pike? And perhaps Julian can explain while many Grand Lodges around the country still don't recognize lodges organized by black Masons? Vestiges of Freemasonry's racism still exist in its rituals, oaths and recognition requirements, no matter what Mr. Julian would have us believe.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: More straw man arguments from Mr. Julian. I never said there is a problem with the foregoing material. It is accurate and follows precisely the ritual in Wisconsin. Remember, we are not arguing that every single statement in Masonic ritual is problematic. But why doesn't Mr. Julian tell us the whole story? Because Mr. Julian is trying to deceive us. Unfortunately for him, I know Masonic ritual better than he does. In the very same Entered Apprentice degree, the Worshipful Master further describes the meaning of the Masonic apron:

“The lamb has in all ages been deemed an emblem of innocence; he, therefore, who wears the lambskin as a badge of Masonry is thereby continually reminded of that purity of life and conduct, which is essentially necessary to his gaining admission into the Celestial Lodge above, where the Supreme Architect of the Universe presides.”

Here, Masonic ritual (this time from the Grand Lodge of Minnesota) teaches the Masonic that the white apron represents the conduct that is necessary to get to heaven. The Grand Lodge of Wisconsin uses exactly the same quote. This quotation is virtually identical in every single ritual throughout the United States, including Julian's state of Washington. Will Mr. Julian have the guts to provide us the Grand Lodge of Washington's version? And why didn't Julian tell us about this teaching? Either because he is ignorant of Masonic ritual or lying to us. I will let the reader decide.

D. Julian: Did you see or hear any reference to a “*Great White Throne?*”

J. Salza: No, because Julian failed to quote the proper ritual. In Wisconsin, the apron presentation says: “And when at last your trembling soul stands naked and alone before the Great White Throne, may it be your portion, oh, my Brother, to hear from Him who sitteth as the Judge Supreme the welcome words, “Well done, good and faithful servant. Enter, thou, into the joy of Thy Lord.”

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: I never said Adam was the first Freemason. And Adam's apron was made of fig leaves for only a very brief period of time (Gen 3:7). After condemning the human race for the Original Sin, God gave Adam an apron made of animal skins (Gen 3:20). Julian can't even get basic biblical facts straight. Further, *Masonry Unmasked* is not my fig leaf, but my thorn in Mr. Julian's side, for he wrote a 64-page review of the book and has done a better job of exposing Freemasonry that I could have done on my own.

D. Julian: 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.*

J. Salza: Then Mr. Julian finds Masonic ritual equally "egregious." I just quoted from Freemasonry's ritual which says that the apron of Masonry "is thereby continually reminded of that purity of life and conduct, which is essentially necessary to his gaining admission into the Celestial Lodge above, where the Supreme Architect of the Universe presides." If this quote is actually *not* a quote from Masonic ritual, then Julian has a case. However, if this quote *is* from Masonic ritual, then again, Julian is either ignorant of the ritual or a liar. It is that simple.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: I have already addressed how Coil says Freemasonry provides a “guarantee” of eternal life, and how the Masonic Bible backs up Coil’s conclusions. I have further addressed how there is no meaningful distinction between “hope” versus “guarantee” when a person rejects Jesus Christ. The Masonic Bible from which Julian quotes also affirms the certainty of the Mason’s eternal fate as it says “...when this earthly tabernacle of his shall have passed away, he has within him *a sure foundation of eternal life*, a cornerstone of immortality emanating from the Divine Spirit, and which will survive the tomb, returning to his Creator and God, above the decaying dust of mortality and the grave” (p. 38). Even though a Mason may reject the truth of Jesus Christ, Freemasonry tells him that he has “a sure foundation of eternal life.” Mr. Julian, do you have the guts to condemn this heresy? I bet not.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: There it is again. Masons are taught that they can, by their own efforts and not God’s grace, make them fit for “that house not made with hands – eternal in the heavens.” This is not true. Outside of God’s grace, no one can make themselves fit for heaven by the “Common Gavel” of their own efforts. We are sinners in need of God’s grace. We first receive this grace in baptism, and God grants us this grace because of the propitiatory sacrifice of Jesus Christ. No Christ? No grace. No grace? No “house not made with hands” in the heavens.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Here again is where Julian doesn’t understand his duty as a Christian. Jesus Christ commands us “to make disciples of all nations” in order to save their souls from

hell. Yet Julian says that “it’s not up to us to try to force it on them.” Of course, we don’t force our beliefs on people. But, unlike Freemasonry, we don’t “hide the lamp under the bushel” either (Matt 5:15; Mark 4:21; Luke 8:16; 11:33). As Jesus has warned us, if we don’t confess Him before men during this life, He will not confess us before the Father in the life to come. And how does Julian proclaim that Jesus Christ is the way to eternal life if he views Jesus as “subjective truth” until His Second Coming?

D. Julian: 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.*

J. Salza: The Ten Commandments were not “replaced,” they were incorporated into the New Covenant by the Catholic and Apostolic Church.

D. Julian: What does the *Holy Bible*, the Great Light of Freemasonry, say about how you determine who is godly and who is not?

J. Salza: What about Masons who say the Book of Mormon is the Great Light? What about Masons who say the Koran is the Great Light (as is also practiced in the Shrine)? What about those who believe in the Zend Avesta? What should we tell these brothers, Mr. Julian?

D. Julian: *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.*”

J. Salza: While I commend Mr. Julian for recognizing the need to add works to one's faith to be saved, his statement that "each man's ultimate heavenly reward is based *solely*" on his works is not accurate (although it is precisely what the Lodge teaches). Heavenly rewards are not based *solely* on works. In fact, as I have stated before, neither faith nor works merit *any* heavenly rewards unless they are done in God's grace. One enters into the system of grace by being baptized into Jesus Christ. Prior to baptism and repentance of sins, we are under God's condemnation. This is why Jesus says, "He who believes in him is not condemned; he who does not believe is condemned *already*, because he has not believed in the name of the only Son of God" (John 3:18).

Once a person is removed from the "system of law" and enters into the "system of grace," he must have both faith and works to maintain his justification before God. As the Apostle James teaches, faith and works are two separate entities (James 2:18), and must act together to merit salvific justification (James 2:20-26). I even address Mr. Julian's erroneous theology on pages 82-83. Most Protestant churches believe in salvation by faith alone. Mr. Julian and Freemasonry believe in salvation by works alone. Neither view is correct. The correct answer is that we are saved *by grace alone*, through both faith and works.

D. Julian: 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)...

J. Salza: What? Freemasonry provides a path to salvation? I thought Mr. Julian said that Freemasonry *doesn't* provide a path to salvation? Now, Julian says Masonry *does* provide a salvation path that is based on its three rounds of faith, hope and charity. Now we are finally getting somewhere. Mr. Julian, tell us about the first Masonic round which the lodge identifies as "faith." What is the "faith" of this round? Is it faith in Jesus Christ alone? Or is it faith in any "deity"? And how does "faith" in any deity provide the Mason a path to salvation, when Jesus said He is the only way?

D. Julian: ...nor does Freemasonry guarantee immortality (it only instructs the Mason to have the "*hope*" of the same).

J. Salza: I have already addressed this misrepresentation.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: That means that Masonic ritual, the Masonic Bible and every other Masonic authority that I have cited is also "skewed," since my positions are based entirely on the plain letter of those authorities. Again, the only thing "skewed" is Mr. Julian's presentation of Freemasonry and his view of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

D. Julian: 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."

J. Salza: I actually agree with Mr. Julian on this simple point. He is correct that faith alone is insufficient. Even the demons believe and tremble (James 2:19). But Julian's references to John 3:16,18 actually highlight the error of his position: God loved us so much that He sent His Son to save us from condemnation; if we don't embrace the Son as the only way to salvation, we *remain* under God's condemnation. We have no "hope" or "guarantee" of attaining to the celestial lodge above.

When Freemasonry teaches about God and eternal life, does it preach John 3:16,18? No. Freemasonry says only that a man's purity of life and conduct are necessary for his admission into heaven, irrespective of whether or not that man believes in Jesus Christ.

D. Julian: 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.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian continues to quote Jesus Christ to defend Freemasonry when Masonry omits any references to Jesus from its rituals. He wants us to believe that Masonry is Christian. And his theology is once again erroneous. It is not first and foremost about "fruits." It is about truth. The Mormons and Jehovah's Witnesses bear "fruit" as well, but does God want them to remain Mormons and JWs? The answer is "No." Why? Because they do not have the truth. They are under God's condemnation until they receive the grace of Jesus Christ. Moreover, who is the judge of what is good fruit versus bad fruit? There must be an objective truth, which Mr. Julian denies, in order for there to be a standard to judge fruits. Otherwise, bearing fruit is purely subjective.

Of course, feeding the hungry and clothing the naked are obvious good fruits. But whether or not fruit is good or bad is not always obvious, especially among the splintered factions of Protestantism. For example, is abortion bearing the fruit of individual liberty? Is condoning prayer to the Great Thumb bearing the fruit of religious freedom? What about the Catholic monk who prays and fasts all day for the holy souls in Purgatory? Is the monk bearing good fruit? Or is fruit in the eyes of the beholder? This is the world in which Mr. Julian lives -- a world of religious subjectivism where truth, and now "fruits," are defined by the individual person.

