THE ATHANASIAN

A publication of Traditional Catholics of America † Editor: Fr. Francis E. Fenton, STL † Volume IX, No. 7 † October 15, 1988

FREEMASONRY AND AMERICAN POLITICS

John Kenneth Weiskittel

A little over a year ago, the floor of the United States Senate was the stage for an extraordinary display of the influence Masonry carries in that body. So clearly do the remarks made that day by Masonic senators convey the duplicity, fear of disclosure and, above all, the lockstep solidarity of Lodge members that they are worth examining even at this late date.

On September 9, 1987, the Senate was called on to confirm North Carolina jurist, David Bryan Sentelle, to the U.S. Circuit Court for the District of Columbia. This it did by an 87-0 vote (13 senators were absent). The unanimity of support for Sentelle was such that the proceedings covered but a scant three pages in the *Congressional Record*. In a rare show of agreement, liberals such as Kennedy, Metzenbaum and Weicker joined conservatives like Armstrong, Hatch and Helms in the confirmation.

That there was no debate is obvious from the above. Rather, Strom Thurmond (R-SC) took the floor to lambaste the Senate Judiciary Committee for dragging its feet on Sentelle's nomination which had been made by President Reagan on February 2, 1987. "There were those on the committee," said Senator Thurmond, "who had concerns about his (Sentelle's—JKW) membership in the Masons..."

Thurmond, himself a Mason since 1925, went on to describe how questions had been raised about Masonic membership requirements. To lay these to rest he told his Senate colleagues that he contacted C. Fred Kleinknecht, Sovereign Grand Master of the Scottish Rite, Southern Jurisdiction (S.R.S.J.), and

> I was informed that membership in the Masons is not restricted by race, color or creed. I have also reviewed the statutes of the Supreme Council of Freemasonry and there is no restriction of membership based on race, color or creed.

He then sought to further bolster his position by identifying blacks who hold prominent positions in New Jersey and Massachusetts lodges. Thurmond concluded by saying that "to use an issue such as this to delay a nomination, when there is irrefutable evidence to the contrary, does not deserve a place in the nomination process."

"LET NOT MASONRY BE SULLIED"

Here the floor was opened for debate *but not a single senator took the opportunity to put forth a counter argument or even probe Thurmond's claims*. In its collective mind the Senate saw the Sentelle appointment as a closed matter: end of discussion. The vote was then taken and duly recorded.

All of this proved, however, merely the prelude for what was to transpire. Seeing that Thurmond's assertions had produced not so much as a whimper of protest, Senate Masons seized the moment to make a rare public profession of faith in their Order and to denounce its critics.

After the vote had been recorded and before other business could be taken up, Alan Simpson (R-WY) asked for a few minutes to comment on the nomination. He went into a summary of earlier difficulties as he witnessed them as a member of the Judiciary Committee, calling the temporary hold on the nomination based on Sentelle's Masonic membership "richly absurd" and "one of the most extraordinary things I have ever seen raised in my time in the Senate." Simpson, stating that he himself has "been a Mason since 1959," cited a list of Masonic Presidents and noted that his fraternity is well represented today in Congress and the Federal

Judiciary.

In short, Simpson argued, "Masonry in this country is the bedrock," and its only requirements for membership are "(a) belief in God (and) that a man be 21 years of age or older..." He next made a patently dishonest statement:

> The only secret part of it (Freemasonry—JKW)—I have often said it should not be secret—is that you are technically supposed to have a person invite you to be a member of the Masons.

As if this weren't enough, he made an attempt to belittle the secrecy issue with the observation that it is difficult to "keep secret things like...love of fellowman and brotherhood, and that is all that is involved in Masonry." Simpson then made clear his desire that the Lodge never again be placed in the spotlight of public scrutiny:

> ...let us not hold matters from going forward ever again on the basis of membership in Freemasonry. That is a galling and ponderous and very unbecoming exercise. What next—Knights of Columbus, International Order of Odd Fellows, various orders and lodges throughout the United States? I hope we will not see that.

