

THE VATICAN CONNECTION TO ENGLAND, A CONTINUATION OF ROMAN CONQUEST.

Forward

This is additional information to the 1213 Charter, along with other important information. I stated in "*The United States Is Still A British Colony*", that the king gave his holdings to the Pope. I also stated that the 1215 Charter was made null and void by the Pope. I have new information that may surprise you on this subject. You will see the letters of correspondence between the Pope and King John, concerning these two charters. You will also read information connecting our flag to Britain's, through the colors, and the direct connection these colors have to the Pope. You will see new information connecting American lawyers to the British Bar, and tacit connection to the Pope.

American and World history have been rewritten, by the exclusion of historical events, for the protection of special interests named in this paper. In this paper I've uncovered some of these lies and truths not told. In some cases a lie can also be withheld truth. I have dealt with both modes of deception in my book. The two charters mentioned above have much withheld truth. The quoted portions of the personal correspondence between the Pope and the king deal with claims I have made regarding these two charters.

It's not my purpose to tell you what, or how to think, but remove the barrier keeping you from thinking outside of the box in which you live, your mind. A box filled and shaped with information provided by those that wish you to think a certain way.

Before you read these letters and the other important information I will deal with in this paper, there is some hidden knowledge you need to understand, it deals with the human mind. What I'm going to tell you will help you understand not only this paper, but any information you read, or hear. This information is short and is contained in this brief forward.

In this paper I'm going to challenge the very foundations for which you base your beliefs, concerning the Constitution and your freedom, and your religion no matter what it is. I call these subjects, "the building blocks of human understanding"; every human is programmed with these building blocks, to a greater or lesser extent. A great deception is taking place, and the executors of the deception are three organizations most trusted by the public; government, media and religion. Only after you come to the realization that you have been deceived, will you be able to think outside of the box which has been provided through education and other mediums, for you. Through the government, media and religion you have been brainwashed with predetermined information, the building blocks of the human mind, your programming.

My purpose for sharing this information is "truth". Keep in mind I was taught the same information as you. Thoroughly indoctrinated by the public schools, television, organized religion and any other medium of indoctrination that formed my beliefs, including the United States Marine Corps. I would say I have had more to overcome than most people, as to the brainwashing I received. Only through making God Almighty's Word my foundation, not Man's indoctrination, was I able to see beyond the box, the reality created for me.

I wish I could MAKE everyone understand how the human mind works, a subject so simple, it is difficult to understand and explain.

As I said above this deals with brainwashing, through indoctrination and programming. I know the subversive term brainwashing automatically triggers disbelief and suspicion; I ask you to bear with me. Whatever your programming has been, it is the reason, the cause, for the way you view and disseminate information. This is the reason there are so many different religions, types of governments and social experiments. The people under these different systems, will go to their grave thinking they are right, simply because of their programming.

Have you never wondered how a Muslim could strap a bomb to his body and kill himself and many others? It is due to his programming, that began at birth. The Muslims have been taught they have 70 virgins waiting for them after they blow themselves up, among other things, and that they are doing the will of God, and will be rewarded for their sacrifice. Only religion promising a reward greater than the suffering here on earth, makes it possible for a human to be programmed in such a way, willing to kill him or herself, along with many innocent people. I am sure there are those in the Muslim religion, amazed how we could believe the Christian religion and

do the things we do.

As an example, the Pope promised the crusaders that if they would fight against the Muslims, that he, the Pope, would pray their souls out of hell and that they would go to heaven. Do you see any difference between this and the belief of the suicide bombers? Christian's were foolish and ignorant enough to believe the Pope. How was it possible? Through the twisting of God's Word by a man claiming to be the equal of Jesus Christ, the Vicar of Christ. Deception can only take place where there is a lack of knowledge. To prove brainwashing is not restricted to foreign governments and other religions, as an example I'll use the USMC (U.S. government). In just thirteen weeks, the time spent in USMC boot camp, an average man that is self centered, concerned only with his own life is transformed into a man that is willing to charge a machine gun nest without hesitation, kill without discretion, or give up his life retrieving a fallen Marine. Brainwashing is necessary in a war setting, but should not be used on the public. To prove brainwashing is used, I heard with my own ears in a Congressional hearing several years ago, a Marine Corps General being questioned, and he offered up this information, that the USMC uses brainwashing to get Marines to charge into a deadly situation when told to do so, to follow orders without question. I'm not arguing right or wrong, my point is, any mind can be brainwashed.

If brainwashing can be done in such a short time, think of what years of public school have done to you, not to mention television, without your knowledge. I laugh when I hear someone in government talk about the extremists in other countries, or even in this country, about their being brainwashed. Strictly because they disagree or oppose the public policy in this country, or their beliefs are contrary to Judeo Christian beliefs. For the average American to get a full picture of what it means to be brainwashed, they need to look in a mirror, examine their own thoughts and beliefs, and how they came by them. The mind set in this county is, it is only others that can be brainwashed; this is what makes me laugh.

The indoctrination sponsored by government through the public schools, and the social engineering by government to create a Country of mind numb robots, that function as the renewable resources they are legally defined to be, is a crime.

No one wants to think they could be so easily manipulated, but you have been, just as I was. Why is the public manipulated in such a way? Because they make better slaves. Just as it serves those that orchestrate this maniacal system, to cause strife between the races and religions, the blacks to hate whites, or vice versa, the poor to hate the rich, or vice versa, the Protestants to hate the Catholics, or both religions to hate all other religions, and vice versa. They keep everyone, distracted with a multitude of issues, so busy earning a living, they have no time to educate themselves. Just as Thomas Jefferson warned, we would be satisfied with the crumbs from our masters table, and the sixteen hours a day it would take to earn them.

You can take any child, I don't care what nationality, keep that child from the teachings that are indigenous to his people, teach him the contrary and that child that grows into an adult, will reject the beliefs that are indigenous to his people, in preference to his indoctrination. Take an Anglo Saxon, Catholic or Protestant that has no knowledge of the Muslim faith, indoctrinate that child in the Muslim faith, and that child will be a Muslim till death and will be capable of taking up arms against a non Muslim, or Nation.

This is THE truth, I don't care what religion you are, or what ethnicity you are, nor does it matter the level of your intelligence. Whatever was programmed into you as a child, into the human mind, God, god, or lack of a God or god, country or religion. Brainwashing subjugates that person's beliefs the rest of his or her life, and will determine how they disseminate all information that comes to them later in life, either accepting it or rejecting it, based on whether or not it agrees with their programming as a child and young adult. Only through deprogramming and reprogramming can this be changed. As an adult you can be reprogrammed, if certain procedures are used, as I pointed out above, describing the USMC. How much more susceptible is a child? A child's mind is a empty hard disk so to speak, it will accept whatever operating system you install on it.

I wrote the following analogy several years ago, I think it may help, more now, since more people understand the function of a computer.

"If you have some knowledge of computers, you know that the operating system; I'll use DOS as an example, is at the lowest level on the hard drive, it is the foundation on which the rest of the data is built and disseminated. The human mind is no different, your operating system is your core beliefs, God, parents teaching, school; with

many in this country you can substitute government for God.

Before your mind accepts any information, it is first disseminated by your core beliefs and rejected if the information coming in is in conflict with your core beliefs. Just as with a hard drive, that is programmed with say DOS 5, all programs installed on the hard drive, have to be accepted by DOS 5 as compatible and not harmful to the operating system. If DOS 5 finds the program your trying to install is in conflict with the operating system, it will be rejected. Likewise, if you input certain information into the human mind during the programming years, you will have predictable behavior by that person, just as with the computer, from birth all the way to the grave.

The only way to change or modify the core beliefs of a human, is to override the existing information with new or modified information, that has to come from such a reliable source, the human mind will allow itself to be reprogrammed, causing the belief structure to be changed. Just as the computer will not allow DOS 5 to be upgraded to DOS 6, unless it recognizes it as coming from its creator, Microsoft. The most reliable and reputable source as far as the computer is concerned. With a human mind, it depends how far down you are going into the program, and what are the predominant core beliefs. The core beliefs in place will determine the level of reliability as well as the source of the information needed, before the information will be accepted. It's sometimes necessary to deprogram the human mind, just as you would format a hard drive, figuratively speaking, to remove faulty data or software. This is very similar to what takes place with the human mind that is deprogrammed, you then reinstall the program you want, reprogram the mind. Just as you would install a new operating system on a hard drive, after you format the drive.

Let me give you another example as to how this works. I know through understanding this principle, through self examination of my beliefs, and the information that created them, that the Bible and Jesus are **THE ONLY** reality, and that Satan is the orchestrator, the manipulator of the governments, thereby responsible for the World in which we live today, but allowed by God Almighty for the fulfillment of His Son's Word, and the operation of Jesus' Kingdom, in which he rules the World and controls the governments of the World with a Rod of Iron.

Now, examine how the statement above effected you, how did you react, but more importantly, Why? I know you reacted, in an instant of time, without any effort or forethought on your part, and with no awareness the process was taking place. You formed an opinion, the information was either accepted or rejected.

WHY? You had no idea while reading the above paragraph, that your thought process was being manipulated, causing you to react a particular way. Folks this happens to everyone daily, your response is predictable. Based on how Americans have been programmed as a child by their parents, and later by the schools, churches, media and government. I want you to be able to recognize this, this is the only way you can be truly free. Be honest with yourself here, no one knows but you. What sets apart your reaction, from say a Christian's, from a Muslim's, or a Baptist's from a Catholic's, etc.? How do you know your reaction is correct, and that the information you learned years before was correct? You just used your prior programming to disseminate the statement I made above. Are you correct? Have you checked it out? Do you have proof? Did you not react to the statement I made above with the information you were programmed with? Would not your reaction have been different if you were raised as a Muslim versus a Christian, or an Atheist? Be honest, think about your immediate reaction to what I said, compare the reaction you had to what you could imagine coming from yourself if you were programmed another way. All humans are the same in regards to their creation, the mind of a Muslim works the same as a Christian. So why are there different reactions to what I said above? Programming, brainwashing to be blunt. The example I gave deals with religion, but replace religion with any subject, any reaction you have is based on your prior programming. Until you understand this you will never be free and be able to think outside of the box. To go against the way your programmers want you to think.