D. Julian: 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?

J. Salza: Most Masons casually throw out this "\$3 million a day" contribution figure, but I have never met a Mason who could actually substantiate it. Neither can Mr. Julian, for I bet he has never audited the financial statements of the Scottish Rite, the Shrine or even his own Grand Lodge. Are we supposed to believe that Freemasonry contributes over \$1 billion a year to charity? The Grand Lodge of Washington's official website says Masonry contributes \$2 million a day, not \$3 million, which shows that the figures are made-up. The difference would result in a \$365 million annual variance which wouldn't exist if the numbers were true. When I was a Mason, being also an inquisitive tax attorney, I investigated Masonry's claim about its "millions a day" to charity. I could find no support for it.

I am not the only one. The Orlando Sentinel published that the Shrine generated \$23 million in 1985 from its circuses through the country, but its tax returns showed less than two percent (or \$346,251) actually went to medical care for children. The rest of the money was used to furnish the Shrine's elaborate Temples and to purchase food, alcohol and costumes for its rituals (August 3 and 7, 1985; September 15, 1985). Ann Landers also reported this activity in the article *Shrine Records Shocking*, South Haven Daily Tribune, Michigan (April 24, 1987). Further, if the Shrine generated only \$23 million, this is only a fraction (2 percent) of Freemasonry's supposed \$1 billion annual charitable contributions. Where does the other 98 percent come from? Answer: Nowhere, because the numbers are phony.

When I was a Mason and member of two lodges, both lodges contributed almost exclusively to charities that benefited Masons. This was especially highlighted by our scholarship program. Monies would only be funneled to children whose fathers were Masons. The Grand Lodge of Wisconsin had \$11 million in the bank, and none of the funds were earmarked for charity. I am not alleging that Freemasonry does nothing good for charity; it does. But if Mr. Julian is going to use Masonic charity to defend Freemasonry, then it is fair game to assess just how charitable Freemasonry really is. The record demonstrates that Freemasonry is its own biggest charity. Moreover, charity is not even the issue. We need to keep Mr. Julian focused on the religious teachings of Freemasonry.

Mr. Julian, regarding your comment about me being on “dangerous ground,” the only “dangerous ground” you should be concerned about is losing your soul for all eternity because you make a mockery out of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

Resurrection of the Body

J. Salza: Dear readers, get ready for Mr. Julian to wiggle and worm as we address Freemasonry’s teachings on bodily resurrection. In my experience, this topic causes the most discomfort among Masonic apologists. It is also the topic that best exposes the lies and misrepresentations of Freemasons. As you will soon see, David Julian will publicly deny what is written in black and white.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Now the Grand Lodge of Wisconsin’s 1999 ritual is “way out of the mainstream”? Past Grand Master Richard Black’s 2000 address is “way out of the mainstream”? The 1988 Masonic Bible is “way out of the mainstream”? Let me also note that the Grand Lodge of Wisconsin’s 1999 ritual and the Masonic Bible, both which teach about bodily resurrection, contain the exact same language today, in 2007. Are the doctrines and practices of the Grand Lodge of Wisconsin in 2007 “way out of the mainstream”? Is Mr. Julian going to contact the Grand Lodge of Wisconsin and let them know? And before he does, he better inform his own Grand Lodge, for the Grand Lodge of Washington shares reciprocity with the Grand Lodge of Wisconsin.

As I have already shown, the only “Masonic authorities” I cite to prove that Freemasonry teaches about bodily resurrection is the ritual from Wisconsin (which Julian recognizes as valid) and the Masonic Bible (from which Julian himself quotes). This topic of bodily resurrection is where Masons run scared. I don’t blame them, however. It was the topic that caused me the most angst when I was a Mason. Ultimately, I had to face the facts.

Freemasonry teaches a belief in bodily resurrection without the need to have faith in Jesus Christ.

D. Julian: 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 Hiramic 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian is obviously very confused. If I were claiming the Third Degree was a Christian rite, I would still be a Mason and we wouldn’t be having this dialogue. Of course, no where in *Masonry Unmasked* do I “attempt to prove” the Third Degree is Christian. I say quite the opposite. See pages 85-102.

D. Julian: Neither my cipher nor Monitor makes any direct reference at all to “*the resurrection of the body and the immortality of the soul.*”

J. Salza: First, we know by now that we cannot trust what Mr. Julian says, particularly about Masonry’s teaching on the resurrection.

Second, the Third Degree in Washington’s cipher has the exact same Hiramic Legend – the allegorical drama that symbolizes life, death and resurrection - that is celebrated in every other state. Wisconsin’s ritual teaches bodily resurrection on page 136 of the Multiple Letter Cipher.

Third, the Masonic Bible – which is also distributed to Masons in Washington - teaches bodily resurrection on pages 11, 39, 41, 44, 45, 49 and 58.

Fourth, the Masonic Landmarks also teach the belief in the resurrection. Here are a few examples:

- Mackey’s 20th Landmark: “Belief in a resurrection to a future life”
- Lockwood’s First Landmark says: “Belief in the existence of a Supreme Being, in some revelation of His will, in the Resurrection of the Body and in the Immortality of the Soul”
- Grant’s 9th Landmark says: “Belief in the immortality of the soul and the resurrection to a future life”

Fifth, Masonry’s most respected authors affirm the Craft’s teaching of bodily resurrection. For example, about the raising up of the candidate from his symbolic death I in the Third Degree, Mackey says: “Literally, this refers to a portion of the ceremony; but more significantly, it refers symbolically to the resurrection, which is exemplified as the

object of the degree.” See *Mackey’s Revised Encyclopedia of Freemasonry*, volume 2, page 828.

Mr. Julian is trying to deceive us. The evidence exposes him for what he really is.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: This is said after the candidate is told that the Hiram Legend is a “legend whose symbolic interpretation testifies to our faith *in the resurrection of the body and the immortality of the soul.*” Mr. Julian conveniently left out the most troubling of the passages. Further, Mr. Julian should explain to Christians how “imitating Grand Master Hiram Abif” prepares them to welcome death and the judgment of Jesus Christ. How, Mr. Julian, does imitating a fictitious character in a death-and-resurrection rite prepare the baptized Christian for death? How will death help “translate” Masons “from this “imperfect to that all-perfect, glorious, and celestial Lodge above” if they have rejected Jesus Christ?

This is exactly what I and other Christian men are talking about. You have even given us the ritual yourself. This passage tells Masons that imitating the “exalted and exemplary character” of the make-believe Hiram Abif will prepare them for heaven, irrespective of having any faith whatsoever in Jesus Christ. This, Mr. Julian, is heretical. This is why Freemasonry and Christianity are irreconcilable, now and forever.

D. Julian: “*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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian, your own Masonic Bible (p. 63) defines an allegory as “uttering a truth in parabolic form, with its meaning hidden in comparison.” Allegory attempts to teach truths, even though the meaning may be hidden or difficult to comprehend. The Hiram Legend teaches a “truth” of Freemasonry – the certainty of the resurrection of the body and the immortality of the soul. Don’t believe me? Then believe your Masonic Bible: “Foremost of all the truths taught and emphasized in [the Master Mason] degree, is the immortality of the soul of man and *the certainty of the resurrection of his body to eternal life*” (p. 11).

So, Mr. Julian, Freemasonry equates what happens in its Hiram legend to what it believes in real life. This is why Freemasonry is able to tell the Mason that by imitating the virtues inculcated in the degree, the Mason can view death not as a grim tyrant but a kind messenger. This is also why at Masonic burial services the family of a dead Mason is reassured with the same teaching. The family is told that, because their beloved imitated the virtues of Hiram Abif during his labors on earth, he is now laboring in the heavenly lodge above. Mr. Julian, the next time you are at a Masonic burial service, tell the family of the dead Mason that such statements don't reflect "reality" and are just "silly." The only thing "silly" about Freemasonry's teaching is that it excludes the need to have faith in Jesus Christ. Actually, it is not silly. It is sad.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Never alleged. Straw man argument. Irrelevant.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: So now the Trinity is an invention by mere men and not a revelation of Almighty God? Mr. Julian once again demonstrates that he is a Freemason, not a Christian. Julian rejects divine revelation and all authority, even the authority of his own Grand Lodge. I have already demonstrated that belief in the Three divine Persons was apart of the Catholic and Apostolic faith from the very beginning. Moreover, the doctrine of the Trinity was revealed by God and dogmatized by the Catholic Church as she was guided into this truth by the Holy Spirit, as Jesus promised (Jn 16:13). Julian has no idea what he is talking about.

D. Julian: 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.*"

J. Salza: Then all the Grand Lodges who use this terminology are wrong? And what about the rituals? Are they wrong? What about the Masonic Bible? What about the Landmarks? What about Mackey? Are they all wrong too? Yeah, sure, David Julian. Everyone is wrong but you.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Tell that to Hiram Abif. Jubelum struck him “dead level” with a setting maul, but he was raised to a “living perpendicular” to the celestial lodge above. And as Mr. Julian has revealed to us, if Masons imitate the bravery of their celebrated martyr, they too will be “translated” to the heavenly lodge above.