"Let not masonry be sullied," he declared, "in the judicial selection process anywhere again in this fine country and especially in this body."

Next to bat for the Masons was Robert Byrd (D-WV), the Senate Majority Leader and also a Judiciary Committee member. When he heard the objections to the appointee in committee, he stated: "I was determined that the Senate have a vote on it." "I am a 33rd-degree Mason and I am proud to see that the Senate has voted unanimously in support of Mr. Sentelle." He finished by saying that he felt the vote "should lear the record once and for all, and I hope that this ugly head of prejudice against Masonry will not rear itself again."

Following Byrd, Jesse Helms (R-NC) spoke of being "aghast" that his "longtime friend" (Sentelle) would be criticized for being a Mason. His shock came, he said, in the fact that it "ever became a matter of discussion, let alone an issue..." Helms pronounced his confidence that "this ought to remove any doubts about it (the Masonic issue—JKW) in the future" and said he was "gratified by the vote today." Finally, Thurmond returned to pour accolades on the secret society (in which he holds the 33rd degree) and to reiterate the feelings of his fellow Masons, saying he hoped the matter was "settled, that will be the end of it, and we will not hear any more on it."

It was only after Thurmond stopped that the Senate moved on to other business. As incredible as it seems, *nothing that the four Masonic senators said that morning was in the least way challenged.* Thus, Freemasonry's well-rehearsed quartet was given free rein to play its song, a song that sounded chords of bravado, arrogance, bewilderment and indignation. And yet the trained ear should have little difficulty in hearing a sour note—*fear of disclosure.*

"The Masonic hierarchy does not encourage debate about the lodge," writes William J. Whalen in *Christianity and American Freemasonry* (Our Sunday Visitor Press, 1987 ed., pp. 8-9). Whalen quotes the following, from a 1984 Masonic Service Association booklet entitled "One Hundred One Questions about Freemasonry," to indicate the sort of thinking behind the senators' comments:

> Q—What discussion of Masonry is proper in the presence of those not Masons?
>
> A—As little as possible, unless in answer to a direct and respectful question the answer to which is not a secret...Freemasonry needs no defense from anyone. The less Masonic matters are discussed in public, the better for Masonry. (cited, p. 9)

To a man, the Senate Masons expressed their desire to stifle anything approaching an open and honest debate concerning Masonry and its influence in the American political arena. They argued that this would be divisive, not to mention "galling, ponderous and unbecoming." But could it be that they have something hidden which they don't want the American people to know?

MASONRY AND SEGREGATION

When Strom Thurmond was defending the Lodge's membership practices, he let slip a clue that should have been pounced upon at once. He named a few black Masons, including those belonging to "predominantly white lodges." What he *didn't* say was the fact that these same individuals would be barred from joining his South Carolina lodge, those of Helms and Sentelle in North Carolina, Byrd's in West Virginia, Simpson's in Wyoming *and almost*

every other lodge in the United States! The truth of the matter is that Freemasonry is "a bulwark of racial segregation in the United States," Whalen contends, noting:

> By 1987, decades after most American institutions had accepted racial integration, only four of the forty-nine Grand Lodges could count even one black member in their jurisdictions. (pp. 23-24)

While "separate but equal" laws have been struck down throughout the nation, they remain intact for the "brotherhood" of Masons. A brief summary of the history of U.S. Masonry and race relations will present a picture quite different from that put forth by Senator Thurmond.