Why did God Almighty create Man, including Woman with this feature? To protect Man from error, which would bring about Man's separation from God Almighty, and ultimately cause Man's death. The circumvention of God's creation is what happened in the garden of Eden, "reprogramming". Satan understood this principle, and used it against Man, by enticing Man to see with the flesh instead of his spirit and programming provided by God Almighty, by asking Man, "hath God Said", just enough doubt to question God Almighty, to get Adam and Eve to eat from the tree of knowledge. What else did Satan say? "You'll be as God, knowing good and evil" from that

point, the programming and the built in protection given God Almighty's creation, was perverted and used against God's creation, Man. What is the relevance? The same mind created by God Almighty, will believe anything it is programmed with, truth or a lie, good or evil. Without God's Word and Spirit, Jesus as your foundation, any programming is possible. As I said above you can take any child, and create anything from a Jeffery Dommer, to George Washington; of course I'm speaking of morals and core beliefs, not intellect. The human flesh is capable of any evil or atrocity, we have many historical examples of this. Many have been perpetrated by the different religions and governments. Only through understanding the human mind and how it works, and that there are forces in the World using this understanding of the mind against you, will you be able to think outside the box, only with the correct building blocks, the foundational programming provide by God's Word and His Son Jesus Christ can you disseminate the information being pumped into you, no matter what medium it comes at you, through government controlled schools, through the media or through religion. There are many different mediums of indoctrination. I hope through self examination you will be able to analyze the beliefs you hold. Beliefs that have been provided for you, which you have accepted as truth without confirming the information. Beliefs you have accepted solely because of supposed reliability of the source, in the belief the source would never lie to you, or that the source has your best interest at heart.

Chapters

Secular

1. Letters from Pope Innocent III, to King John.
2. The Pope's creation of the Knights Templars.
3. Betrayal of the Knights by the Pope and the kings they served.
4. Connection of our flag to the Pope, and the secret societies.
5. The bridge between the secular and the Biblical, the Knights Templar and Lawyers.
6. Conclusion

My Comments are in brackets []

Chapter 1

Letters from Pope Innocent III, to King John

[America, for that matter the whole World, the documents below will conflict with what you have been taught by government sponsored schools and the government sponsored churches. I wrote about the information contained in the below letters, in my book called "*The United States Is Still A British Colony*". I pointed out that in the 1213 Charta, the king gave all of England and Ireland to Pope Innocent III. Many people still find this hard to believe, or understanding what they have read in this Charter. To do so Challenges what they have accepted as truth for years. Some wonder if true, what is the relevance. I made it clear what the relevance is, not just the obvious, that the Pope was now a legal party, as of 1213, in regards to the affairs of England, Ireland and the United States, by way of the charters creating the United States.

Since Britain's rejection of the Catholic Church in 1689, when they cast off the Pope's religion and bulls, for the Protestant religion, the Pope has used any means to regain control. This needs to be understood by every person in the World, for knowledge is freedom and it will change our World.

The documents that frame our country, including the Fairfax Resolves, Declaration of Independence, etc., are said to be derived from the 1215 Magna Charta, a document declared null and void by the Pope. I explained the Pope's authority to inject his will was made possible by what happened in the 1213 Charter. The king became a tenant and trustee of the Pope, again proof of this is the fact that a rent was paid by the king to the Pope. The Pope was now a legal party to whatever transpired in England, concerning his new possessions, with an exception that I'll get into later. I made these statements based on contract law, which the courts would have to uphold. Since the 1689 Bill of Rights, the appearance is that these documents have no relevance. For sure between the years of 1213 and 1689, the Pope's power and bulls changed the World. I stated years ago that the

Magna Charta was an illegal document, based on the actions of the Barons, it was null and void.

The letters below clarify what I had written, concerning the 1213 and 1215 Charters. Here you have the actual communication between the Pope and the king, not my opinion, that prove I was correct in my assessment.

The 1213 Charta was written May 15, 1213, the first letter below was two months later, in which the Pope accepts the king's offer. This would be a good time to cover again the legal construction of a contract; offer, acceptance, and valuable consideration. If you are not aware of it, a contract between parties overrules any civil or common law right. It does not matter how absurd a contract is, it just has to meet the above legal definition, and be free from fraud. The king offered his kingdom to the Pope as reparation for his supposed sins against the Pope, the Pope accepted the king's offer, the valuable consideration was the king's payment of a 1000 marks. The king as sovereign transferred his status and property to the Pope, and here is the exception, through a lie perpetrated by the Pope, made possible by the king's ignorance of God's Word. The king was lead to believe he would, for a lack of a better way to put it, go to hell, unless he made this agreement with the Pope.]

Letter from Pope Innocent III, to king John, July 6, 1213

"To Him, who from evil is able to bring forth good, we render thanks for having mercifully inspired you to make fitting reparation for the losses and wrongs inflicted upon the Church: for you have both accepted the form of reparation which had been prepared after much consideration, and you have also put your person and territory under apostolic suzerainty by right of lordship making over in perpetuity to the Holy Roman Church your kingdoms of England and Ireland, to be held through the church and of the Church, subject to an annual payment of 700 marks for England and 300 marks for Ireland, as is more fully and explicitly contained in your legally framed charter."

Selected Letters of Pope Innocent III, concerning England
(1198-1216), Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1956. page 149

"You now hold your kingdoms by a more exalted and surer title than before, for the kingdom is become a royal priesthood and the priesthood a kingdom of priests as stated by Peter in the Epistle and Moses in the Law. Come, then, exalted prince, fulfil the promises given and confirm the concessions offered, so that God Almighty may ever fulfil any righteous desire of yours and confirm any honorable purpose enabling you so to walk amid temporal blessings as not to fail of winning the eternal."

Selected Letters of Pope Innocent III, concerning England
(1198-1216), Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1956. page 149-150

"The aforesaid legate, having full knowledge of our mind, will instruct and reassure you as to our good pleasure."

Selected Letters of Pope Innocent III, concerning England
(1198-1216), Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1956. Page 151

[Below is a Quote from the second letter from the Pope, echoing the transfer of the king's property, to the Pope.]

Letter from Pope Innocent III, to King John, November 4, 1213

"...and manifestly grateful, in that, to make full amends for your sins, you have offered yourself and your property to God and the Church."

Selected Letters of Pope Innocent III, concerning England
(1198-1216), Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1956. Page 168

[The third letter below, is the legal closing of the contract, payment of the 1000 marks to the Pope, the signing of the document with the signing of the witness, sealed with the king's golden seal. This document declares that the contract between the king and the Pope was legal and binding on all parties, heirs and successors, forever. You will notice if you study closely the likeness in the legalize of these letters and the later Charters written by the king's barristers, regarding the incorporation of America.]

Letter from Pope Innocent III, to king John, April 24, 1214

[This is the heading to this letter.]

"INNOCENT, BISHOP, SERVANT OF THE SERVANTS OF GOD, TO HIS WELL-BELOVED SON IN CHRIST, JOHN ILLUSTRIOUS KING OF THE ENGLISH, AND TO HIS LEGITIMATE FREE-BORN HEIRS FOR EVER."

"The King of kings and Lord of lords, Jesus Christ, a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedech, has so established in the Church His kingdom and His priesthood that the one is a kingdom of priests and the other a royal priesthood, as is testified by Moses in the Law and by Peter in his Epistle; and over all He has set one whom He has appointed as His Vicar on earth, so that, as every knee is bowed to Jesus, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, so all men should obey His Vicar and strive that there may be one fold and one shepherd."

Selected Letters of Pope Innocent III, concerning England
(1198-1216), Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1956. Page 177

"...so that those provinces which from of old have had the Holy Roman Church as their proper teacher in spiritual matters should now in temporal things also have her as their peculiar sovereign. You, whom God has chosen as a suitable minister to effect this, by a devout and spontaneous act of will and on the general advice of your barons have offered and yield, in the form of an annual payment of a thousand marks, yourself and your kingdoms of England and Ireland, with all their rights and appurtenances, the Holy Roman Church and to us and our successors, to be our right and our property as is stated in your official letter attested by a golden seal, the literal tenor of which is as follows:

'John, by the grace of God king of England, lord of Ireland, duke of Normandy and Aquitaine, count of Anjou, to all the faithful of Christ who may see this charter, greeting in the Lord.

'By this charter attested by our golden seal we wish it to be known to you all that, having in many things offended God and Holy Church our mother and being therefore in the utmost need of divine mercy and possessing nothing but ourselves and our kingdoms that we can worthily offer as due amends to God and the Church, we desire to humble ourselves for the sake of Him who for us humbled Himself even unto death; and inspired by the grace of the Holy Spirit not induced by force nor compelled by fear, but of our own good and spontaneous will and on the general advice of our barons we offer and freely yield to God, and to SS Peter and Paul His apostles, and to the Holy Roman Church our mother, and to our lord Pope Innocent III and his catholic successors, the whole kingdom of England and the whole kingdom of Ireland with all their rights and appurtenances for the remission of our sins and the sins of our whole family, both the living and the dead. And now, receiving back these kingdoms from God and the Roman Church and holding them a feudatory vassal, in the presence of our venerable father, lord Nicholas, bishop of Tusculum, legate of the Apostolic See, and of Pandulf, subdeacon and member of household fealty henceforth to our lord aforesaid, Pope Innocent, and to his catholic successors, and to the Roman Church, in the terms hereinunder stated; and we have publicly paid liege homage for the said kingdoms to God, and to the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and to the Roman Church, and to our lord aforesaid, Pope Innocent III, at the hands of the said legate who accepts our homage in place and instead of our said lord, the Pope; and we bind in perpetuity our successors and legitimate heirs that without question they must similarly render fealty and acknowledge homage to the Supreme Pontiff holding office at the time and to the Roman church. As a token of this our perpetual offering and concession we will and decree that out of the proper and special revenues of our said kingdoms, in lieu of all service and payment which we should render for them, the Roman church is to receive annually, without prejudice to the payment of Peter's pence, one thousand marks sterling five hundred at the feast of Michael and five hundred at Easter that is, seven hundred for the kingdom of England and tree hundred for the kingdom of Ireland, subject to the maintenance for us and our heirs of our jurisdiction, privileges, and regalities. Desiring all these terms, exactly as stated, to be forever ratified and valid, we bind ourselves and our successors not to contravene them; and if we or any of our successors shall presume to contravene them, then, no matter who he be, unless on due warning he come to his senses, let him

lose the title to the kingdom, and let this document of offer and concession remain ever valid.