D. Julian: 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!*

J. Salza: From the Masonic Bible: “Literally, this refers to a portion of the ceremony; but more significantly, *it refers symbolically to the resurrection*, which is exemplified as the object of the degree” (p. 55). *Mackey’s Revised Encyclopedia of Freemasonry* describes the symbolism of the resurrection the same way (Vol. 2, page 828). Either Mr. Julian is lying to us, or he is grossly ignorant of the teachings of his Craft.

D. Julian: 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!

J. Salza: I address Julian’s silly “reinterment” argument on pages 97-98. While Hiram was *literally* reburied, he was *symbolically* raised from the dead. So says Masonic ritual, the Masonic Bible, Mackey, Coil, Pike, Newton, the Landmarks, as well as Richard Black, Past Grand Master of Masons in Wisconsin. This is the allegorical part of the Third Degree that Mr. Julian either missed or simply denies. But it is written in black and white, for all to see.

No, Mr. Julian, Hiram is not raised to go back to work on the Temple (the ritual, of course, never says Hiram goes back to work). He is raised up to the celestial lodge above. This is why Masons are told that, if they follow the example of Hiram Abif, they too will be “translated from this imperfect to that all-perfect, glorious and celestial lodge above where the Supreme Architect of the Universe presides.” Masons are told this not only in the Third Degree, but also at Masonic burial services for dead Masons. Why? Because the Hiram Legend is about *life after death*, not just death.

If Hiram weren't raised from the dead, then the Third Degree of Freemasonry is nothing more than a drama about a murder and a funeral. Mr. Julian, is the highest and most sublime degree of Freemasonry only about a murder and a funeral? Is that all the Master Mason degree is about? And at Masonic Memorial Services, are you just giving false hope to the deceased Masons' families?

D. Julian: 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?

J. Salza: Actually, Mr. Julian "just skipped over lightly" this part of my book, because I quote it verbatim on pages 97-98 (the lecture comes from page 136 of the Wisconsin Multiple Letter Cipher, the same page that teaches about bodily resurrection). As the ritual, the Masonic Bible, Mackey and a host of other authorities teach us, the Hiram Legend of the Third Degree represents death, burial and resurrection. The raising of the candidate symbolically teaches Freemasonry's faith in the resurrection of the body. The Masonic Bible even says that this teaching is the "object of the degree." But Mr. Julian never got the allegory. Mr. Julian never read the rituals. And now that he knows what the rituals actually say, is he going to leave Freemasonry?

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian has just trapped himself. Previously, he said that the rituals don't teach bodily resurrection. Now, conceding that the rituals *do* teach bodily resurrection (according to the plethora of Masonic authorities), he says that "it doesn't matter" what other Masons think. What he is really saying is that "it doesn't matter what Freemasonry teaches." Why? Because, as a professing Christian, he cannot defend what the rituals teach. So he thinks he can exonerate himself by saying that "it doesn't matter." Sure, Mr. Julian. You spent 64 pages critiquing my book because "it doesn't matter." You are on emotional overdrive because "it doesn't matter." You put your credibility on the line by denying what is in black and white because "it doesn't matter."

Let me force you to recognize one important fact. This is not about what "Masons think." This is about what Masonic ritual *teaches*. It is what the Grand Lodges throughout this

country promote. When are you going to understand the difference? When are you going to acknowledge the authority of the Grand Lodge of Washington as you promised in your oath? When are you going to acknowledge the authority of the Grand Lodge of Wisconsin? If Masonic ritual teaches “resurrection of the body” but David Julian chooses not to believe it, that is his choice. But we will not let David Julian tell us that Freemasonry doesn’t teach what is in black and white (page 136, Wisconsin Multiple Letter Cipher; pages 11, 39, 41, 44, 45, 49 and 58 of the Masonic Bible et. al.) because Julian doesn’t want to believe it.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Why does Julian let Newton off the hook but not me? Why is Newton’s interpretation of bodily resurrection permissible, but Salza’s interpretation of bodily resurrection “one of the most outrageous and demonstrably false claims of [his] book”? After all, I held that interpretation when I was a 32nd degree Mason, Shriner and Proficiency Ritualist. Any honest reader can see that Mr. Julian is a desperate man.

Also, Newton could have been writing about David Julian when he wrote: “How many Masons fail to grasp the master truth of the Master Degree!” (*The Builders, A Story and Study of Freemasonry*, 270-271).

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: First, Julian is wrong when he says that the Grand Masters are the only Masonic authorities. The Masonic ritual of the Grand Lodge, and not the Grand Master, is the principal authority of Freemasonry. The Masonic ritual, not the Grand Master, embodies the Landmarks, doctrines, teachings and practices of Freemasonry. The Grand Master is only a custodian of this Masonic patrimony. A Grand Master cannot change the rituals (other than making minor modifications which go through a specific, legislative process) which shows that Masonic ritual is higher.

Second, Richard Black is a Past Grand Master of Masons in Wisconsin who believes that the Third Degree teaches resurrection to eternal life. We see this in his May, 2000 address to Masons in Wisconsin (Wisconsin Masonic Journal). According to Mr. Julian, Brother Black, as Grand Master, is a “Masonic authority.” Therefore, Julian is forced to admit that a “Masonic authority” teaches about the resurrection. Richard Black is also a higher ranking Mason than David Julian to whom Julian owes recognition by virtue of his Master Mason oath. Let Mr. Julian quibble with Past Grand Master Black about what Freemasonry’s Third Degree teaches.

Third, Mr. Julian articulates the problem very well. He says “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 problem is that there is *one common denominator* underlying the symbolism: Freemasonry’s teaching about resurrection and eternal life. As Mr. Julian explains, a Mason is free to believe that his faith in Buddha will translate him to the celestial lodge above. Therefore, Freemasonry teaches that it is not necessary to have faith in Jesus Christ to be saved. That is the bottom line. The Masonic symbols are “what the observer wants them to symbolically represent.” This is why Freemasonry and Christianity are irreconcilable.

D. Julian: Digging himself further into the pit, Salza says “*Another problem with the reinterment argument is that 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...”?

J. Salza: Yes, that is what the ritual says *literally* happened. The same ritual also says that the raising *symbolically* represents the resurrection of the body, as do all the other Masonic authorities I cite. Mr. Julian wants to focus only on what literally happened, but not on what is being symbolically represented, even though the ritual “literally” tells him to do so.

D. Julian: 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 Hiram 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 “Hiram 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.

J. Salza: This digression has nothing to do with the Third Degree’s symbolic presentation of bodily resurrection. It is just another attempt to confound the issue. In fact, the whole paragraph makes little sense. What “key information” are we missing, Mr. Julian? In what are we supposed to be “proficient” to understand the meaning of the Third Degree? Julian doesn’t say. Moreover, while Julian tries to confuse the issue by telling us when the Hiram Legend begins and ends (which is also wrong), he never tells us the *meaning* of the Hiram Legend. He never tells us the meaning behind the candidate’s symbolic death, burial and raising. But that is okay. The Masonic ritual, Masonic Bible, the Landmarks and the rest of the Masonic authorities do.

D. Julian: 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...*

J. Salza: “What makes this bizarre, of course, is”: Julian passes right over the eight verbatim statements about bodily resurrection in my book on the very pages 91-92 that he refers us to! He skips right over this damning material and moves into another irrelevant digression about the Great Light of Masonry. I will, for a third time, cite the material on pages 91-92 of *Masonry Unmasked* that David Julian has deliberately chosen to ignore. Again, these quotes come from the insert in Julian’s Masonic Bible, King James Version. Last time, I used “*italics*” and “underline” to present these teachings. This time I will use “**bold**” and “underline.” Maybe the third time will be a charm?

- “A distinctive tenet of Masonry is that there remains a heaven of rest and of rewards for the good and faithful, a place of perfect happiness beyond the grave and **the resurrection of the body**” (p. 44).
- “The doctrine of eternal life permeates all the Mysteries of Freemasonry; it is the fundamental basis of the Third Degree in a very special emphasis. Co-equal with emphasis on this tenet of Masonic Faith is belief in the **future resurrection of the body**” (p. 41).
- “Foremost of all the truths taught and emphasized in [the Master Mason] degree, is the immortality of the soul of man and **the certainty of the resurrection of his body to eternal life**” (p. 11).
- “...there will be an awakening of the body and **a resurrection of a spiritual body capable and fitted for eternal life**” (p. 39).
- “[House not made with hands] comprehends the eternal dwelling place of God, and **the resurrected and glorified body** of the redeemed in the life beyond the grave” (p. 45).
- “This collection of metaphors is a part of the Scripture reading of the Third Degree, and forms an appropriate introduction to the sublime ceremonies whose object is to teach symbolically **the resurrection and life eternal**” (p. 58).
- “...the very philosophy of Masonry teaches us that there can be no death **without a resurrection**, no decay without a subsequent restoration, no loss without eventual recovery” (p. 49).
- “his soul returns to God who gave it and **his body which returns to dust shall be raised, incorruptible and glorified** and qualified for entrance into the Grand Lodge of the Celestial City of God” (p. 11).