In Colonial America 14 free black soldiers sought entrance to Saint John's Lodge, Boston. When they were refused, they formed Prince Hall Lodge in 1775. Nine years later, it was chartered by the Grand Lodge of England as African Lodge No. 459. (Whalen, p. 24) Today, almost all black Masons in the U.S., who number about 250,000, belong to "black only" Prince Hall lodges. Prominent Prince Hall Masons include Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall (who voted *for* the pro-abortion *Roe vs. Wade* decision), Atlanta Mayor Andrew Young, Detroit Mayor Coleman Young, Los Angeles Mayor Tom Bradley and Dr. Benjamin Hooks of the NAACP. (ibid, pp. 24-25)

Prince Hall Masonry forms a kind of fraternal ghetto; such lodges "are considered clandestine and irregular by white Masons." (Whalen, p. 14) It would be interesting to know how Thurmond and company would explain this in light of the claim of "no restriction to membership based on race, color or creed"—or explain the charge leveled by Whalen:

> Apart from one curious exception, Alpha Lodge No. 116 in New Jersey, and a handful of blacks reported to be initiated by lodges in New York and Massachusetts, regular Freemasonry remains ninety-nine and forty-four hundredths per cent white. A Prince Hall Mason may not visit a white lodge, nor a white Mason visit a Prince Hall lodge, without risking Masonic punishment...(p. 24)

The only explanation that fits is that Thurmond, to put it mildly, was being less than candid. He was behaving as 33rd-degree Masons behave.

MASONRY AND THE KU KLUX KLAN

And yet segregation is only part of a deeper problem. For more than a century the Lodge has had to distance itself from another secret society—the Ku Klux Klan. Started after the Civil War, the Klan had connections with Masonry that the latter would prefer to forget. Whalen writes:

> A former Confederate general and Freemason, Nathan Bedford Forrest, founded the Ku Klux Klan and served as its first Imperial Wizard. Albert Pike held the office of Chief Justice of the Ku Klux Klan while he was simultaneously Sovereign Grand Commander of the Scottish Rite, Southern Jurisdiction. Pike's racism was well known. He expressed his concept of Masonic brotherhood succinctly: "I took my obligation to white men, not to (N)egroes. When I have to accept (N)egroes as brothers or leave Masonry, I shall leave it." Some believe Pike concocted the ritual for the original KKK. (pp. 17-18)

Albert Pike was, of course, one of the most influential Masons of all time. As possessor of an important position in American Freemasonry and author of numerous books on the Craft's ritual and philosophy, including the massive *Morals and Dogma*, he was revered and honored by international Masonry. Suffice it to say, Pike never left the Lodge (nor have we seen any evidence that he was asked to leave it) over his racist views or his involvement with the Klan.

After decades of relative dormancy, the Klan reemerged in the early twentieth century and once again we find a Masonic tie-in:

> A dedicated Mason, William Joseph Simmons, revived the Ku Klux Klan in 1915 and, in the following year, the Klan achieved members and power which far eclipsed the success of the original Klan...Almost all of the top officials of the revived Klan were also Masons. (Whalen, p.18)

In his study, *The Ku Klux Klan*, William Pierce Randel has written that Simmons' new KKK succeeded largely by casting its nets in Masonic waters and by using as its selling point the notion that "the Klan is, in fact, a Masonic movement." (Chilton Books, 1965, p. 200. Cited, Whalen, p. 19) According to another researcher, the Klan found that the "the Scottish Rite Mason and Orange Lodges were particularly rich hunting grounds." (David M. Chalmers, *Hooded*

Americanism, Doubleday, 1965, p. 34. Cited, ibid) By the 1920's, the Lodge was receiving so much adverse public opinion on this count, relates Lynn Dumenil in *Freemasonry and American Culture*, that "most Grand Masters...found it necessary to make a statement either condemning the Ku Klux Klan or denying Masonry's connection with it." (Princeton University Press, 1984, pp. 122-123. Cited, ibid)

IS THE MASONIC FRATERNITY ABOVE THE LAW?