I, John, by grace of God king of England and lord of Ireland, will from this hour henceforward be faithful to God and Saint Peter and the Roman Church and my lord Pope Innocent III and his catholic successors. I will not take part in deed, word, agreement, or plan whereby they should lose life or limb or be treacherously taken prisoners; any injury to them, if aware of it, I will prevent and will check if I can; and otherwise, I will notify them as soon as possible, or inform a person whom I can trust without fail to tell them; any counsel they have entrusted to me either personally or by envoys or by letter I will keep secret, nor will I wittingly divulge it to anyone to their disadvantage. I will help in maintaining and defending, to the utmost of my power, against all men, the patrimony of Saint Peter, and particularly the kingdom of England and the kingdom of Ireland. So help me God and the Holy Gospels of God whereon I swear.

To prevent any questioning of these terms at any time in the future, and for the greater surety of our offer and concession, we have caused this charter to be made and to be sealed with our golden seal; and as tribute for this the first year we pay a thousand marks sterling to the Roman Church by the hand of the said legate. (The witness were listed here), signed October 3, 1213

This offer and concession so piously and wisely made we regard as acceptable and valid, and we take under the protection of Saint Peter and of ourselves your person and the persons of your heirs together with the said kingdoms and their appurtenances and all other goods which are now reasonably held or may in future be so held: to you and to your heirs, according to the terms set out above and by the general advice of our brethren, we grant the said kingdoms in fief and confirm them by this privilege, on condition that any of your heirs on receiving the crown will publicly acknowledge this as a fief held of the Supreme Pontiff and of the Roman Church, and will take an oath of fealty to them. Let no man, therefore, have power to infringe this document of our concession and confirmation, or presume to oppose it. If any man dare to do so, let him know that he will incur the anger of Almighty God and of SS Peter and Paul, His apostles. Amen, amen, Amen.

(Rota) I, Innocent, bishop of the Catholic Church, have signed. Farewell. (The other signers were listed below)
Selected Letters of Pope Innocent III, concerning England
(1198-1216), Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, 1956. Page 178-183

[The last letter is from Pope Innocent III, to the king, with record of the king's appeals to the Pope, the Pope puts the rebellious barons on notice, also the world, of his legal claims. In this letter, the Pope declares the Magna Charta was to be ignored, and reports that the king informed the barons he had no legal authority to sign the Magna Charta. The Pope declared the Magna Charta null and void.]

Letter from Pope Innocent III, to king John, August 24, 1215

"...such complete amends that he not only paid compensation for losses and restored property wrongfully seized, but also conferred full liberty on the English church; and further, on the relaxation of the two sentences, he yielded his kingdom of England and of Ireland to St Peter and the Roman Church, and received it from us Again as fief under an annual payment of one thousand marks, having sworn an oath of fealty to us, as is clearly stated in his privilege furnished with a golden seal;...."

Selected Letters of Pope Innocent III, concerning England
(1198-1216), Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, 1956. Page 212

"For we in our letters, and we equally through the archbishop and bishops, have asked and advised the king, enjoining it on him as he hopes to have his sins remitted, to treat these magnates and nobles kindly and to hear their just petitions graciously, so that they too might recognize with gladness how by divine grace he had had a change of heart, and that thereby they and their heirs should serve him and his heirs readily and loyally; and we also asked him to grant them full safe conduct for the outward and homeward journey and the time between, so that if they could not arrive at agreement the dispute might be decided in his court by their peers ACCORDING TO THE LAWS AND CUSTOMS OF THE KINGDOM. But before the envoys bearing this wise and just mandate and reached England, the barons threw over their oath of fealty; and through, even if the king had

wrongfully oppressed them, they should not have proceeded against him by constituting themselves both judges and executors of the judgement in their own suit, yet, openly conspiring as vassals against their lord and as knights against their king, they leagued themselves with his acknowledged enemies as well as with others, and dared to make war on him, occupying and devastating his territory and even seizing the city of London, the capital of the kingdom, which had been treacherously surrendered to them. Meantime the aforesaid envoys returned to England and the king offered, in accordance with the terms of our mandate, to grant the barons full justice. This they altogether rejected and began to stretch forth their hands to deeds still worse. So the king, appealing to our tribunal, offered to grant them justice before us to whom the decision of this suit belonged by reason of our lordship: but this they utterly rejected. Then he offered that four discreet men chosen by him and four more chosen by themselves should, together with us, end the dispute, and he promised that, first in his reforms, he would repeal all abuses introduced into England in his reign: but this also they contemptuously refused. Finally, **THE KING DECLARED TO THEM THAT, SINCE THE LORDSHIP OF THE KINGDOM BELONGED TO THE ROMAN CHURCH, HE NEITHER COULD NOR SHOULD, WITHOUT OUR SPECIAL MANDATE, MAKE ANY CHANGE IN IT TO OUR PREJUDICE:** and so he again appealed to our tribunal, placing under apostolic protection both himself and his kingdom with all his honour and rights. But making no progress by any method, he asked the archbishop and the bishops to execute our mandate, to defend the rights of the Roman Church, and to protect himself in accordance with the form of the privilege granted to Crusaders. When the archbishop and bishops would not take any action, seeing himself bereft of almost all counsel and help, he did not dare to refuse what the barons had dared to demand. And so by such violence and fear as might affect the most courageous of men he was forced to demeaning but also illegal and unjust, thereby lessening unduly and impairing his royal rights and dignity....we refuse to ignore such shameless presumption, for thereby the Apostolic See would be dishonoured, the king's rights injured, the English nation shamed, and the whole plan for a Crusade seriously endangered; and as this danger would be imminent if concessions, thus extorted from a great prince who has taken the cross, were not cancelled by our authority, even though he himself should prefer them to be upheld, on behalf of Almighty God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and by the authority of SS Peter and Paul His Apostles, and by our own authority, acting on the general advice of our brethren, we utterly reject and condemn this settlement, and under threat of excommunication we order that the king should not dare to observe it and that the barons and their associates should not require it to be observed: the charter, with all undertakings and guarantees whether confirming it or resulting from it, we declare to be null, and void of all validity for ever. Wherefore, let no man deem it lawful to infringe this document of our annulment and prohibition, or presume to oppose it. If anyone should presume to do so, let him know that he will incur the anger of Almighty God and of SS Peter and Paul His."

Selected Letters of Pope Innocent III, concerning England
(1198-1216), Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1956. Page 214-216

"barons until the Sunday after Easter on the pretext that their demands were too complex for immediate decision. The Pope's reply to the king's message was a suggestion of delay by the device of "arbitration." On May 9, 1215, the king proposed to the barons "arbitration" before a court consisting of representatives of himself, of the barons and of the Pope, after the barons had besieged the royal castle at Northampton. This proposal was rejected by the barons. And they answered on May 17, 1215, by capturing London. The king's negotiators, who included Archbishop Langton, finally effected an agreement with the barons, about June 10, 1215, at a conference at Runnymede, that was signed and sealed by King John on or about the date that the Magna Carta bears, June 15, 1215.

After he had been forced to sign the Magna Carta by threat of defeat by the barons, King John sent word of it, by envoy, to the Pope. The envoys returned several months later, bearing Papal bulls, dated August 24 and 25. Pope Innocent III declared the Magna Carta to be:

"...unlawful and unjust as it is base and shameful...whereby the Apostolic See is brought into contempt, the Royal Prerogative diminished, the English outraged, and the whole Enterprise of the Crusade greatly imperiled."
(211:14)

On these grounds and on the ground that "the king had been compelled to enter upon it by force and fear"

(211:14), and On the implied ground that it violated the basic tenets of Christianity in its denial of dictatorial rights to him and his henchmen, POPE INNOCENT III DENIED ON BEHALF OF THE CHURCH THE DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AS EMBODIED IN THE MAGNA CARTA, BECAUSE POSSESSION OF RIGHTS BY ANYONE VIOLATES THE TENETS OF THE CHURCH.

The Papal bulls were greeted by the barons with a resumption of the civil war in England. The Pope was so enraged at the failure of Archbishop of Canterbury Langton to destroy the rebellious barons and carry out the orders incorporated in his bull, that he suspended him from his office when he visited Rome at the end of September 1215, to attend the Fourth Lateran Council. Undoubtedly with the consent, and probably at the direction of the Vatican, the French invaded England under Prince Louis and joined forces in a treacherous alliance with the barons, as pretender to the throne of King John.

The sudden death of King John, in October 1216, brought to the throne his nine-year-old son, as King Henry III. His supporters revived the Magna Carta to appease the barons and gain their support against the pretender who was badly routed. These circumstances barred any further effective opposition to the Magna Carta by the Pope, without risking loss of the 666 pounds tribute."

Chapter 2

The Pope's creation of the Knights Templars

[In the below quotes You'll see that the Knights Templars were a creation of the Pope. Their special grant of nobility came from the Pope, not to mention the grants they received from the king of England, including their being the first tax collectors on income. They were arguably the first International Bankers. You'll see that the Knights Templars were agents of the Pope, fiduciaries of the king. The Knights Templars transferred the king's payment to the Pope, for the king's agreement in 1213, transferring his holdings to the Pope, and receiving them back as fief, paying yearly as valuable consideration of their agreement, making the agreement perfectly legal. The Knights Templars were the military arm of the Pope, and they answered only to him, they were bound to no civil law, no authority on earth could subject them to their law or jurisdiction.]

"As they had no fixed place of abode, Baldwin II, King of Jerusalem, gave them a residence within the precincts of his own place on Mount Moriah near the church known as the Temple of Solomon, while the clergy of the Temple, inspired by his example, added ground for the erection of necessary offices, and other benefactors supplied the means of maintaining the Knights in food and clothing. From their sacrifice of all worldly advantage, and this the first place of their settlement, they became known as the poor fellow-soldiers of Christ and the Temple of Solomon (Pauperes Commilitones Christi et Templi Salomonis). Thus was founded in 1118 the famous Brotherhood of Soldier Monks the Knights of the Temple.