Here is one more quote which I include on page 89 of my book but have not yet included in this dialogue:

- The acacia is “to teach symbolically the great Masonic doctrine of **a resurrection and a future life**” (p. 43).

There is more, but this should be sufficient. Dear readers, does the foregoing material teach about bodily resurrection? You be the judge.

Julian can respond only by saying that these statements are just “opinions” and he doesn’t have to follow them. Of course, if he dismisses the “opinions” of the Masonic Bible, then he must also dismiss the same “opinions” found in the rituals, the Landmarks, the monitors, the Masonic Encyclopedias, the Grand Masters and a host of other authorities. Julian will be reduced to arguing that Freemasonry is just one, big “opinion” (and quite a consistent opinion at that!).

He also has to deal with the fact that the word “opinion” is found nowhere in Masonic ritual. In the Masonic oaths, Masons don’t swear to keep secret Freemasonry’s “opinions.” Masons don’t promise to keep secret their own “opinions.” As we will further see below, Masons swear to preserve and protect Freemasonry’s “secrets,” “mysteries,” “teachings,” and “doctrines,” but never “opinions.”

D. Julian: ...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?

J. Salza: As I explain specifically on page 115 (and in six other places in *Masonry Unmasked*), the candidate is presented with “whatever book he deems sacred.” If he is a Christian, he swears his oath on the Holy Bible. If he is a Muslim, he uses the Koran. If he is a Sikh, he can bring a copy of the Granth.

Also, is Julian arguing that “Christian” Masons are required to use the King James Version of Scripture? What about “Catholic” Masons who prefer the more accurate translation of the Douay-Rheims? Mr. Julian, if a Catholic requested to use the Douay-Rheims for his Masonic oath, would he be refused? The answer, of course, is “No.” Just like a Muslim would not be denied the Koran.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Sure, Mr. Julian. The Wisconsin Masonic rituals from 1999 are “obsolete.” Past Grand Master Richard Black’s 2000 statement is “obsolete.” The 1988 Masonic Bible is “obsolete.” All the teachings of Grand Lodges throughout the United States from the 1980s, 1990s and 2000s are now “obsolete.” What is “bizarre” is David Julian’s complete ignorance of Freemasonry.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: The readers are probably sick of Mr. Julian’s *ad hominem* arguments by now. I am too. He is a shallow man. But this is the technique Masonic apologists resort to when defending the Lodge. Of course, Julian once again has it wrong. I left the Lodge, not because I couldn’t get clients. And I didn’t write *Masonry Unmasked* to get “a few extra bucks.” I left the Lodge because I love my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ and would not tolerate Masonry’s teachings about eternal life without Him. I wrote *Masonry Unmasked* to expose the religious errors of Freemasonry and men like David Julian who embrace these errors.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Once again, Julian confuses Freemasonry’s teachings with the individual beliefs of its members. Freemasonry teaches about its faith in the resurrection of the body, independently of the beliefs of its members. So it’s Julian’s premise, not mine, that is wrong.

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.

J. Salza: More confusion between the teachings of Freemasonry and the individual beliefs of the membership. Before, Mr. Julian said that Freemasonry believes in deity and eternal life. Now Mr. Julian says “Freemasonry doesn’t believe anything.” Which one is it? I will tell you: *Freemasonry teaches that Masons can go to heaven without faith in Jesus Christ.* It is that simple.

D. Julian: *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.

J. Salza: “For nearly all” the Christian churches in the United States, Freemasonry is condemned as an anti-Christian religion which teaches salvation without faith in Jesus Christ. Mr. Julian, the religion of Jesus Christ does not need any enhancements from Freemasonry. And thank you for admitting that some Masons reject Jesus Christ, yet Freemasonry teaches that these men too can be “translated” to the celestial lodge above. In Freemasonry, the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ is not necessary for salvation.

D. Julian: 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.”

J. Salza: First, how does this statement disprove Masonry’s teaching on bodily resurrection? It doesn’t. Second, the statement is false. Freemasonry does not require a candidate “to assent to a belief in a ‘transition to a future life.’” It requires only that a candidate “believe in deity.” As credentialed as Mr. Julian thinks he is, he doesn’t get even basic facts about Freemasonry correct.

D. Julian: We have also shown that being lifted out of one grave to be buried in another is not resurrection.

J. Salza: We have also shown that the raising of the candidate in the Hiram Legend *symbolizes* bodily resurrection, according to Freemasonry’s own rituals and other authorities. Moreover, Mr. Julian pretends like reinterment precludes resurrection. What another silly argument.

D. Julian: 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.*”

J. Salza: Mr. Julian, Freemasonry *teaches* these doctrines. If you want to confuse “teaching” with “belief,” go right ahead. Teaching is the purpose of Masonic ritual, as Julian himself has admitted. But Mr. Julian does not have the courage to address its problematic teachings. Like the rest of the Masonic apologists, he can only focus on attacking the character of his Christian opponents.

D. Julian: 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...

J. Salza: Christian readers, did you hear it again? Jesus Christ being the only way to salvation is “mumbo-jumbo” according to Mr. Julian. Julian is a Freemason, not a Christian, and you can be only one or the other.

D. Julian:...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.’*”

J. Salza: Mr. Julian’s ignorance of Catholic teaching continues. Let me explain to him the “current official position of the Church.” It is the same position that Jesus Christ Himself has revealed because the Catholic Church is His Church. The official position is this: Jesus Christ is the only way to salvation. Period. Not Hiram Abif. Not Masonic charity. Not belief in deity. However, if a person does not know of Jesus Christ or the moral obligation to join His Church “through no fault of their own,” they may still be saved. They may be saved in spite of their invincible ignorance, not because of it.

Nevertheless, even though the Church recognizes the possibility of salvation for non-Christians, their salvation is not guaranteed. The popes throughout the ages have exhorted Catholics not to make any further inquiry about this question as they bear witness to Jesus Christ as the only way to salvation. This, Mr. Julian, is the official position of the Church. And if Julian is so eager to profess the official position of the Catholic Church on matters of salvation, here is another one for him: *Catholic membership in Masonry is forbidden, and any Catholic who enrolls in a Masonic association is in a state of grave sin and may not partake of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ.*

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: What in the world does this have to do with Freemasonry? And why do we care what Sedevacantists say? The Church cannot fall into heresy, unless of course Mr. Julian doesn't believe in Jesus' promise that the gates of hell will not prevail against His Church (Mt 16:18). The Catholic Church is the Church that Jesus Christ founded upon the rock of Peter, as Scripture, Tradition and history affirm. My book *The Biblical Basis for the Papacy* demonstrates this unequivocally, and if Mr. Julian disagrees, then I will be happy to debate him on that topic as well.

Further, *subsistit in* is not "an abdication of the Church's historic identification of itself alone as God's church." *Subsistere* (from which *subsistit* comes) is a special case of *esse*, which deals with autonomous existence. Thus, the phrase *subsistit in* means that the Church depends on no one for her existence other than Jesus Christ. The Church, *in its substance*, exists as an independent being because she is the Bride of Christ. Her existence depends solely on her union with the Bridegroom, Jesus Christ. The life of the Church is borne from her intimate, one-flesh union with Jesus Christ, which is renewed in the celebration of the Eucharist and will be consummated at the end of time. The "current, official position of the Church" is this: The Body of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church *are one and the same thing*. No "current, official" statements from the Magisterium contradict this teaching.

D. Julian: 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."

J. Salza: While I respect the opinions of then Cardinal Ratzinger immensely, whatever Cardinal Ratzinger's opinions were about "*subsistit in*" are just that – his opinions. They are not official statements from the Magisterium, as for example, the Church's condemnations of Freemasonry. If Mr. Julian is so influenced by Cardinal Ratzinger's *private* opinions, then why doesn't he also feel the same way about Cardinal Ratzinger's *official* opinions, such as his 1983 condemnation of Freemasonry while he was Prefect for the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith?

Most obviously, what does this digression have to do with *Masonry Unmasked*? Nothing, of course. Mr. Julian probably thinks that by providing so much information his readers will think he knows what he is talking about. But as I have show at almost every turn, Julian's knowledge of Scripture, Tradition, Latin, Greek, Catholicism, Protestantism, Freemasonry, Cosmology, history and all the other topics he has introduced into the debate is grossly deficient. He may be able to fool some of his Masonic buddies, but he is not fooling me or anyone else with even a rudimentary understanding of these topics.

D. Julian: On 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.

J. Salza: More emotional, irrational, anti-Catholicism from the anti-Catholic bigot David Julian.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: It doesn't take "impressive academic credentials" to read the plain words of Masonic ritual. It doesn't take "impressive academic credentials" to read and understand the meaning of "bodily resurrection." Mr. Julian can compare the Hiram Legend with "cowboys and Indians" if he so desires, but by now, any honest reader will see that David Julian is in complete denial of what Freemasonry teaches. And even putting Masonry's teaching of bodily resurrection aside, if Julian's Freemasonry is nothing but make-believe play time for him, then he will have to explain to God why He swore an oath with a self-curse to keep his play-time world secret.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Notice that Julian never tells us what the point is of dramatizing the murder and funeral of Hiram Abif. Is the Hiram Legend solely about glorifying death? The Third Degree is only about death and burial? What is the point of that? And why does Freemasonry refer to Hiram Abif when they bury their dead brothers in Masonic burial services? Because death is the end of the game? Julian, of course, is embarrassing himself. And no, Freemasonry didn't fail me. Freemasonry *helped* me. Masonry helped

me realize that I needed to make a choice: Either accept the exclusive claims of Jesus Christ as the only way to salvation, or the inclusive theology of Freemasonry. Mr. Julian needs to make the same choice. To date, we know what his choice is.