Call it deception; call it subterfuge; but whatever one chooses to call it, the fact remains that Senator Thurmond and his Masonic cohorts managed to win Senate support for their man Sentelle by refusing to speak candidly to their colleagues. Quite simply put, the laws of the land do not seem to apply to the Masons. Another instance of this can be seen in recent court decisions banning "male only" clubs. While countless groups have had to open their doors to women, the Lodge is free to go its merry way. (An ex-Mason has informed us that the handicapped are also barred from joining.) It was Millard Fillmore who noted: "The Masonic fraternity tramples upon our rights, defeats the administration of justice, and bids defiance to every government which it cannot control." And, we might add, it does so with cunning and audacity.

ANTI-CATHOLICS IN THE SENATE

In the February 1960 issue of *The New Age*, S.R.S.J. Sovereign Grand Commander Luther A. Smith made the following accusation: "whatever bigotry is in evidence in the United States is exhibited solely by the Roman Catholic hierarchy." The deviousness and hypocrisy of this statement give a further hollow ring to Masonry's claim of tolerance. Anti-Catholic sentiments like this represent an essential part of Masonic thinking, particularly the thinking of its inner circle of leaders.

While it would be unfair to characterize all Masons as having this militant hatred of the Roman Catholic Church, it remains true, nonetheless, that there has been a "trickle down" effect, so much so that Chalmers says Klan leader F. Y. Clarke favored recruitment of Lodge members "because the chances were that they would not be overly friendly to Roman Catholics." (cited, Whalen, p. 19) Be that as it may, initiates into Scottish Rite's higher degrees pledge themselves to a war against the Catholic Church.

The Mason seeking the 18th degree (or Rose Croix) is asked: "Do you promise never to consent to the admission into a Chapter of the Rose Croix of anyone who is or has been a Monk or Jesuit, or who is an Atheist?" (cited, Whalen, p. 74. It should be noted that Whalen checked the various rituals with two former 32nd-degree Masons.) Even more wicked is the 30th degree or Knight Kadosh. (*Kadosh* is Hebrew for "Holy House," which refers to the temple but which, to Masons, means the palace in Jerusalem where Jacques De Molay and his Knights Templars stayed during the Crusades of the early fourteenth century, before Pope Clement V dissolved that order for various offenses, including idolatry.) "Vengeance is the motif of this degree, whose bitterly anti-Catholic tone is absent in the corresponding English (York Rite—JKW) workings." (Whalen, p. 75) In his book *Legenda* for candidates to the 32nd degree, Pike explains the agenda behind the 30th-degree's symbolism:

> Clement V., and Philip the Fair (France's king—JKW), who had murdered De Molay and suppressed and plundered the Great Order, had long since become mere names in history; but the mitre of the one and the crown of the other were the symbols and remain the symbols of the the enemies whom it is the purpose of the Order of the Temple of Solomon, of the Holy House, or Hierodom, of Jerusalem, *to war against without remission or relaxation.* (Emphasis added; all spelling, punctuation and capitalization are unchanged.)

It is the former symbol, that of the papal tiara, that concerns us here. In the 30th-degree ceremony the Grand Master leads the candidate to a table upon which rests a skull adorned with a tiara. "The Grand Master stabs the skull with the papal tiara and the candidate repeats, 'Down with Imposture! Down with crime!'" (Whalen, ibid) Later in the ritual, the Grand Master accuses the Pope of being "one who pretends to be the successor, the Vicar, of Jesus of Nazareth," and invites the candidate to crush the tiara under foot; all present then "tramp on the Pope's crown, brandishing poniards and shouting 'Down with Imposture!'" (ibid, pp.78-79) In the 31st degree (or Grand Inspector Inquisitor Commander) the following blasphemy is uttered by the Advocate:

> We revolt against the law, by which the crooked limbs and diseased organism of the child are the fruits of the father's vices. We even think that a God, omnipotent and omni-

scient, ought to have permitted no pain, no poverty, no servitude. Our ideal of justice is more lofty that the actualities of God. (cited, ibid, p. 79)

And in the 32nd degree (or Sublime Prince of the Royal Secret), Whalen writes that "(t)he candidates are told that 'Masonry will eventually rule the world' and pray for the 'universal domination of the true principles of Masonry.'" (cited, ibid)