At first their progress was slow; few joined them in their seemingly inglorious toil. At the end of nine years they had obtained seven recruits. Then, however, the saintly Bernard of Clairvaux lent them the aid of his powerful advocacy, and drew up for their guidance rules of conduct soon embodied and drew up their guidance rules of conduct soon embodied in the more elaborate code which received the sanction of the Council of Troyes (1128). By Pope Honorius II they were given a distinctive habit in a white mantle, symbolical of purity and innocence; to which, twenty years later, Pope Eugenius III added the red cross seal and badge of martyrdom thus proclaiming by the sign they bore the dedication of their lives to the defence of pilgrims and the Holy Land." The History Of The Temple, London, J. Bruce Williamson, pages 5-6

"By the famous Bull Omne datum optimum, first published in 1162 and a second time ten years later, Pope Alexander III raised the Order to a position of extraordinary privilege, and rendered them immune from all jurisdiction, lay or ecclesiastical, other than that of the Holy See....

....Thus the Templars became independent of all control save that of the Supreme Pontiff, and as proceedings of their chapters were secret, virtually a sealed book to the rest of the Catholic Church. The admission of priests, however, did not place them on a footing of equality with the lay brethren, to whom were reserved all the powers

of government. Further, only a knight who had taken the vows of the Order could hold the office of Grand Master, and to the vows of the Order could hold the office of Grand Master, and to the Grand Master all the members were bound by their vows to render implicit obedience. In the Church at large authority lay with the priest, only he could bind and loose, could pronounce the dread sentence of excommunication, and grant deliverance from it by absolution. This was the power by which, in the Middle Ages, the Church was able to lay a restraining hand on the most licentious Rulers and even to shake the thrones of Kings." The History Of The Temple, London, J. Bruce Williamson, pages 6, 12, 13

"The estates of the Order were managed in the interests of the common object, the defense of Christianity in the East, and the revenues they yielded devoted to that purpose. They formed a network over Christendom, and the means of communication this elaborate organization afforded led to the Templars becoming the financial agents of the Crusaders and later the Bankers of Kings and Princes.

From the first the Knights in England were closely associated with the royal Court, and the prestige this connection gave the Order no doubt often induced them to undertake duties not contemplated by their pious Founders. As laymen, yet invested with ecclesiastical sanctity and a power within the kingdom though not of it, their counsel was frequently sought by embarrassed Rulers often at issue with rebellious subjects in the rude age in which they flourished. Thus the New Temple became a recognized center of meeting and conference in great affairs of Church and State. Bound to the Popes by a peculiar allegiance, the hospitality of the Templars was often extended to foreign Prelates and other officers of the mediaeval Church who visited England on the business of the Holy see. The Master of the Temple ranked as one of the Magnates of the Realm, and successive Kings made use of his services as envoy in the conduct of negotiations with other Princes." The History Of The Temple, London, J. Bruce Williamson, pages 16, 17

"...These relate chiefly to the King's business, but there can be no doubt that in multitudes of other private cases of which there is now no record the same thing was going on. Moreover, from a very early date the Crown made use of the services of Templars as royal agents in the collection of monies payable under subsidies granted the King by the Magnates lay and ecclesiastical. Thus in 1188 Henry II appointed Gilbert de Ogrestan, a Brother of the Temple, with others to collect the tenth known as the Saladin Tithe, believed to be the first tax levied upon personal property in England....

...It is manifest also that the Knights carried on a regular business of foreign exchange and constantly undertook, in consideration of money paid to them at the New Temple, to discharge abroad debts owing to foreign creditors by persons resident in England. Further, the New Temple is frequently named as the place where money borrowed or a debt otherwise arising is to be paid or discharged....

...By the second and third, dated respectively January 1st and 4th, 1214, a sum of 6000 marks was ordered to be paid from the Temple Treasury to Pandulph the Papal Legate, and another sum of 1000 marks to the same person, together with Thomas de Erdington and Almeric de Sacy. In the following year John paid to the Master of the Temple 1100 marks, which he had borrowed from the Order to enable him to bring troops to England from Ponthieu." The History Of The Temple, London, J. Bruce Williamson, pages 30, 31

"Further gifts still continued to be showered on the Order. As late as April, 1303 license was granted the Templars to hold lands in mortmain, received from six different grantees." The History Of The Temple, London, J. Bruce Williamson, page 43 footnote

Hospitallers of St. John of Jerusalem

"The most important of all the military orders, both for the extent of its area and for its duration. It is said to have existed before the Crusades and is not extinct at the present time. During this long career it has not always borne the same name. Known as Hospitallers of Jerusalem until 1309, the members were called Knights of Rhodes from 1309 till 1522, and have been called Knights of Malta since 1530." Catholic Encyclopedia

"Present State of the Order"

The secularization of the property of the order in Protestant countries was extended by the French Revolution to the greater number of Catholic countries. On the other hand, Czar Paul of Russia assigned them considerable property in his domains (1797), and in return was elected grand master, but his election was not recognized by the pope. From that time forward the pope has named the grand master of the bailiff who takes his place. From 1805 to 1879 there was no grand master, but Leo XIII re-established the dignity, bestowing it on an Austrian, Geschi di Sancta Croce. It is now (1910) held by Galeazzo von Thun Hohenstein. The actual conditions for admission to the order are: nobility of sixteen quarterings, the Catholic Faith, attainment of full legal age, integrity of character, and corresponding social position. There are now in existence only four great priories, one in Bohemia, and three in Italy. There are still commanders and several classes of knights, with different insignia, but all wear the same eight-pointed Maltese cross (see DECORATIONS, PONTIFICAL)." Catholic Encyclopedia

Military Orders

England

"In England, Edward III, in memory of the legendary Knights of the Round Table, established in 1349 brotherhood of twenty-five knights, exclusive of princes of the blood and foreign princes, with St. George as its patron and with its chapel in Windsor Castle for the holding of chapters. This, the Order of the Garter, takes its name from the characteristic badge, won on the left knee. The choice of this badge has given rise to various anecdotes of doubtful authenticity. Nothing is now known of the original object of the Order of the Bath, the creation of which dates from the coronation of Henry IV (1399). A third order, Scottish by origin, is that of the Order of the Thistle, dating from the reign of James V of Scotland (1534). These orders still exist, though they have been protestantized." Catholic Encyclopedia

Religious State

"The knights of the great orders were regarded in the Church as analogous to monks whose three vows they professed and whose immunities they shared. They were answerable to the pope alone; they had their chapels, their clerics, and their cemeteries, all exempted from the jurisdiction of the secular clergy. Their landed property was free from tithes. They were not subject to the interdicts which the bishops in those days employed so freely. They did not all follow the same monastic rule. The Templars and orders derived from them followed the Cistercian Reform. The Hospitallers followed the Rule of St. Augustine. Nevertheless, in consequence of the relaxation which manifested itself among them after the period of the crusades, the Holy See introduced mitigations in favour of the non-clerical brethren. For these it was difficult to maintain the rule of celibacy in all its rigour; they were permitted, in certain orders, to marry once, and that only with a maiden. Even where second marriages were tolerated, they had to vow conjugal fidelity, so that if they violated this obligation of the natural law they sinned doubly against the law and against their vow. Besides the three vows, the rule bound the brethren to the exercises of the monastic life such as the recitation of the Hours, for which, in the case of illiterates, a fixed number of Paters was substituted. It also prescribed their dress and their food, and their feast, abstinence, and fast days. Lastly, the rule imposed detailed obligations in regard to the election of dignitaries and the admission of members to the two ranks of combatants -- knights and men-at-arms -- and the two of non-combatants - chaplains, to whom all sacerdotal functions were reserved, and casaliers, or tenants, who were charged with the management of temporal affairs." Catholic Encyclopedia

Military Organizations

"The military organization of the orders was uniform, explained by that law of war which compels the belligerent to maintain his military apparatus on a level with those of his adversary, on pain of defeat. The strength of an army was in its cavalry, and to this type the armament, mounting, and tactics of the military orders conformed. The knights-brethren were the heavy cavalry; the men-at-arms-brethren, the light cavalry. The former were entitled to three horses a piece; the latter had to be content with one. Among the former, only knights of tried prowess were admitted, or, in default of this qualification, sons of knights, because in such families the warlike spirit and military training were hereditary. The consequence was that the knights, properly so-called, were never

very numerous; they formed a corps d'elite which carried the great mass of the crusaders. Gathered in convents which were also barracks, combining with the passive obedience of the soldier, the spontaneous submission of the religious, living shoulder to shoulder in brotherly union, commander and subordinate, these orders surpassed, in that cohesiveness which is the ideal of every military organization, the most famous bodies of picked soldiery known to history, from the Macedonian phalanx to the Ottoman Janissaries."

Economic Organization

"The importance acquired by the military orders during the course of the Middle Ages may be measured by the extent of their territorial possessions, scattered throughout Europe. In the thirteenth century nine thousand manors formed the portion of the Templars; thirteen thousand that of the Hospitallers. These temporalities were an integral part of the ecclesiastical domain, and as such had a sacred character which placed them beyond liability to profane uses or to secular imposts. They differed from the temporalities of other monastic institutions only in the centralized system of their administration. While within each of the other religious institutes every abbey was autonomous, all the houses of a military order were bound to contribute their revenues, after deducting expenses, to a central treasury. As a result of this enormous circulation of capital controlled by the orders, their wealth could be applied to financial operations which made them veritable credit and deposit banks. Their perfect good faith earned for them the implicit confidence of the Church and of temporal rulers. The papacy employed them to collect contributions for the crusades; princes did not hesitate to entrust to them their personal property. In this respect, again, the military orders were model institutions." Catholic Encyclopedia

Chapter 3

Betrayal of the knights by the Pope and the king's they served

[The Knights Templars were disbanded in 1312 after the Pope had accused them of heresy, corruption and abuse of their titles of nobility. Another secret group called Knights Hospitallers received the property held by the Knights Templars.

The claim that Pope Clement V was a puppet of the French king is ludicrous. Were political favors extended back and fourth? Sure, but to suggest more than this flies in the face of historical fact. Once the Templars had out lived their usefulness and their power had grown large enough to threaten the Pope, the Pope decided it was time to destroy them, and see to it their holdings, which were acquired through Papal favor, escheated back to the Pope, or to be held by his trustee the king, and were again granted to the next Papal secret society.

The plot between the Pope and the French king is the most heinous, despicable and evil betrayal of trust in the history of mankind. It was such a vile plot it could only have been born in hell in the mind of Satan carried out by his henchman, the Pope and king of France, later to include the king of England. I'm not a defender of the Templars, nor do I agree with their religion, but what was done to them by the Pope is the ultimate betrayal.