D. Julian: The primary purpose of the Drama was not to teach the doctrine of bodily resurrection, as Salza and some others claim...

J. Salza: The “some others,” of course, are all the Grand Lodges in the United States, the Masonic ritual, the Masonic Bible, the Landmarks, Coil, Mackey, Pike, Newton, and Black, just to name a few.

D. Julian:...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.*

J. Salza: Having the courage and character to face death? I thought Mr. Julian said Masonry was just a make-believe world of “cowboys and Indians”? Now he says that the secrets of Masonry give a man the courage to face death? What are these secrets, Mr. Julian? Believing in the GAOTU and the resurrection of the body? And wait another minute. I though Julian said that Masonry has no secrets. Now he contradicts himself yet another time by saying that Masonry *does* have secrets.

More importantly, how can Freemasonry give a man the courage to face death when that courage is not based on faith in Jesus Christ? I will tell you how: Freemasonry doesn't teach that faith in Jesus Christ is necessary for one to have the courage to face death. As Julian himself now admits, Masons can have the courage to face death without Jesus Christ. Even though Jesus alone has changed death from a curse to a blessing, Masons can face the blessings of death without Him. This is precisely why Freemasonry is incompatible with Christianity. Thank you again, David Julian, for demonstrating this glaring inconsistency between your religion and mine.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: More misrepresentations from Mr. Julian. I am just about sick of this entire dialogue. Mr. Julian, if you are not going to listen to Masonic ritual, why don't *you* tell us what happened to Hiram Abif? What happened to Hiram after he was killed and buried? Did he go to heaven? Did he go to hell? How about purgatory? Is the Hiram Legend

about nothing more than a murder and funeral? Why don't you tell us what you and your Masonic brothers say at a Masonic funeral service? Don't you tell the families of your dead brothers that their beloved are now laboring in the celestial lodge above?

Allow me to refer to the ritual that Mr. Julian presented to us a few pages ago. This part of the lecture is given to the Master Mason after he has been symbolically resurrected to new life:

“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.”

Thus, when Julian says that “nothing in the ritual actually indicates that Hiram Abif actually makes the transition to a future life at all,” he is not telling the truth. If the ritual tells Masons that by imitating Hiram Abif they can be “translated” upon death to the “celestial lodge above,” that means Hiram is in the “celestial lodge above.” Masons must do the *same* thing that Hiram did to go to the *same* place that Hiram did. Masons must be martyrs for Freemasonry, not Christianity. This heresy should outrage any faithful Christian.

D. Julian: 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’”.

J. Salza: More arbitrary timelines from Mr. Julian. As I have said before, I am willing to use only Masonic ritual approved by U.S. Grand Lodges. Also, if 1960 is “a little closer to contemporary” for Mr. Julian, then why isn't the 1999 Wisconsin ritual contemporary enough?

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Notice that Mr. Julian doesn't provide any evidence against my claim that the Hiramic Legend mirrors the dramas that were celebrated by the ancient pagan mystery religions. He simply says it's a “perceived similarity.” We wonder how Mr. Julian perceives a death-and-resurrection rite that never mentions Jesus Christ. Is this more Christian or pagan to Mr. Julian?

D. Julian: 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.*"

J. Salza: More straw man arguments. I never said that Hiram died "to demonstrate resurrection of the body." I said what the Masonic ritual and Bible say: "The Hiramic Legend testifies to Freemasonry's faith in the resurrection of the body and the immortality of the soul."

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: More confusion from Mr. Julian. First, he says that it is "not quite right" to say that Hiram died for refusing to disclose "esoteric Masonic knowledge." But then he says that Hiram died because he refused to disclose "architectural secrets of Master Masons." Evidently, for Mr. Julian, "architectural secrets" of Master Masons are not considered "esoteric Masonic knowledge." His last sentence about a distinction between stonemasons' and speculative Masons esoteric knowledge also makes no sense.

But who really cares? The issue is not about *why* Hiram Abif was murdered. The issue is about *what* Hiram Abif received for his martyrdom. According to Freemasonry, Hiram Abif received an eternal reward – being "translated from this imperfect to that all-perfect, glorious and celestial lodge above, where the Supreme Architect of the Universe presides."

Burial Rites

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: No, Mr. Julian, Freemasonry makes that connection for us. In describing the sprig of acacia that helped identify the burial of Hiram Abif, the Masonic Bible on page 43 says that the acacia is "to teach symbolically the great Masonic doctrine of a resurrection and future life."

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Even the Protestant apologists I regularly debate would laugh at this ridiculous statement. The Church who defined the dogma of bodily resurrection at her earliest councils is now the same Church who sought to “prevent” resurrection, as if that is even possible (which it is not). The statement shows how ignorant Mr. Julian is of the doctrine of bodily resurrection (taught by both Freemasonry and Christianity). Burning a body doesn’t prevent God from raising the body, Mr. Julian. If decomposed or burned bodies would prevent God from raising the dead, then resurrection would never occur (except for the incorrupt, Catholic saints)! Mr. Julian’s GAOTU god must not be as “All-powerful and omnipotent” as the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

D. Julian: 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.*”

J. Salza: If Mr. Julian knew anything about Christian history, he would know that the Catholic Church had already translated the Scriptures into the common tongues of the people and distributed them to these people 1,000 years before Wycliffe came along.

D. Julian: 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?

J. Salza: This again shows Mr. Julian’s unfamiliarity with the dogma of bodily resurrection. Just because Hiram was buried once, twice or three times, just because his body turned to ashes, just because he died for refusing to disclose architectural secrets is *irrelevant* to Freemasonry’s most sublime teaching. I even address this common Masonic digression on pages 97-99 of *Masonry Unmasked*. Masons who point out that Hiram’s body turned to ashes fail to grasp the mystery of bodily resurrection. It is precisely *because* we die and decay that resurrection is a mystery of faith. Bodily decay is part of

the mystery of bodily resurrection.

It is because of this sublime mystery that Freemasonry says: “*Foremost of all the truths* taught and emphasized in [the Master Mason] degree, is the immortality of the soul of man and *the certainty of the resurrection of his body to eternal life.*” For Freemasonry, the doctrine of bodily resurrection is “Foremost of all the truths” taught in the Masonic lodge.

D. Julian: 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.*”

J. Salza: Why does Julian find this statement so “insulting, defaming, and assassinating” to the character of his Masonic brothers? Because it is true? If David Julian has a problem with my statement, then he should do what I and thousands of other Christian men have done: Renounce the errors Freemasonry and follow Jesus Christ. Time is short for Mr. Julian. Also, notice that Mr. Julian is offended by what he thinks is character assassination on my part, all the while he assassinates my character throughout this dialogue! More duplicity from David Julian.

D. Julian: Salza is forced to admit that “*These services are not intended to interfere with any other religious services the family has requested.*”

J. Salza: Yes, Masonry claims that the “services are not *intended* to interfere” with any *other* religious service the family has requested (Julian acknowledges that the Masonic burial service *is* a religious service). But whether it *intends* to interfere and whether it actually *does* interfere are two different things. There have been Masons in Wisconsin whose faithful Christian relatives refused to attend their funerals because of the anti-Christian nature of the Masonic burial rites. I have witnessed this first-hand. These services often cause division and heart-ache among those who loved the dead Mason and his family but can’t bear to participate in the pagan Masonic burial rite. Such rites, which assure the dead Mason’s family of his eternal bliss, are profoundly offensive to faithful Christians.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Julian says “I don’t know what the Funeral Service looks like in Wisconsin,” and then accuses me of misrepresenting the Service. Perhaps he can explain how he can criticize something he knows nothing about. Further, Washington’s rite has the gall to quote Jesus Christ without mentioning His Blessed Name. Even so, the devil masquerades as an angel of light.

D. Julian: 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.*

J. Salza: What about the address to the deceased Muslim Mason? What about the Mormon? The Sikh? The Buddhist? The Hindu? The Zoroastrian? Would Freemasonry use this same ritual? The answer, of course, is “No.” If Mr. Julian disagrees, then let him prove to me and the rest of the world that Freemasonry is really a Christian fraternity.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: So what? This just shows that Mr. Julian is trying to define Freemasonry by his own personal experiences. Whether he has ever attended a Masonic Memorial Service outside a Christian context is not relevant to whether Masonic Memorial Services are conducted outside a Christian context. They are. Even for the dead “Christian” Mason, the Wisconsin Masonic Memorial Service *never* mentions Jesus Christ. Not once. The family of the dead Mason is simply told that their beloved is in the celestial lodge above where the Supreme Architect of the Universe presides.

Chapter V -- Masonic Secrecy And Deception

Recruitment

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: After reading almost 60 pages of Julian's material, much of which consists of irrelevant digressions into anti-Catholicism, let the reader decide who is really doing "too much talking and not enough listening." Yes, patient reader, you now have permission to laugh.