All of this unpleasantness brings us back to the U.S. Senate chambers where the Masonic senators, perhaps emboldened by the results of the Sentelle vote, allowed their guard to drop amidst the doubletalk. Simpson and Byrd announced that they were 33rd-degree Masons, as did Thurmond, who stated that Senator Bob Dole (R-KS) also shared that distinction. It must be noted that this means that all of these men are Scottish Riters because only that rite has 30 degrees above the basic three and only it identifies them by number (York Rite, by comparison, has but seven degrees over the first three and these are not numbered). Moreover, while some Scottish Rite degrees may be conferred titularly, in which case the ceremonies are dispensed with, others, such as the 18th and 30th, are never given without the candidate going through the noxious and offensive initiation. Thus, the above senators, by making such an admission, are stating in so many words that they are *anti-Catholic bigots.* Apparently, they believed they could do so without anyone knowing the significance of such remarks.

IS RONALD REAGAN A MASON?

The April 1988 issue of *The New Age* (a monthly magazine and the official publication of the Supreme Council, 33rd degree, S.R.S.J.), featured a cover story on the visit of a group of Scottish Rite officials to the White House on February 11. Photos show President Reagan receiving a certificate of membership and other gifts from Sovereign Grand Master C. Fred Kleinknecht and a formal group portrait of the President and his nine Masonic guests.

Included in the issue is a signed letter from Reagan to Kleinknecht, on White House stationary and dated February 22, that mentions the President's "special pleasure" at having hosted the Masons. Reagan goes on to "commend the outstanding charitable work of the Masons as one of our nation's oldest fraternal organizations." He then expresses his "sincere gratitude" for the membership certificate and "other tokens of friendship." Finally, to cap it off, comes the clincher: "*I am honored to join the ranks of sixteen former Presidents in their association with Freemasonry.*" (Emphasis added—JKW)

This revelation, however, poses more questions than it answers. Is Reagan's certificate proof of his *actual* membership in the Lodge or is it merely the symbol of *honorary* affiliation? If it is the former, does it represent recognition of the fact that he has been conferred with the 33rd degree? If so, when and where was he initiated? And if he *has* been a member of this "noble" Order, why has he seen fit to keep it a deep, dark secret?

We'd like to say we have the answers but, the more we looked into the mystery, the more the mystery grew. Before the *New Age's* revelation, Reagan's Masonic ties were a disputed issue. Neither Simpson (who listed 14 Masonic Presidents during the Sentelle hearing), nor Whalen (also naming 14), nor Joseph Nathan Kane (whose figure is 15 in *Facts about the Presidents*) has included Reagan, but one source we've seen, *The Brotherhood: The Secret World of the Freemasons,* a 1984 work by British journalist Stephen Knight, *does* include him as one of 17 Masonic Presidents.

When we called the White House to learn about the nature of the President's certificate, we talked with an aide who was noncommittal but who did say that she knew about it and felt it was honorary. She suggested that a letter to the President might clear up the matter. This was impossible due to the time constraints that go with deadlines. In *The NRI Trumpet* of August, 1988, a nationally-circulated publication of the National Research Institute (its stated objective is to "provide information about the dangerous, mushrooming New Age Movement"), Reagan is identified as a 33rd-degree Mason. We called *Trumpet's* editor, Kathleen Hayes, to inquire about it. She said that she received the information from one of her contacts in California. And, from the copies of *Trumpet* we've seen and from the lengthy conversation we had with Kathleen Hayes, we are convinced of her sincerity, her objectivity and her commitment to get the facts. Still, however correct her contact may prove to be, we believe it is necessary to see the matter substantiated before we can remove it from the "heresay" file.

So the investigation stops here for now as a series of hot trails turned into dead ends. The

question remains: Is Reagan a Mason? All we can answer is that, given his statement in *New Age*, he most certainly *is* one in *some* sense and is quite proud of the fact. It has yet to be determined, however, in *what* sense that may be.