This paper is not an attack on the people, that practice Catholicism. They have as much right as the Baptist to go to hell, as with followers of other "religions". However, I recognize the honor and dedication of the Templars, for their service to the Pope and Catholicism; for which they learned in the most horrible way, was misplaced faith and loyalty. The enormity of the evil plot and betrayal of these honorable men is dwarfed only by the betrayal and murder of Jesus Christ, carried out by the Jews. Through selective history being taught, and this history being hidden, the World has been kept ignorant of the dastardly and evil destruction of the Templars, to obtain their wealth and power. The horrendous and baseless claims created by the Pope, to slander honorable men sworn to give their lives and fortune to this evil and vile man, who claims to be the vicar of Christ, redefines betrayal. The only analogy I can give to compare to what the Pope did would be, a mother murdering her children while they look into her eyes with total faith, trust and love as she murders them. Even though I don't support the religious or political views of the betrayed Templars, to see through history how these honorable men were shamed and murdered by the one person they trusted, who declared to be second only to Jesus Christ, the moral compass of the Church Jesus Christ established, makes me mad as Hell!

When the perpetrators of this evil plot against honorable men, come before Jesus Christ at the Judgement Seat, stand back. Their torture throughout eternity will be second only to Satan himself.

A glimpse of righteous indignation and judgement was carried out by the knights Templars of England, those that survived the Pope's inquisition. Those of you that saw the movie Braveheart will remember the close of the movie, when Robert the Bruce decided to attack the king and his soldiers. The movie stopped at that point, but the battle did not. They fought all day, some accounts say two days. Then at the end of the day appearing at the rear of the Scottish ranks, attacking through the worst possible terrain, the king of England and his knights saw what no doubt filled them with horror, proven by their action. The 500 English Templars entered the battle, these battle hardened swordsmen engaged the English soldiers, who were no match for the Templars. The Templars were the special forces or the Bruce Lees of their day, battle hardened men, expert in the Art of War. The carnage the king of England and his knights saw, caused them to flee the field of battle, the king's soldiers seeing this followed the king, giving the Scots a rout, against 4 to 1 odds, 20,000 English troops against 6,000 poorly armed Scots.

I'm sure the reason the king fled was, because he knew no mercy would be had at the hands of the betrayed Templars, and that he and his knights would have been killed, and there was no one who could stop the Templars attack. I would have given anything to have seen this battle, not for the carnage, but for the justice. All be it not carried out against the main conspirator, the Pope. The victory was no doubt very sweet. Reports say the Templars did not lose a single man on this day of retribution. You see a glimpse of Jesus Word, a 1,000 shall fall by my side, 10,000 by my right hand, also, my enemies shall flee seven ways. History shows the Templars migrated to what is now known as Sweden, and are the bankers and farmers of today, still intrusted with the wealth of the World.

The complicity by the public during the inquisition is proof positive of prior programming of the public, by religion and government, giving the Pope and king a freedom to declare whatever they wanted about the Knights Templars, no matter how absurd, to be believed by the public. The complicity of the public was expected and counted on by the Pope and king, they knew they could act with impunity and with no fear of retaliation by the public. Does the evil perpetrated by the Pope and king, and the complacency of the public remind you of a modern event? Waco! The public having been programmed over the years, then given implanted code words to describe those in the Waco Church, like cult, child molester, extremist in a compound and the possessors of dangerous weapons. Once they were so labeled, the public was totally complacent, even when they saw the Constitution and Bill of Rights being violated by the government, for them that just added more credence to the charges. If the government is using this extreme force, these have to be dangerous people. I have no idea what religion the Davidians practiced, it's irrelevant. Did the women and children deserve to be tortured and burnt alive?

After the women and children were burnt alive by the government, the public was quick to believe the government's spin and propaganda, that the Davidians had to have set the fire. The horror and suffering the women and children went through as their skin and eyes were chemically burnt, as their backs were broken by the chemically induced constriction of their muscles, and if still conscious, they slowly drowned by their blood pooling in their lungs. All this occurred before the fire. Their torture was caused by the huge amounts of tear gas pumped into the church. All this occurred as the public watched on television. Do you understand how you have been manipulated by the government and the Press? Compare the propaganda the public was spoon fed by the government and the press at Waco, with what was done to the Knights Templars in the quotes below. There is no difference, it was much easier today thanks to the modern technology utilized by the government and media.]

"The Temple Church was built by the Knights Templars in the twelfth century. It is the third oldest church in London and in it the Knights Templars were accused of performing some very strange Pagan rites. In the Great Fire of 1666 the Temple Church barely escaped."

Rambles in Old London, George W. Jacobs and Company, page 88

"At this time the occupant of the Papal throne was Bertrand de Got, formerly Archbishop of Bordeaux and now

known as Pope Clement V. He had moved the Papacy to Avignon, and was a puppet in the hands of the French King, to whose influence he owed his elevation to the Pontificate. Philip IV, surnamed le Bel, now ruled France: a Prince whose handsome exterior veiled a nature essentially false and cruel. With revenues depleted by his Flemish Wars, he turned a greedy eye on the wealth of the Templars. Exactly when and how the plot between Philip and his subservient Pope was first hatched has not been disclosed, but it is certain that while still professing publicly the most friendly feelings towards the Order he was secretly planning their destruction." *The History Of The Temple*, London, J. Bruce Williamson, pages 44, 45

"...Upon allegations secretly made, charges were drawn up imputing to the Templars infidelity, idolatry, heresy, and the most detestable vice. Proof presented no difficulties, for France was at this time under the Inquisition, and, heresy being charged, the expert hands of the Inquisitors could be relied on to force by torture confessions sufficient to establish guilt. Moreover, the Chief Inquisitor was Philip's private Confessor, so that in the seclusion of the royal palace all the plans could be secretly matured for bringing to the State. The events which followed have been truly called "the great crime of the Middle Ages."

Mysterious rumours were first set in circulation defaming the Order. Some of these reached the ears of the Grand Master, who at an interview with Pope Clement denounced them as false and asked for a public inquiry. No inquiry was granted, but Molay seems to have been satisfied that the rumours found no credence from the Holy Father. Philip treated him with a like duplicity, for it was essential the secret of his plot should be carefully guarded till the time was ripe for action. Three years before, in conferring fresh privileges on the Order, he had proclaimed the esteem in which he held them, eulogizing their works of piety and charity, and their magnificent liberality in all times and places, and his outward demeanour gave no indication of the deadly intentions he harboured towards them. Thus no steps were taken by the unsuspecting victims to meet the impending blow. On October 12th, 1307, the Grand Master was honoured with the place of pall bearer beside the King at the obsequies in Paris of the Comtesse de Valois. The very next day the storm burst. Pursuant to royal orders secretly issued a month before, Molay and all the officers and members of the Order who could be found in France were seized and imprisoned, and all their property taken into the King's hand. Thus the empty coffers of Philip were at once replenished with the immense treasure stored in the Temple at Paris. On the 14th the arrests were followed by a proclamation which set forth the alleged crimes of the Templars, charging the whole Order with idolatry, denying Christ, and spitting on the Cross at initiation, and habitual immorality of the vilest description; while further instruction in their depravity was imparted to the populace assembled for the purpose in the gardens of the royal palace." *The History Of The Temple*, London, J. Bruce Williamson, pages 46, 47

"...Further, ignorant of the Pope's complicity, King Edward also wrote to Clement on behalf of the accused, expressing his amazement and horror at the terrible nature of the charges inspired, as he suggested, by envious and evil disposed persons who turned the good deeds of the Order to works of perversity, and which he was unable to credit because the Master and Brethren of the Temple, constant in the purity of the Catholic Faith, were greatly esteemed by him and all his kingdom in living as well as morals.

Meanwhile, however, Clement had decided to intervene himself in England, and, on November 22nd, had addressed to Edward from Poitiers, where he appears to have been in conference with the French King, one of those mendacious Bulls with which he now sought to poison the mind of Christendom. In this document (*Pro Capcione Templariorum*), after reciting the crimes of the Templars, their arrests in France, and the seizure of their property by Philip, which he alleged had been done for its safe custody and the benefit of the Holy Land, he proceeded to state that the Master of the Order had since publicly and spontaneously confessed that the denial of Christ at the instigation of Satan had been made part of their ceremony of initiation, and that many other Brethren of the Temple in different parts of France had also confessed the wickedness charged against them, doing unfeigned penance therefor. Further, he alleged that he himself had examined a Knight of the Order of high birth and authority, who had spontaneously and fully confessed the crime of denying Jesus Christ on admission, and had been present at a Chapter in the Kingdom of Cyprus when a certain nobleman at his initiation by the Master's command committed this very wickedness in the presence of two hundred members of the Order, of whom about one hundred were Knights. His Holiness accordingly exhorted King Edward with caution and secrecy in one day to arrest all the Templars in his Kingdom and take their property into safe custody.

Although it is clear there was no belief in the charges at the English Court, on receiving this further communication, Edward yielded. Perhaps in that age even it strong Ruler, if a professed son of the Church, could hardly have done otherwise, for, as has been aptly said, " When the Vicar of Christ himself entered the witness box scepticism was silenced." The History Of The Temple, London, J. Bruce Williamson, pages 48, 49

In August, 1808, came another Papal Bull (Faciens Misericordiam), repeating much that had been alleged in Clement's former missive to the King but addressed to Winchelsea, Archbishop of Canterbury, and his suffragans. In this Bull the Pope declared that at the very commencement of his Pontificate reports had confidentially reached him that the Grand Master, Preceptors, and Brethren of the Order of the Temple had lapsed into the unspeakable sin of apostasy, the detestable vice of idolatry, the execrable crime of sodomy, and many heresies that his dearest son in Christ, Philip, the illustrious King of the French, had also heard these things, and that the guilt of the Templars had been proved by many confessions, attestations, and depositions of the said Grand Master and many Preceptors and Brethren of the Order in France. That before three Cardinals deputed by himself to inquire and ascertain the truth, the Grand Master and many Preceptors being sworn had deposed and confessed freely and spontaneously without compulsion or fear that on reception into the Order they had denied Christ, spitting upon the Cross; that some had also admitted that with the same denial and spitting they had received others; that certain Brethren had confessed other things horrible and indecent regarding which shame kept him silent; and that on beaded knees, with clasped hands, humbly and earnestly and with many tears, they had begged for absolution. He accordingly directed the Archbishop and Bishops to institute inquiries in England through the Provincial Councils, and in particular to examine the Templars there upon certain articles of accusation transmitted with the Bull, and named two Inquisitors, Deodatus, Abbot of Lagny, and Sicarde de Vaur, Canon of Narbonne, whom he was sending to conduct the examinations, and whom he required the English Bishops to assist. Clement had no doubt heard of the letters King Edward had dispatched to Portugal, Castile, Sicily, and Aragon, for in this Bull he further alleged that King Philip had not acted against the Templars from avarice, not intending to take any of their property for himself, and having wholly removed his hand from it, but following in the illustrious footsteps of his progenitors, from zeal for the orthodox Faith." The History Of The Temple, London, J. Bruce Williamson, pages 51, 52

"The articles of accusation sent by the Pope numbered eighty seven. They dealt (i. a.) with the alleged denial of Christ and spitting on the Cross at initiation; alleged acts of indecency between the Preceptors and novitiates; the wearing of cords or belts consecrated to idolatry; alleged acts of immorality; the worshipping of idols (including cats) in their Chapters; disbelief in the Sacraments of the altar and absolution from sin by the Master and Preceptors, being laymen only....