D. Julian: 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,...

J. Salza: Mr. Julian doesn't know Wisconsin's ritual but has the nerve to criticize it anyway. He criticizes what he doesn't know because his defense of Freemasonry is based on emotion, not fact. When I make an argument, I present quotations from the ritual to back up my argument. Notice also that Mr. Julian doesn't say my quotations are inaccurate. He can only say that my "interpretation" of the plain words is inaccurate. Anyone with a modicum of honesty and intelligence can see right through Julian's defense.

D. Julian: ...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?

J. Salza: Wisconsin uses the identical questions. This, of course, is because Masonic ritual is essentially the same from state to state. This means the Hiram Legend of Wisconsin is the same as the Hiram Legend of Washington.

D. Julian: "*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.

J. Salza: If Mr. Julian is telling us that candidates for Freemasonry are not often solicited on the grounds that Masonry provides advantages in the business world, then he is mistaken. In fact, this is one of the main reasons men consider joining the Lodge – to develop a broader network of friends and associates in the business community. After all, when candidates are solicited, they are not told about Freemasonry's religious teachings. What are they told? That Freemasonry is an ancient and honorable fraternity whose members "take care of their own."

When I was solicited to join Freemasonry, the Masons told me that Masonry would be a wonderful opportunity for me to develop a network in the business world. They also provided me the names of fellow Mason attorneys and judges. As a young attorney, this appealed to me. I found it odd that I was later asked to promise that I was unbiased by improper solicitation and uninfluenced by mercenary motives. While I didn't have "mercenary motives," I questioned why the Lodge was now asking for such a promise. This is an example of the "bizarre doublespeak" of Freemasonry. It solicits men to join for business reasons, and then, on the evening of initiation, asks the candidate to promise he is not joining for business reasons.

Masonry's disclaimers about God are another great example. When Masons solicit men to join the Lodge, they invariably declare that, while all Masons must believe in deity, "God is never discussed in the lodge room." They do this to desensitize the candidates. When the candidate later hears prayers to the GAOTU and teachings about resurrection and eternal life, Masonry hopes that the man will remember the promise of his brothers that "God is not discussed in the lodge room." If not, the man would be forced to admit that his brother misrepresented the ritual. Masonry wants the man to believe that "God is not discussed in the lodge" while it conditions him to accept Masonry's own doctrines about God.

Masonry's requirement of divesting the candidate of his religious sacramentals is another sad example. Masons claim that the Lodge promotes and encourages the candidate's particular religious faith. Yet, on the evening of his initiation, Masonry requires the man to remove all reminders of that faith in order to become a Mason. Whether it's a crucifix, a scapular, a ring (including a wedding ring) or any other reminder, it must be removed before being admitted into Freemasonry's system of morality. This is Masonic hypocrisy at its worst. So, yes, Mr. Julian, there are inconsistencies between Masonry's solicitation process and its indoctrination process. These inconsistencies are intentional.

D. Julian: 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?

J. Salza: How is this a contradiction? I say that "most candidates" join Freemasonry because of the relationship they have with their sponsor, and are giving pamphlets about the organization. Again, there is no contradiction, because both are true. Mr. Julian continues to try to find contradictions where none exist to impugn the credibility of his opponent. I am hip to his tactic. I have dealt with weak debaters like Mr. Julian for years. This may influence people who are as ignorant as Mr. Julian is about Freemasonry, but it will not work with me or any of my patrons.

D. Julian: 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 is 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.

J. Salza: Where is the "obvious distortion" with Freemasonry's teaching on "the resurrection of the body"? Where is the "outright lie" about Masonry's teaching of the "purity of life and conduct" that is necessary to get to heaven? Is Mr. Julian saying that the rituals of American Freemasonry are full of "obvious distortions"? Is he saying that the Masonic Bible is full of "half-truths"? Is he saying that American Masonic monitors are full of "outright lies"? The only thing that has begun to "unravel" (no, it has already unraveled) is David Julian's defense of Freemasonry.

D. Julian: 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.*"

J. Salza: Julian's statement is unresponsive and irrelevant. What does solicitation and recruitment have to do with the secrecy of the Masonic lodge room?

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: First, no one has argued that Freemasonry is secret from God. I agree with Mr. Julian that such an argument would be nonsensical. In fact, Freemasonry specifically petitions God to witness the oaths that are sworn at the Masonic altar as the Mason says “So help me God and keep me steadfast in the due performance of the same.” Whether the “one, true and living God” actually responds to the Mason’s request is quite another matter. Second, no one is debating whether or not Masons wear Masonic rings or lodges publish their meeting times. None of this is at issue.

Freemasonry is a secret society because it binds its members by solemn oaths to keep its religious teachings secret. This is so fundamental and universal to Freemasonry that I cannot believe I need to point it out to Mr. Julian. But this is why I engaged in this dialogue. David Julian is lying to the public, and his lies will not get passed me. I don’t mean to sound uncharitable, but in Julian’s own words, he is a “self-confessed liar.”

Let me prove it once again. In the Entered Apprentice degree oath, which is virtually the same throughout the country, the Mason swears the following:

“Of my own freewill and accord, in the presence of Almighty God, and this Worshipful Lodge, erected to Him and dedicated to the Holy Saints John, [WM presses down on hands of Cn.] do hereby and hereon, most solemnly and sincerely, promise and swear, [WM hands off] that I will always hele, ever conceal, and never reveal any of the secret arts, parts or points of the hidden mysteries of Freemasonry, which may have been heretofore, shall be at this time, or any future period communicated to me as such, to any person or persons whomsoever, except it be to a true and lawful brother Mason, or within a regularly constituted Lodge of such, and not unto him or them, until by strict trial, due examination, or legal information, I shall have found him or them as lawfully entitled to the same as I am myself.

I furthermore promise and swear that I will not write, print, paint, stamp, stain, cut, carve, mark or engrave them, or cause the same to be done, upon anything movable or immovable, capable of receiving the least impression of a word, syllable, letter or character, which may become legible or intelligible to any person under the canopy of heaven, and the secrets of Freemasonry thereby unlawfully obtained through my unworthiness.

All this I most solemnly and sincerely promise and swear, with a firm and steadfast resolution to keep and perform the same, without any hesitation, mental reservation, or secret evasion of mind whatever, binding myself under the symbolic penalty of having my throat cut across, my tongue torn out by its roots, and buried in the rough sands of the sea at low watermark, where the tide ebbs and flows twice in twenty-four hours, should I every knowingly violate this, my Entered Apprentice obligation. So help me God, and keep me steadfast in the due performance of the same.”

As you can see, the thrust of the entire Entered Apprentice degree oath is about secrecy. Almost the entire oath is devoted to concealing the secrets of Freemasonry from the public. A man is oath-bound never to reveal any of Masonry’s secrets, even if it’s the “least impression of a word, syllable, letter or character.”

If Freemasonry is not a secret society, then why does it make its members swear oaths to keep its teachings secret? Why does the Lodge bind a man under the penalties of having his throat slit, his heart plucked out, and his body severed in twain should he ever reveal Masonry’s secrets? Is swearing these oaths to keep things secret part of Mr. Julian’s world of “cowboys and Indians”? Do Masons swear trivialities to God just for fun? Does Julian know that such oaths are blasphemous and worthy of God’s most severe judgment? For Mr. Julian to argue that Freemasonry is not a secret society is for him to reveal his true character.

D. Julian: 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?

J. Salza: Again, no one is arguing that Masonry is “secret from God.” Nothing is secret from God. In fact, God’s Church has condemned Freemasonry which means that not only is Freemasonry not secret to Him, but Masonry has His attention. Second, no one is arguing that Masonry is “secret from Masons,” although many Masons, Mr. Julian included, don’t have a clue what Freemasonry really teaches. Third, through its repeated exhortations and grisly oaths, Freemasonry intends to keep secret its religious teachings. Masonry does not want non-Masons (whom the organization calls “profanes”) to know its teachings on bodily resurrection and eternal life. If Freemasonry deliberately made public its religious teachings, its “fraternity” label would be severely compromised and petitions from new members would all but cease.

That is why Mr. Julian wrote a 64-page review of *Masonry Unmasked*. He needed to do some damage control because the book reveals Masonry’s religious teachings that Mr.

Julian does not want the public to know about. But since he cannot defend what the rituals actually teach, and since anyone willing to do a bit of work can verify through the public domain what is presented in my book, Julian has come out to assail the character of his former Lodge brother.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: In Milwaukee, the lodges would ask for the religious affiliation of the candidates and document the same on the petition for the three degrees. The lodges also made efforts to solicit Catholics and would have pat answers to a Catholic’s questions about the Catholic Church’s position on Freemasonry. When I was solicited to join the Lodge, I was told specifically that the Church had once objected to Catholic membership in Freemasonry, but had abandoned that position (this, of course, was not true). The process may be different elsewhere, but that really doesn’t matter. Solicitation deals with practice and procedure, which varies from state to state. I, on the other hand, am focusing specifically on the religious doctrines of the Lodge, which do not vary from state to state.