NOW IS THE TIME FOR ACTION

If the Masons are to achieve their expressed goal of subjugating the world under the "universal domination of the true principles of Masonry," they must first gain political power in the nations and hang on to that power long enough to fashion the laws of those lands. To a very large extent, the America we see around us *is a nation whose laws are Masonic.*

For their plot to succeed in the U.S., the Masons realize that they need to cover all three branches of the Federal Government: Executive, Judicial and Legislative, or at least two of the three. If we are to turn them back, we need, in large part, to focus on just one...*the Legislative.* Why? Because if Congress is soundly constituted it can begin to redirect the nation onto a Christ-centered path *and,* even if we were cursed with another Masonic President, a Congress sufficiently strong could override his vetoes and demand that he appoint judges who were not bent on subverting the spirit of America.

We harbor no illusions that this alone would save our country. Masonry is a many-tentacled creature. Its control of the government school system, to cite but one example, has churned out generation after generation of people who think like Masons. Whatever the actual number of Masons in Congress, it is far exceeded by those who, largely because of their public education, have become nothing less than "Masons without aprons."

If we are to do this godly work we must take to heart Pope Leo XIII's admonition "to tear away the mask from Freemasonry," and this can only be done by alerting our fellow citizens to the stark reality behind all its platitudes. An excellent place to begin this apostolate is in the election process. The Sentelle hearing showed one important thing about Freemasonry—it is frightened to death at the thought that the public may discover its discriminatory membership practices. Let us hammer away at this point at every opportunity: with reprints, letters to the editor, radio call-in shows and even face-to-face confrontations with the candidates at town meetings. Let's make them explain their "brotherhood" in light of this hypocrisy. And in traditional Catholic circles or with conservative Conciliar friends, we should add to this the anti-Catholic nature of the higher degrees and ask them if they really want to vote for someone who—no matter how spotless his "conservative" voting record seems to be—tramples on a symbol of the papacy! Even fair-minded non-Catholics should rebel at this bigotry.

This is potentially a very big issue if we don't let it die, not only for this election but for every one in the future. And it is an issue that is just as relevant for state and local races. A time could come, if we are persistent enough, when every candidate would be obliged to let the voters know to *just what* groups he belongs or from which he receives or accepts support. Here we have Masonry's Achilles' heel. *Now let us attack it.*†

††

MASONS IN THE 100TH CONGRESS

(Of the 535 members of the current United States Congress, 57 openly admit to Masonic affiliations according to biographical sketches provided by the legislators in the *1987-88 Congressional Directory.* This amounts to 10.6 percent representation and breaks down thus according to chambers: 13 senators (13 percent) and 44 representatives (10.1 percent). Included in this count are two members of B'nai B'rith (the Lodge's Jewish order) and one each for Eastern Star, De Molay and Prince Hall. This list doesn't pretend to be the final word because there are some who don't choose to identify themselves. For years Senator Barry Goldwater, a high-ranking Mason, didn't reveal his membership. In the current Congress, Alan Simpson has named Senators J. Bennett Johnston (D-LA), Mark Hatfield (R-OR), John Glenn (D-OH), Sam Nunn (D-GA) and Lloyd Bentsen (D-TX) as Lodge brothers, but none appear as such in the *Directory.* The *Buffalo News* in September, 1987, identified Representative Jack Kemp (R-NY) as a 33rd degree Mason (see Paul A. Fisher, *Behind the Lodge Door,* Shield Books, 1988, p. 246) Conversely, Representative Wesley Watkins (D-OK) had his Masonic affiliation in the *Directory* for the 99th Congress but dropped it in the more recent one. *Only those in the current Directory*

are listed here. In addition, an asterisk (*) has been placed beside the name of each member whose sketch indicates that he is a Scottish Rite Mason above the 30th degree, this being a tacit admission of his having taken part in expressly anti-Catholic rituals. We have taken the liberty of including Alan Simpson's name, since he admits belonging to the 33rd degree, and Bob Dole's as well because Dole was present when identified by Thurmond as a 33rd-degree Mason and made no attempt—according to the *Congressional Record*—to challenge the statement.)