....No evidence was obtained, however, in proof of the Papal allegations. All the members, Knights, Priests, and Serving Brothers, alike denied the charges and protested their innocence. The History Of The Temple, London, J. Bruce Williamson, page 53

"Meanwhile, under the merciless direction of King Philip and his Inquisitors, the tragedy had been pursuing its cruel course in France. There, those Brethren who did not confess were condemned to perpetual imprisonment, while those who admitted the charges and did not afterwards withdraw their admissions were for the most part absolved and set at liberty. Others who, ashamed of their weakness under torture, subsequently retracted their confessions of guilt and claimed to defend the Order, were seized by Philip's command and burnt as relapsed heretics. Fifty four so suffered at Paris in one day. Their firmness in adhering to their retractations notwithstanding the terrible consequences and the intrepidity with which they endured a cruel death, astonished all beholders, and point with overwhelming force to the falsity of the charges laid against them." The History Of The Temple, London, J. Bruce Williamson, pages 63, 64

"....The fate of James de Molay, the Grand Master of the Temple and some of his superior officers still remained undecided....With Molay, Geoffrey de Charnis, Preceptor of Normandy, and two other Knights of high position, Hugh de Peraud, Visitor of France, and Godfrey de Gonnville, Preceptor of Aquitaine, were arraigned before this tribunal. The two latter abode by their former confessions, and were sentenced to perpetual imprisonment. But the Grand Master and Geoffrey de Charnis, to the astonishment of their Judges, seized the opportunity to

publicly declare that they were innocent of the charges laid against them, that the confessions they had made to save their own lives were false and that the Order was pure and holy. Unprepared for such an emergency and at a loss what course to pursue, the Commissioners adjourned without pronouncing any judgement. Subject only to ecclesiastical law the Knights were not amenable to any lay jurisdiction till sentenced by a spiritual Court, but, contemptuously indifferent to Papal sanction, King Philip did not wait. Calling his Counsellors together he forthwith passed sentence of death, and at dusk of the same day, March 18th, 1313, the Grand Master and his undaunted companion were taken by royal officers to an island in the Seine and, protesting their innocence to the last, slowly burnt to death.

It is said that in his final agony Molay summoned Pope and King to meet him within a year before that tribunal where judgment does not err. The story may be an ex post facto invention to be explained rather by a popular belief in the innocence of the victims than by any circumstance which actually occurred. But, be that as it may, in the events which followed many believed they beheld the retribution of divine wrath. In little more than a month the venal Pontiff, glutted with ill gotten gain wealth, was smitten by a foul disease and passed to his account; while on the 29th of the following November King Philip, still in middle life, was called from the enjoyment of his plunder to answer for the wrongs he had committed. He expired at Fontainebleau, the victim of a mysterious malady which baffled all medical skill."

The History Of The Temple, London, J. Bruce Williamson, pages 65, 66

"The severance from Rome and the confiscation of the Monastic estates in England which were carried out by Henry VIII, were accompanied by one change which intimately concerned the two legal Societies of the Temple. The heavy hand of that masterful monarch fell with crushing force upon the Order of St. John of Jerusalem. During two hundred years in the Island of Rhodes, the Knights, against the Moslem Power, had valiantly upheld the cause of the Cross, but at last, in 1525, they were forced to capitulate to the conquering Turk. In their extremity their great services to Christendom were forgotten. Henry coveted their possessions, and in 1540 his subservient Parliament passed an Act confiscating the property of the Order in England. To give some colour of justification to the robbery this statute recited that the Knights of the Hospital of St. John had unnaturally, and contrary to the duty of their allegiances, sustained and maintained the usurped power and authority of the Bishop of Rome, the common enemy to the King and his realm; and that the Island of Rhodes, being lost, it was better that possessions of the Order should be employed and spent within the realm for the defence and surety thereof than used by such unnatural subjects who daily did privily and craftily attempt to subvert good and godly policy. Accordingly, it proceeded to make the wearing by the members of the Order upon their bodies of any sign, mark, or token, heretofore used or accustomed for the knowledge of the said religion, an offence against the Statute of Praemunire (16 R. II, c. 5); vested all the property of the Order real and personal in England and Ireland in the King and his successors, to use and employ at his own free will and pleasure under survey of the Court of Augmentations, and pronounced void and of none effect all privileges of sanctuary hitherto belonging to, used, or claimed in the mansion houses and other places commonly called St. John's hold. Pensions were provided under the Act for various officers of the Order, "being the King's true and faithfull subjects,...."

The History Of The Temple, London, J. Bruce Williamson, pages 143, 144

"The turning of the tide for Robert the Bruce, Scotland and the Knights Templar was the famous Battle of Bannockburn which took place on June 24, 1324.... On June 24 of 1324, Robert the Bruce of Scotland with approximately 6,000 Scots miraculously defeated 20,000 English soldiers. Exactly what took place has never really been recorded. It is believed by some that Bruce did it with the help of a special force of Knights Templar. After all, June 24 was also a special day to the Knights Templar; it was St. John's Day....after a day of combat which had left both English and Scottish armies exhausted... Panic swept the English ranks. King Edward, together with 500 of his knights, abruptly fled the field. Demoralized, the English foot-soldiers promptly followed suit, and the withdrawal deteriorated quickly into a full-scale rout, the entire English army abandoning their supplies, their baggage, their money, their gold and silver plate, their arms, armour and equipment."
<http://www.netspace.net.au/~newdawn/41b.htm>

"...the great King Robert the Bruce supported by the Knights Templar led by Sir William Sinclair with an army of only 9,000, defeated 38,000 Englishmen, the Scots facing heavy cavalry, archers and wave upon wave of staunch

and brave Englishmen.

On that day, it was the crushing charge of the Knights Templar across rocky and almost impassable ground that turned the tide of victory. That far off day, almost seven hundred years ago, they won for Scotland her independence....Sir Robert Keith commanded the light cavalry whilst the Knights Templar were led by Sir William Sinclair."

<http://sinclair.quarterman.org/history/med/battleofbannockburn.html>

Chapter 4

Connection of our flag to the Pope, and the secret societies

[The below quotes are self explanatory, I've already dealt with the military nature of our flag in "The United States Is Still A British Colony". I would just point out, Britain use their uniforms as representations of their flag, we retained the British colors in our flag, the colors of Britain and the Pope.]

"The first Templar to be initiated in the United States was William Davis who was given thhe degrees of Excellent, Supe Excellent, Royal Arch, and Knight Templar by the St. Andrew's Royal Arch Lodge on August 28th, 1769. Davis owned an apothecary business in Boston, but is perhaps most noted for his efforts at the Battle of Bunker Hill. Here it was Davis who suggested the "Barrel Defense" in which Barrels full of earth and stone were rolled down on the attacking units.

Of course other Revolutionary War notables would be invested with the honor of being Knights Templar, among them Paul Revere who was initiated on December 11th, 1769. Latterly, on May 14th 1770, Joseph Warren another Revolutionary War hero would add his name to the roster of early American Templars."

<http://www.templarhistory.com/Masonic.html>

"All Knights Templar are members of the world's oldest fraternal organization known as "The Ancient Free And Accepted Masons" or more commonly known as "Masons". However, not all Masons are Templars. Templary is but a part of the Masonic structure known as the "York Rite Of Freemasonry"."

<http://www.knightstemplar.org/>

"....that of the Templars was purely military form the beginning, and on this point it can claim priority, despite the contrary assertions of the Hospitallers. The Templars followed a different monastic rule and wore a different habit -- the white habit of the Cistercians, whose rule they followed, with a red cross, while the Hospitallers had the black mantle with a white cross. In war the knightly brothers wore above their armour a red surcoat with the white cross. Mutually emulous from the outset, they soon became rivals, and this rivalry had much to do with the rapid decline of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. In other respects the two orders held the same rank in Church and State, both being recognized as regular orders and endowed by the papacy with most extensive privileges, absolute independence of all spiritual and temporal authority save that of Rome, exemptions from tithes, with the right to have their own chapels, clergy and cemeteries....The name knights then prevailed over that of hospitallers. This character was accentuated by the fusion of the Hospitallers with the remaining Knights Templars subsequent to the suppression of the latter (1312). This fusion at the same time increased the wealth of the order, to which the pope assigned the property of the Templars in every country except Aragon and Portugal." Catholic Encyclopedia

"All of the flags used in the colonies were military flags: "The flags used by the Colonies, before the Revolution, were chiefly those of the mother country, and though there were many other designs, they were nearly always combined with some feature of the British colors." Fallows P. 3.

"The flag mentioned by Admiral Preble that was unfurled by General Washington at his camp at Cambridge is called the Grand Union Flag. It was the first federal flag to contain the thirteen stripes.

What is this Grand Union Flag? How is it composed? In the canton are the crosses of St. George and St. Andrew, taken, with their blue field, straight from the "meteor flag" of old England. But the greater part of this

new flag is contained in the thirteen alternate stripes of red and white, symbolic of the thirteen leagued Colonies that stretch from New Hampshire to Georgia." Abbott P. 10.

"The Grand Union flag was nothing more than an adaptation of the British red ensign, also known as the meteor flag. The only difference being that instead of being entirely red, it contained thirteen, horizontal red and white stripes, like the modern day American ensign.