Initiation

D. Julian: 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.’”*

J. Salza: It is truly incredible how Mr. Julian denies reality. Is Julian arguing that candidates for Freemasonry are not required to remove all jewelry, including wedding rings and crucifixes? The only thing “egregious” is Mr. Julian’s bold-face misrepresentations and deceptions. This is what the candidate for the Entered Apprentice degree is told before he is admitting into the lodge while he waits in the anteroom (the language is virtually identical throughout the country):

“Mr. B., the institution of which you are about to become a member is one by no means of a light and trifling nature, but of high importance and deep solemnity. Masonry consists of a course of ancient hieroglyphical and moral instruction, taught according to ancient usage by types, emblems, and allegorical figures.

The members of this Lodge request that you lay aside all thought of levity and address your mind to the solemn truths with which they will endeavor to invest

you. Be assured that nothing will be required of you that does not tend toward your own good or toward the usefulness to your fellow men.

You are now about to tread the path which all Masons have traveled before you; therefore, in conformity to the Ancient Regulations, it is necessary that you be divested of your outward apparel and clothed with a garment furnished by the Lodge. Are you willing to submit to these regulations?

In the Lecture that follows the swearing of the oath, the Worshipful Master tells the new Mason that he was stripped down to his underwear so that “you might carry nothing offensive or defensive into the Lodge.” In the Masonic lodge, an image of Jesus Christ is considered “offensive.”

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Yeah, so? Is Julian saying the candidate doesn’t strip down to his underwear? Further, the candidate is not given any “monitor” explaining this request. He is simply asked to strip down as a requirement for receiving the Entered Apprentice degree. Second, the Entered Apprentice degree is not an “allegorical play.” The “allegorical play” is the Hiram Legend of the Third Degree. It is in the Third Degree where the candidate plays the part of Hiram Abif. In the Entered Apprentice degree, the candidate doesn’t play any such parts or represent any characters. Again, Mr. Julian doesn’t get even basic facts about Masonic ritual correct.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Huh? Mr. Julian disagrees with my statement that the divestiture involves religious reminders, and then Mr. Julian says that Wisconsin and Washington ritual work are “obviously very similar.” Another strange and inconsistent statement from Mr. Julian.

Second, if the divestiture has “absolutely nothing to do with religious reminders,” then why does Freemasonry tell a man to take off his crucifix? Why does the Lodge tell the man to take off his scapular? Why does the Lodge tell a man to take off his wedding ring? The ritual answers the questions: “so that “you might carry nothing offensive or defensive into the Lodge.”

D. Julian: 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...”

J. Salza: I never said that the Junior Deacon’s response is a Masonic Landmark, so Julian’s statement is unresponsive and irrelevant once again. I even admit on page 28 of *Masonry Unmasked* that there are slight variances in Masonic ritual from state to state. The Masonic Landmarks don’t involve the minor roles of the Junior Deacon or Senior Steward. Again, this is practice and procedure. Mr. Julian should know better. The Masonic Landmarks deal primarily with doctrine. These doctrines include Freemasonry’s belief in the resurrection of the body and the immortality of the soul.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian deliberately failed to provide us the rest of the quotation from the Masonic Bible, so I will, with emphases added to rebut Julian’s misrepresentations:

In Freemasonry . . . darkness is a symbol of ignorance; while light is the symbol of enlightenment and knowledge. It is a principle of Freemasonry that the natural eye cannot perceive of the mysteries of the Order until the heart has embraced the deep spiritual and mystic meanings of those sublime mysteries. Hence, all applicants for the Degrees of Freemasonry are required to enter the Lodge in total darkness, this darkness is preparatory and preliminary to his receiving the light he desires and searches. [Masonic Bible, p. 39]

While Mr. Julian says that the “darkness” does not relate to “spiritual” enlightenment, the Masonic Bible says just the opposite. While Mr. Julian says that the candidate does not

“desire” this light, the Masonic Bible says just the opposite. That is why the Junior Deacon says that the candidate “has *long* been in darkness.” When the Junior Deacon makes this statement, the candidate has only been blindfolded for a couple minutes. His “long” state of darkness does not describe his temporary hoodwink, but his ignorance of the “deep spiritual and mystic meanings of [the] sublime mysteries” of Freemasonry.

D. Julian: 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?*”

J. Salza: First, it is not my theology, Mr. Julian. It is the theology of Jesus Christ, which He gave to His apostles, and they to their successors. This is what St. Paul called “Tradition” (1 Cor 11:2; 2 Thess 2:15; 3:6). If Mr. Julian would go to my website, he would find over 100 quotes from the early Church Fathers from the first eight centuries holding the same view about baptismal regeneration. Mr. Julian does not understand the difference between God’s grace and man’s freewill, just like he doesn’t understand the difference between the office of the papacy and a pope’s personal conduct, and the difference between the teachings of Freemasonry and the beliefs of its individual members. Also, Mr. Julian, the Muslims and Vikings who invaded Catholic Europe seeking to destroy Christianity during the Crusades were not “innocent.”

Because Mr. Julian doesn’t read the Bible, he also probably doesn’t know that Jesus told us that the wheat and the weeds would grow together within the Church until the end of time (Mt 13:30). This is God’s plan, and God will judge all evil doers, beginning with the Catholic hierarchy, for judgment begins at the “household of God” (1 Pet 4:17). Julian’s statements about the Catholic Church are so incredibly insulting and inaccurate that I will not respond in kind. I will stay focused on the teachings of Freemasonry (which is extremely difficult when debating a man like David Julian).

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Now Mr. Julian has inside information about who has remained priests and who has been laicized. We should not be surprised because Mr. Julian is also a mind reader. Mr. Julian, satan will always attack Christ’s true Church, and many times her members fall. This has nothing to do with *Masonry Unmasked*. Maybe that is why Mr. Julian doesn’t believe in the inerrancy of Scripture. After all, the inerrant Scriptures were written by erring and sinful men. This is because the God of Christianity can lead sinners to teach infallibly, another truth that Julian rejects.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: I am sure Mr. Julian would have also scolded Albert Mackey, one of Freemasonry’s giants, who elaborates on the spiritual, moral and intellectual condition of the candidate as he waits outside the lodge room:

Having been wandering amid the errors and covered over with the pollutions of the outer and profane world, he comes inquiringly to our doors, seeking the new birth, and asking a withdrawal of the veil which conceals divine truth from his uninitiated sight. . . There is to be, not simply a change for the future, but also an extinction of the past . . . the chains of error and ignorance which have previously restrained the candidate in moral and intellectual captivity are broken (Masonic Ritualist, page 23).

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: I am grateful for Julian’s reaction. He is admitting that if the Lodge did tell a man who believed in any deity whatsoever that his faith was well-founded, that would be “hogwash.” I agree. Unfortunately for Mr. Julian, that is exactly what the Lodge does. He has just admitted defeat.

D. Julian: The candidate is asked, “In whom do you put your trust.” He has to give the answer “In God” without prompting.

J. Salza: This is incorrect. The candidate does not have to say “In God.” The candidate has to profess only a “belief in deity.” Thus, the candidate could say “In God,” “In Buddha,” “In Brahma,” or whatever “deity” he chooses. Moreover, even if the candidate does say, “In God,” it begs the question “What God?” Why? Because, as Mr. Julian well knows, the Worshipful Master responds by telling the candidate, “Your trust being in God, your faith is well-founded. Arise, follow your conductor, and fear no danger.”

How can the Worshipful Master tell the candidate that his trust is in God if the candidate says “In Brahma”? How can the candidate’s trust be in God if the candidate does not believe in the Blessed Trinity? Because Freemasonry teaches that there is one God for all religions. If not, then the Worshipful Master could not say “Your trust being in God, your faith is well-founded.” Again, either the Worshipful Master is lying to the candidate who

rejects the Trinity or the Master is declaring that a profession of any deity qualifies as a belief in the true God. It is one or the other.

D. Julian: 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?”

J. Salza: This is incorrect as well. The candidate is only asked “In whom do you put your trust?” He is not asked about a belief in the “one, everliving (sic) and true God,” nor is he asked about a “transition to a future life.” Also, I didn’t say the candidate’s belief “didn’t matter,” Julian did. The candidate’s belief *does* matter. If the candidate is an atheist, he is not admitted into Freemasonry. If the candidate believes in the divinity of the Great Thumb, he is admitted into Freemasonry. Not only that, but he is told that his trust is in God and his faith *is* well-founded. In other words, he is told a lie. And the Lodge’s lie could have eternal consequences for its new brother.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Now Mr. Julian claims that Psalm 133 is about Freemasonry! I wonder if the Grand Lodge of Washington will endorse his statement. I wonder if any other Mason in the United States could make such a statement with a straight face. And wait just another minute. Psalm 133 was written about 2,700 years ago. If Mr. Julian rejects Masonic authorities written in 1999 A.D. on the grounds that they are “obsolete,” why doesn’t he reject authorities that were written in 700 B.C.?