SENATE
(7 Republicans / 6 Democrats)

QUENTIN BURDICK (Dem., North Dakota)
ROBERT BYRD* (Dem., West Virginia)
ROBERT DOLE* (Rep., Kansas)
JAMES EXON (Dem., Nebraska)
CHARLES GRASSLEY (Rep., Iowa)
JESSE HELMS* (Rep., North Carolina)
ERNEST HOLLINGS (Dem., South Carolina)
JAMES McCLURE (Rep., Idaho)
TERRY SANFORD (Dem., North Carolina)
ALAN SIMPSON* (Rep., Wyoming)
ROBERT STAFFORD (Rep., Vermont)
JOHN STENNIS (Dem., Mississippi)
STROM THURMOND* (Rep., South Carolina)

HOUSE
(24 Republicans / 20 Democrats)

CHARLES BENNETT (Dem., Florida)
TOM BEVEL (Dem., Alabama)
MICHAEL BILIRAKIS* (Rep., Florida)
WILLIAM BROOMFIELD (Rep., Michigan)
BILL CHAPPEL (Dem., Florida)
HAL DAUB* (Rep., Nebraska)
WILLIAM DICKINSON (Rep., Alabama)
MICKEY EDWARDS (Rep., Oklahoma)
HAMILTON FISH (Rep., New York)
BENJAMIN GILMAN (Rep., New York)
WILLIAM GRAY (Dem., Pennsylvania)
JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT* (Rep. Arkansas)
AUGUSTUS HAWKINS (Dem., California)
LARRY HOPKINS (Rep., Kentucky)
FRANK HORTON* (Rep., New York)
WILLIAM HUGHES (Dem., New Jersey)
ANDY IRELAND (Rep., Florida)
WALTER JONES (Dem., North Carolina)
MARTIN LANCASTER (Dem., North Carolina)
MEL LEVINE (Dem., California)
TOM LEWIS* (Rep., Florida)
TRENT LOTT (Rep., Mississippi)
RON MARLENEE (Rep., Montana)
GILLESPIE MONTGOMERY (Dem., Mississippi)
CARLOS MOORHEAD (Rep., California)
JOHN MYERS (Rep., Indiana)
BILL NICHOLS (Dem., Alabama)
CARL PERKINS (Dem., Kentucky)
CLAUDE PEPPER (Dem., Florida)
NICK RAHALL (Dem., West Virginia)
DON RITTER (Rep., Pennsylvania)
MARTY RUSSO (Dem., Illinois)
RICHARD SCHULZE (Rep., Pennsylvania)
IKE SKELTON (Dem., Missouri)
NEIL SMITH (Dem., Iowa)
ROBERT SMITH (Rep., Oregon)
VIRGINIA SMITH (Rep., Nebraska-Eastern Star)
GERALD SOLOMON (Rep., New York)
SAMUEL STRATTON* (Dem., New York)
PAT SWINDALL (Rep., Georgia)
GENE TAYLOR (Rep., Missouri)
TIM VALENTINE (Dem., North Carolina)
TED WEISS (Dem., New York)
CHALMERS WYLIE* (Rep., Ohio)

Additional copies of the above article are available at the following prices:

3 copies for $ 4.00 (minimum order)
25 copies for $25.00
50 copies for $40.00

(Payment must accompany order)

Please order from:

Traditional Catholics of America
P.O. Box 38335
Colorado Spings, CO 80937

THE POPES ON FREEMASONRY

We have resolved and decreed to condemn and forbid such Societies, assemblies, reunions, conventions, aggregations or meetings called either Freemasonic or known under some other denomination. We condemn and forbid them by this, our present constitution, which is to be considered valid forever. (Clement XII—*In Eminenti,* 1738)