The statement is made that it was designed by a committee appointed by Congress for that purpose; but the committee referred to was appointed to confer with General Washington and others for the purpose of devising means for organizing and maintaining an army, and neither does their official report nor correspondence show that they even considered the question of a flag. It was not long after their return to Philadelphia when, on January 1, 1776, there was hoisted over General Washington's headquarters on Prospect Hill, at Somerville, near Cambridge, a flag having thirteen horizontal red and white stripes, and in the canton was the Union Jack, complying with the act of 1707, requiring that it be on all flags, banners, standards, and ensigns, whether used on land or at sea. It was merely the British marine flag of that day, with the solid red field divided by white ribbons so as to make thirteen red and white stripes, representing the thirteen revolting Colonies.

At that time the idea of independence was not generally seriously considered, so that the Union Jack in this flag showed the allegiance of the Colonies to their mother country. The flag itself was immediately appropriated by the Navy, for our continental fleet under Admiral Hopkins carried it as a national ensign early in February, if not in January, 1776; and although our Army used it over fortifications and barracks, they did not carry it in battle. With the growth of the idea of independence the colonists apparently conceived a dislike for the Union Jack in the flag, for after 1776 I have found no definite instance of its use by our Revolutionary patriots." Thurston P. 8.

"Prior to the Declaration of Independence the different colonies retained the standards of the mother country, the ancient national flag of England, a white banner with the red cross of St. George, or the union flag of King James, a combination of the crosses of St. George and St. Andrew, designated as the King's colors." California Constitution P. 5.

"On January 2, 1776, at Cambridge, in the presence of the military, with the assistance of his officers, and with appropriate ceremonies - in which the Franklin Committee were participants - General Washington, with his own hands, hoisted the newly accepted and newly made banner upon a towering and specially raised pine tree liberty pole; thus unfurling to the breeze and displaying to his army, the citizens of the vicinity, and the British forces in Boston, for the first time, the new and officially recognized Confederated Colonial Flag.

This was the first authoritative recognition of any standard having the color of Congressional action as a distinctively accepted flag to represent the confederated and co-operative union of the Colonies in their resistance of tyranny, injustice and oppression. And this was the first time in the history of the world when thirteen alternate red and white stripes was the foundation field of any national standard."

Campbell P. 50.

"For nearly seventy years before the Revolutionary War broke out, the red ensign of Great Britain was generally adopted by the American colonies. It was called the Union flag, because in the upper corner next to the staff, which is called the canton, were the red cross of St. George, representing England; and the white cross, representing Scotland. The combination of these crosses which indicated a union character, was prescribed in 1707. While the colonists were not lacking in devotion to the British ensign in pre-revolutionary times, they nevertheless took occasion to place some particular device upon it applicable to the individual colony to which it belonged."

Smith P. 10.

"The Declaration of Independence, at Philadelphia, on July 4, 1776, transformed the hitherto British Colonies into Independent States; changed the Colonial Congress into as nearly a Continental Legislature as under the circumstances it could become; and made John Hancock the representative [P.54] head of the new government. The Colonial Flag, of "Thirteen Stripes and British Union," thus became the Standard of the thirteen newly

nationalized and cooperating state governments."
Campbell P. 53, 54.

"From 1707 on the Union Flag and the red ensign, or Meteor Flag, were borne by both merchant marine and the royal navy. On land they floated over the forts and followed the marching armies. They waved, too, over remote wilderness posts, and over the forest-threading brigades of the fur trader.

Thus the flag of Britain was the colonists flag, endeared to them by ancient association and by the endurance of common hazards and triumphs in uncounted campaigns and battles. Quaipe P. 35." A Treatise On the Jurisdictional Significance of the American Ensign

"With this practice of nations, then, before them, and evidently applied by them, viz.: that of applying some badge of distinction in use in their armies to their national banner, combined with that of indicating different portions of their armies by different colors for their flags; and of two nations, when uniting, adopting as a common ensign something to indicate their union, and still preserve the original banners (both as to devices and color), under which they had respectively achieved signal triumphs, especially as this last example was that of the mother country, we may expect to see the colonies carrying out this practice in their Union flag.

They were British colonies: and, as we have [P.69] shown, they used the British Union, but now, they were to distinguish their flag by its color from other British ensigns, preserve a trace of the colors under which they had previously fought with success, and, at the same time, represent this combination in some form peculiar to themselves.

The mode of distinction by color could not well be applied by the United Colonies in a single color, as the simpler and most striking were exhausted in application to British ensigns; but, if applied, must have been used in a complex form or combination of colors. This being the case, stripes of color would naturally be suggested as being striking, as enabling them to show the number and union of the colonies, as preserving the colors of the flags previously used by them; and also the badge of distinction, which, at the time of the adoption of this flag, marked the different grades in the un-uniformed army before Boston. Hence, probably, the name, The Great Union Flag, given to it by the writer in the Philadelphia Gazette, before quoted, doubtless Colonel Joseph Reed, inasmuch as this flag indicated, as respected the Colonies, precisely what the Grand Union Flag of Great Britain indicated respecting the mother country." Hamilton P. 68, 69.

"This idea became an accomplished fact upon the inauguration of the new government, in 1789. Up to that date the Stars and Stripes formed the flag of the "Thirteen United States." Since that time the "Red, White and Blue" has been the National Standard of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.] is precise and pointed, but it is very brief. The entire subject is contained in one sentence of the Journal of the Continental Congress, and it reads as follows:

"Resolved, That the flag of the thirteen United States be thirteen stripes alternate red and white; and that the union be thirteen stars, white, in a blue field, representing a new constellation."

This resolution was passed by the Congress, at Philadelphia, on June 14, 1777. It was nearly a year after the Declaration of Independence, and a year and a half after the meeting of the Franklin Committee on the Colonial Flag, at Cambridge, that the English Union in the American flag was replaced by the blue field containing thirteen stars." Campbell P. 55.

"We cannot escape more or less difficulty when we search for light as to who designed and manufactured the first flag bearing the Stars and Stripes. The popular story bestows the honor upon Mrs. Betsy Ross. It is alleged that Congress appointed a committee composed of General Washington, Robert Morris, and George Ross to design a flag. These gentlemen called upon Mrs. Ross in the month of May or June, 1776, and commissioned her to make the first flag with thirteen stars to harmonize with the thirteen stripes which had been placed on the standard raised at Cambridge six months previous." Smith P. 45, 46.

"One of the most famous events involving the flag in colonial times was the case of John Endicott, who removed

the cross from the flag because he believed it to be a symbol of popery, a sentiment felt by many in the colonies:

In November, 1634, complaint was recorded that John [P.15] Endicott had defaced the English ensign at Salem by cutting out with his sword a part of the red cross in the flag that hung before the governor's gate, declaring that it savored of popery, and he would have none of it. He was a member of the court assistants, but for this insult to the king's colors he was reprimanded, removed from his office, and disqualified to hold any public office for the space of one year.

In this sentiment, that his violent act indicated, Endicott was not without sympathizers; and soon after some of the militia refused to march under the symbol that was to them idolatrous. After a grave controversy, which was not concluded until some time in December, 1635, when the military commissioners appointed colors for every company, leaving out the red cross in all of them, it was agreed that the king's colors should fly from ships and be displayed over Castle Island, Boston, because the castle belonged to the king, and this flag continued in use there until the establishment of the commonwealth under Cromwell.

In 1651, when the English Parliament revived and adopted the old standard of the cross of St. George as the colors of England, the General Court of Massachusetts adopted this order: As the Court conceive the old English colors, now used by the Parliament, to be a necessary badge of distinction betwixt the English and other nations, in all places of the world, till the state of England alter the same, which we very much desire, we, being of the same nation, have therefore ordered that the captain of the Castle shall advance the aforesaid colors of England upon all necessary occasions." Harrison P. 14, 15. A Treatise On the Jurisdictional Significance of the American Ensign.

Chapter 5

The bridge between the secular and the Biblical, the Knights Templar and Lawyers

[For years I have heard lawyers say the American Bar has no connection to the British Bar, and that their law license and admission to the Bar, in no way separates them from the public by way of privilege or title of nobility. This argument is utter folly. The courts try to give the impression that there is no privilege, but just on the face of reality, even through a court may let a defendant represent himself, you are denied access to the same information a lawyer has access to. You are denied witnesses when a lawyer would not be. Your paperwork is rejected for the most juvenile reasons, when the same mistake would be overlooked or fixed by a clerk. An American defending himself is held to a much higher standard, to a greater or lesser extent depending on the judge, because you are not a Bar member. Your case is dismissed with the slightest misstep, or possibly ruled frivolous and without merit, without explanation. Lawyers are brought up to the side bar to work out deals, or are given instruction or help, through advice by the judge. Non Bar members are kept from such side bars, so this claim that a lawyer has no privilege is a lie.

Today it's almost impossible to get elected to a public office higher than dog catcher, unless you are a lawyer or a Mason.

Let's look at some historical reality. Knights Templars worked and answered directly to the Pope, they were a direct link between the Pope and the king. They worked in concert with the kings of many Nations to carry out the Popes policies.

The property the Knights Templars held in England was by grant by the king, it was called the Temple, it had three courts, the inner, middle and outer, later in history the outer temple faded away, the temple has four inns, Inner Temple, Middle Temple, Lincoln's Inn and Gray's Inn. There was a gate built to enter the Inns/Courts, called the Bar, only these four Inn's could admit someone to the Bar.

I have covered what happened to the Knights Templars during the inquisition, and that the Knights Hospitallers took their place, until they met a similar fate as the Templars. The Knights Hospitallers began renting the Inner Temple to a certain company of lawyers, and the Middle Temple to another company of lawyers. This was when the lawyers got their hold on the Inns of the Temple and the Bar, during the fourteenth century. In 1673 the

lawyers purchased the Inner and Middle Temples for a gold cup weighing 200 ounces and filled with gold pieces, for this price they became absolute owners as tenets, forever. The lawyers have been in the Temple since 1312.