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Wrong again. Mr. Julian is confusing the solicitation process that occurs outside the lodge with the ritual work that occurs inside the lodge. I have never argued that a man is “coerced” to join Freemasonry. What I have stated in the book is that, when the candidate is asked if his participation is of his own free will and accord, “the candidate does not really know what will be further required of him,” so “the question is unfair.” If Mr. Julian disagrees, then let him explain how the candidate could possibly know what will happen to him (unless, of course, a Mason violated his oath and told the candidate in advance). Mr. Julian missed my point completely.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: No one is debating that most candidates consent to proceed. My point is that, because candidates do not know what is going to happen to them during the ensuing ritual, their consent is not completely informed. If a candidate were told that he was going to participate in the death-and-resurrection rite of the Hiram Legend, he would likely *not* proceed.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian should know “full-well” that the candidate places his hands on the “Volume of the Sacred Law,” which isn’t necessarily the Holy Bible. Again, if the man is a Christian, the Bible is used. If the man is a Muslim, the Koran is used. Either Mr. Julian is ignorant of one of the most basic practices of Freemasonry or all the Masons in Washington are Christian.

Covenant Oaths

D. Julian: 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...”

J. Salza: More strange comments from Mr. Julian. Is Mr. Julian saying that the Masonic oath is sworn in public? Why would he pick such a silly battle to fight? Even the “profane” public knows that the Masonic oath is sworn behind the secrecy of the lodge door. Only Masons are allowed to be present when the oath is sworn. Freemasonry even appoints a Tiler at the front of the lodge room door to ensure that all who enter to witness the degree are Freemasons. The Tiler’s job is to protect the lodge from being infiltrated by “cowans and eavesdroppers.” Further, as we have seen, much of the subject matter of the oath involves promises to keep Masonry’s teachings and practices secret. Masons fulfill their promises by administering the oath in secret.

Also, the “Oath of Obligation” is not “an allegorical play teaching a moral lesson.” An oath is an oath, and an allegorical play is an allegorical play. They are two different things. In Masonry, the oath is a promise sworn to God to keep Masonry’s teachings secret. The allegorical play teaches Masonry’s religious doctrines. The Masonic oath is sworn before the allegorical play of the Hiram Legend commences.

Further, what does Mr. Julian mean when he says the oath is “not ‘real life’”? Does he mean that Masons only swear pretend oaths? Does he mean that Masons invoke their God to witness the promises made, but they really don’t mean it? Does he mean that Masons are making promises that they don’t intend to keep because all of this Masonic nonsense is “not real life”?

D. Julian: 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.*

J. Salza: Mr. Julian continues to demonstrate his ignorance and hypocrisy. Tell us, Mr. Julian, if charity is supposed to be done in secret, why do Freemasons like yourself make so much noise in public about Masonry’s supposed \$2 million-a-day charitable contributions? Why do Masons universally violate this principle? And who is even talking about charitable works in secret? This discussion is about Freemasonry’s religious

teachings and oaths which are secret, not its charitable works (which Freemasonry makes sure are not secret).

Also, why doesn't Julian ever refer to the name of Jesus Christ when quoting the Savior? Mr. Julian, the Masonic Bible doesn't teach the principle of doing charitable works in secret. The Lord and Savior Jesus Christ teaches this principle. Julian, like Masonry, believes he has a license to quote Our Lord but never actually refer to Him by name. What is even more sad is that Mr. Julian professes to be a Christian.

D. Julian: 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?

J. Salza: Thank you, Mr. Julian, for pointing out that the oaths are just a sham. Thank you for telling us that the oaths Freemasons swear to God are not "to be taken literally." This means that the moral principles the Mason is swearing to uphold cannot be "taken literally" either. Most importantly, this means that Masons, by Julian's own admission, are using the Lord's name in vain. They are swearing trivialities to God. I have news for you, Mr. Julian: Whenever you swear an oath to God, it better be "taken literally," or you have just committed the grave sin of blasphemy. You have violated the Second Commandment which forbids every improper use of God's name. But, then, Mr. Julian doesn't believe the Ten Commandments apply to Christians.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: More nonsense from Mr. Julian. When you back Masonic apologists against the wall, the most desperate ones disclaim everything about Freemasonry. If they can't defend it, they simply disclaim it. They say, "Its only symbolism"; "the symbols mean nothing"; "no one speaks for Freemasonry"; etc., etc., etc. When we see this kind of argumentation from our opponents, we know they are defeated.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian ends his review just like he began it, and just like he continued it the entire way: with *ad hominem* attacks on my character. Mr. Julian resorts to these kinds of statements because he has nothing else to offer us.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: Mr. Julian reveals again that his religion is Freemasonry, not Christianity. According to Mr. Julian, Jesus' Church needs the Lodge. According to Julian, Christianity needs Freemasonry. Only a man who lacked faith in the promises of Jesus Christ would dare make such a statement. And I bet it is time for Mr. Julian to once again quote from Jesus (without mentioning His name of course). I was right! And it is a long quote this time:

D. Julian: *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 tithe 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

J. Salza: Irrelevant to *Masonry Unmasked*, as were most of Mr. Julian's "cut-and-paste" jobs.

John F. Salza, J.D.
Milwaukee, Wisconsin
25 January 2007, Anno Domini
Conversion of St. Paul, Apostle

D. Julian: *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.

J. Salza: I "could not let go by" Mr. Julian's error. No where as a Preface to Article VI or anywhere else in the Constitution does the phrase "Separation of Church and State" appear. This is a Masonic doctrine first espoused by Freemasons (and especially the Scottish Rite) and finally dogmatized by Masonic Supreme Court Justices in the *Everson v. Board of Education* (1947) case. Mr. Julian casually slips it into his "cut-and-paste" of the U.S. Constitution.

D. Julian: 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...*”

J. Salza: Mr. Julian is only partially correct. Amendment I has two prongs: The Establishment Clause and the Free-Exercise Clause. The Establishment Clause prevents the government (courts, Congress) from sponsoring or endorsing an official religion, including a national religion. Why did the Fathers enact this amendment? Because, prior to the American Revolution, the English parliament designated the Anglican Church as the official church of England and the American colonies, and the American Fathers wanted to eliminate a similar situation from happening. The Free-Exercise Clause allows American citizens to exercise their religious faith without governmental intrusion. If Julian disagrees, I can refer him to some of my fellow Doctors of Jurisprudence who teach Constitutional Law. None of this has anything to do with *Masonry Unmasked*.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: At least Mr. Julian admits the obvious – that Freemasonry has been instrumental in secularizing our country. The “sectarian religious onslaught” that Mr. Julian refers to included prayers and any references to God in public schools, Bible reading in public schools, the Ten Commandments posted in public schools, release time for religious instruction, financial aid to religious colleges, public funding of parochial schoolteachers’ salaries and instructional materials, public funding for maintenance and repair grants, busing of children to parochial schools, and tuition reimbursements for parents of parochial school children. Thanks to Masonic Supreme Court Justices, the foregoing “sectarian religious onslaught” has been dealt with. All in the name of Masonic “Liberty, Equality and Fraternity.” I am sure that God – the Father, Son and Holy Spirit – is very pleased.

D. Julian: 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.

J. Salza: If Mr. Julian wants to argue that the United States of America is a godless country, he won't get any pushback from me. This does absolutely nothing for his defense of Freemasonry. But if one reads pages 167-170 of *Masonry Unmasked*, I demonstrate that this wasn't always the case. Unlike what Mr. Julian would have us believe, the United States identified itself as a Christian nation (although, I will admit, never a Catholic nation). This all changed when Masonic Supreme Court Justices, appointed by Masonic Presidents, dominated the Court. Don't believe me? Ask the Scottish Rite of Freemasonry. When asked about how Masonry was able to do wreak such havoc, the *New Age* shamelessly reported: "It can be done; it has been done" (see *New Age*, 1976, pages 19-22).

D. Julian: 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),

J. Salza: Yes, but since Mr. Knight focused on the Masonic oaths and these oaths are virtually identical to those sworn in America, Knight's material on why Freemasons are reluctant to break their oaths is relevant, as Mr. Julian already knows.

D. Julian: ...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.

J. Salza: No, I believe that Jesus Christ is the only way to salvation, and, yes, I follow the traditions passed down from the original Apostles because those traditions are the teachings of Christ Himself. Mr. Julian doesn't believe in divine revelation, so it is no surprise that he would mock my obedience to the Apostolic Tradition.

D. Julian: 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

J. Salza: Mr. Julian completes his postscript very appropriately, by confessing that his religion is Freemasonry, not Christianity. In Mr. Julian's world, Christianity needs Freemasonry to thwart "the real enemies of salvation." Forget the Social Kingship of Jesus Christ; Freemasonry offers the world what no religion can. Even though Jesus said that one must be baptized to be saved (Mk 16:16), Mr. Julian tells us we need not worry about whether one is "baptized properly," because baptism, according to Mr. Julian, is not that important.

Mr. Julian, the real “enemies of salvation” are those who hold God's revealed truth to be superfluous and sectarian as you and Freemasonry do. The real “enemies of salvation” are those who preach salvation without Jesus Christ. That is why Freemasonry is the enemy of not only the Christian faith, but of any religion that claims to be true.

Thank you, Mr. Julian, for allowing me to vindicate *Masonry Unmasked* and further expose the false religion of Freemasonry once again. I pray that God will open up your heart to His Truth, Jesus Christ Our Lord.

Sacred Heart of Jesus, have mercy on us!

JFS