Those Societies, according to men who are prudent and honest, are ill-famed and, to become a member thereof, would lead to evil and perversion. (Benedict XIV— *Providas,* 1751)

The Satanic spirit of the Sect was particularly evidenced in the past century during the course of the Revolutions of France which shook the entire world. Such upheavals proved that the total dissolution of human society can be expected unless the forces of this ultra-criminal Sect were crushed. (Pius IX—Letter to the Bishop of Olinda, Brazil, 1873)

We condemn this Masonic Society and all other Societies of the same order which, although different in appearance but pursuing the same aim against the Church or legitimate Civil Power, are constantly being formed. It is Our order that all Christians of any rank or high appointment and over all the earth should be informed that the said Societies are forbidden and reproved by Us, and incur the same sentences and condemnations as those that are specified in the former Constitutions of our Predecessors. (Piux IX—*Multiplices inter,* 1865)

(I)n the space of a century and a half, the sect of Freemasons has made incredible progress. Making use at the same time of audacity and cunning, Masonry has invaded all the ranks of social hierarchy and, in the modern States, it has begun to seize a power which is almost equivalent to Sovereignty. (Leo XIII—*Humanum Genus,* 1884)

From what We have already written, it is indisputably evident that their (the Freemasons—JKW) ultimate aim is to uproot completely the whole religious and political order of the world which has been brought into existence by Christianity and to replace it with another in harmony with their way of thinking. This will mean that the foundation and laws of the new structure of society will be drawn from pure Naturalism... Now the fundamental doctrine of the Naturalists, as is clear from their very name, is that human nature and human reason must be in all things mistress and guide. (Leo XIII—*Humanum Genus,* 1884)

...tear away the mask from Freemasonry and... let it be seen as it really is...let no man think that he may for any reason whatsoever join the Masonic sect, if he values his Catholic name and his eternal salvation as he ought to value them. Let no one be deceived by a pretense of honesty. It may seem to some that Freemasons demand nothing that is openly contrary to religion and morality; but, as the whole principle and object of the sect lies in what is vicious and criminal, to join with these men or in any way to help them cannot be lawful. (Leo XIII—*Humanum Genus,* 1884)

Full of the spirit of Satan who, according to the words of the Apostle, knows how to transform himself into an angel of light, it (Freemasonry—JKW) gives prominence to its humanitarian object but it sacrifices everything to its sectarian purpose. It protests that it has no political aim while in reality it exercises the most profound action on the legislative and administrative life of the nations. While loudly professing its respect for authority and even for religion, it has for its ultimate purpose, as its own statutes declare, the destruction of all authority as well as the priesthood, both of which it holds as the enemies of liberty. (Leo XIII—Letter for the 25th year of his Pontificate, 1902)

(Author's Note: Many Masons belong to the Lodge for business benefits, social reasons or out of curiousity to learn the hidden "wisdom" the Lodge pretends to possess — and they never go beyond the first three degrees. Consequently, they may be unaware of its darkest secrets. If so, and if they are men of goodwill, we believe that such Masons will leave Freemasonry when presented with the facts.)

THE ATHANASIAN

Published by Traditional Catholics of America

Eight issues a year: (Jan. 15, Mar. 1, Apr. 15, June 1, July 15, Sept. 1, Oct. 15, Dec. 1)

Subscriptions: $12.00 per year (via First Class Mail) for the USA, Canada and Mexico; $16.00 per year (via Air Mail) for all other countries

Additional copies: single copy - $1.50; 10 copies - $12.00; 40 or more to same address - $1.00 each

Mailing address: P.O. Box 38335, Colorado Springs, CO 80937

Telephone: (719) 636-1575

Manuscripts sent to us for possible publication in *The Athanasian* should be typewritten, double-spaced and no more than seven pages in length. If not accepted, they will be returned to the sender. No articles from this newsletter may be reproduced either in whole or in part without the written permission of the TCA.