The "Bar" was created by the Knights Templars, not the lawyers, to cross the Bar and enter the Temple you had to get permission. When the lawyers bought their way into ownership of the Temple and received their grants, they just carried on the tradition that you could only gain admission to the "Bar" by the keepers of the Temple. The lawyers also continued the practices of the Knights Templars, as a secret society, this is why so many lawyers and judges are Masons, and secrecy is built into their profession. You will read in these quotes, that all Templars are Masons, but not all Masons are Templars. These Templars came to America as did the lawyers that had been taught, subjugated by the British Bar. These groups are directly responsible for the laws used before, during and after the formation of this country. They have almost exclusively run this country since its inception, holding every office in our country at one time or another. The American Bar that exists today came by these men, and they have the gall to say there is no connection; they are joined at the hip with the British Bar. So why do they make such foolish claims? I think most lawyers don't know their own history, it was not necessary for them to be taught this by law schools, and may even have been detrimental. It's not necessary for the lawyers to know the truth about the Bar, and the evil system it gave birth to. Once our legal and judicial system was put in place by our fore fathers, the intent of those that created the Bar gained a life of its own. To live on through the legal system, changed or modified in this Country by Congress as needed for the preservation of the major corporations and Trusts, that give life to this system.

It's laughable that President Wilson and Senator Charles Lindbergh Sr. and others thought that by breaking up Standard oil and other major Corporate trusts, that they stopped the monopolies. All they did was make them smaller pieces and allowed trusts to change corporate names making it harder to track them. If not for lawyers and Masons controlling the federal and state governments, they would have had a better chance. However, the fact is, it was for the public's consumption, just a show.

There is no way a lawyer can deny the American Bar is not part of the British Bar. Those loyal to the British Bar formed our legal system and were totally loyal to it, as a matter of oath. Also, their blind loyalty to the Bar was guaranteed by their source of income and privilege being derived by their membership in Bar. Guarantying the decedents of the legal profession continued in their blind loyalty to the Crown. The establishment of the Bar in the United States guaranteed enforcement of the king's law, again which operates without the lawyers knowledge of the Bar's hhistory, intent, or the secret societies it descended from.

Another point, who helped finance the Virginia Charter, or I'll say a large portion of it, other than the Crown? The money barons "merchants" of London. Where were the Knights Templars, Masons and Lawyers based? London, directly under the control of the king and the Pope. Who set up our monitory system? Who set up our federal Reserve? Who set up our Social Security system?

Finally, who set up our legal system, to enforce this whole system? The merchants of London, the Bank of London and the secret societies they utilize. I hope you don't have to fall off a cliff to know gravity works. Likewise, that the system we have today can be traced back to England. Not just historically as a metaphor, but directly, by creation and control. Names and faces have changed, but the Bar "legal system" set up to protect the king's interest has not.]

"1781 British momentarily lose control of the sea to French which requires Cornwallis to surrender at Yorktown. According to British historians "this provides the new nation at its birth with a myth to sustain it."

Masons installed Constitutional Government in America with "checks and balances" designed to make it permanently subservient to the Money Power of the Bank of England and its agents: Peabody, Morgan, Brown, Belmont, etc. America becomes "covert" colony of Britain."

A-albionic Research Weekly Up-Date of 3-4-95 and 3-11-95

"The Temple has close historical associations with the American Republic. Five of the signers of the Declaration of Independence were members of the Middle Temple: Edward Rutledge, Thomas Hayward, Thomas McKean,

Thomas Lynch and Arthur Middleton. Besides these, George Rutledge, William Livingstone, John Dickinson of Pennsylvania and Arthur Lee of Virginia and Payton Randolph, President of the Continental Congress of Philadelphia, were all members of the Inn.

....It all began with the Knights Templars who in the days of their power and pride formed a highly privileged order. They governed within their territory according to their own laws without interference from any outside authority. When the lawyers took over the property they inherited or assumed the like privilege and independence, a position that they have stoutly and resolutely and successfully maintained until the present day." Rambles in Old London, George W. Jacobs and Company, pages 89-90

"The attack upon the order which became general on the Continent was not shared in England, but when the dissolution was pronounced by the Council of Bienna in 1312, the properties passed to the Knights Hospitallers. In London however that Order did not take full possession of the Temple when the Knights Templars were disbanded. The three parts of the properties lying contiguous to each other were called the Inner, the Middle and the Outer Temple, according to the relation of each to the City. The Knights Hospitallers were allowed to occupy the Inner, which included the more sacred parts. The Outer was granted by the King to the Bishop of Exeter and was eventually acquired by Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, and with Essex House became the seat of that ill-fated nobleman. There he surrendered to the officers of Elizabeth and thence he proceeded to his trial and execution. The properties continued in private hands and so the Outer extending from the Strand to the River along both sides of Essex street. Within a few years of their occupation of the Inner Temple the Knights Hospitallers were in possession of the Middle as well and we find them renting parts of the Inner to a certain company of lawyers, and the Middle to another company of lawyers, the rent paid in each instance being ten pounds annually. It was therefore early in the fourteenth century that the lawyers got their first footing in the temple and from the first they appear to have formed two distinct societies, one in the Inner Temple and the other in the Middle Temple."

Rambles in Old London, George W. Jacobs and Company, pages 78-79

"The Temple has not been spared the calamities that have been visited upon London. One occurred during the peasants' revolt in 1381 under Wat Tyler. The peasants who regarded the lawyers with special aversion, moved in a mob to the Temple with the avowed purpose of hanging its inhabitants. The lawyers having got wind of the plan, had business elsewhere on that day. The rebels however plundered the houses, some of which they destroyed, and made a bonfire of all books and records.

Till the dissolution, the Knights Hospitallers remained the owners of the Temple, receiving rents from the two societies of lawyers. That Order was dissolved by Henry VIII, who confiscated the property and allowed the lawyers to remain as tenants of the Crown at an annual rental of ten pounds a year for each of the two societies. It seems that Henry had a scheme for turning out the lawyers and converting the Temple into some use of his own devising, but it also seems that the lawyers were too smart even for Henry and managed somehow to retain the properties at the same rent that they had been paying for over two hundred years, the only difference being that the Crown became their landlord.

In 1608 James the First made an effort to deprive the lawyers of the premises by effecting a sale. Again they scored, this time by presenting the King with a gold cup weighing two hundred ounces filled with gold pieces in exchange for a charter granting them the Temple FOREVER at the old annual rental of ten pounds a year for each Society. In 1673 however the two Societies together purchased these rents from Charles II and became the absolute owners forever, the one of the Inner Temple and the other of the Middle Temple.

Thus the Temple premises, the heritage of an ancient order of chivalry identified with the Crusades, became the permanent property of the lawyers who have been in continuous occupation since 1412, and whose present title is based on the rental of 10 pounds which each of the two societies paid at that time for its share as tenant. In no instance does the persistence of custom in the City of London show to better advantage, with deeper meaning or with greater honour than in this Temple of Law where students come from all over the British Empire to gain admission to the Bar....

Always there have been four Inns of Court: the Middle Temple, the Inner Temple, Lincoln's Inn and Gray's Inn, the last two lying outside the Temple precincts in Holborn....They are the only power in England that can admit to the Bar."

Rambles in Old London, George W. Jacobs and Company, pages 80-82

"I know of no event that presaged the founding of the Empire overseas like the arrival of the Golden Hinde at London. It was the most colossal and most daring propaganda that ever encompassed the earth.

From that time on the Londoners developed and fostered the colonizing spirit and from the time that Englishmen got a foothold in America the plantations were nourished and powerfully supported by London merchants. Virginia was founded by the City of London and the City Companies together....Among the leaders in the New World were men learned in the law who had lived at the Inns of Court and sat with the Benchers in the Temple. Not the law alone but the customs, the traditions, the faiths of London penetrated the Thirteen Colonies.

....Whatever difference of opinion there might have been in the colonies about the policies of the government there was none in London. Right or wrong these policies were opposed by Londoners from the beginning. The Lord Mayor and Aldermen, as spokesmen for the City, sent on remonstrance after another to the King on the throne till, incensed at their persistence, he informed their representative in Parliament that he would receive on the throne no more communications from the Lord Mayor. This was a denial of one of London's ancient rights. The Lord Mayor promptly reminded him that London's right of making representations to the King on the throne had never been challenged. The King acknowledged the right. The Lord Mayor and Aldermen continued to send their remonstrances against the colonial policy of government. They were no perfunctory warnings that the City sent to the Throne."

Rambles in Old London, George W. Jacobs and Company, pages 94-96

"...The Royal Palace and the seat of the Carmelite Brothers lay therefore between Ludgate and the Temple, and between Fleet Street and the Thames. Lying outside the wall but inside the City, they had Temple Bar as an outer protection. Temple Bar is at least as old as the Temple whence it derived the name by which it has been known to history."

Rambles in Old London, George W. Jacobs and Company, page 101

Conclusion

[There has been a major lie concerning the Catholic Church. That being, the Catholic Church's claim that Peter was the first Pope.

Just briefly, Peter was not present in Rome at the time the first Church was started, Paul was. Also, the Catholic Church did not start listing Peter as the first Pope, until a few hundred years after Paul started the first Church in Rome. Peter did not come to Rome until after Paul's death. Had Peter visited Rome while Paul was in prison, Paul would have mentioned him in his letters, as a matter of protocol. The movements concerning the Apostle Paul and the Apostle Peter were closely tracked and recorded in the Bible. Remember, Peter was called and chosen to evangelize the Jews, not the Gentiles.

What's the significance? This claim gave the Catholic Church, through this heresy, moral authority and the base for their power, and acceptance as "the" Christian religion. This was made secure when the Roman Emperor Constantine made Catholicism the official religion of the Roman Empire. This is not an attack on the Catholic people; they are unaware of this, and unaware of being unaware. However, it is incumbent on them once they learn the truth, to separate themselves from this heresy. Jesus said: Rev 18:4 "And I heard another voice from Heaven, saying, Come out of her, My people, that you may not be partakers of her sins, and that you may not receive of her plagues." The lie "misrepresentation" by the Popes claiming they were the chosen lineage by Jesus Christ, selected by Jesus Christ to be the Vicar, in succession of Peter, helped them perpetrate a fraud on the World. It gave them access to the governments of the World, as a representative of the Roman Empire, with the largest military power on Earth at that time, busy conquering the World. Likewise, Rome used the Catholic Church, through the Church's coercive power, to control the kings of the Earth. Due to their fraud and deception

as an imposter, as the Church of Jesus Christ, they gained control of the governments of many Nations. The Catholic Church; let me make this clear, I'm talking about the hierarchy, not those in the congregations. The Catholic Church as an institution is lead by Satan, not Jesus Christ. I can hear people say: "what did you say"? Don't drop your coffee cup, let me explain. It goes without saying this statement will be attacked. It would of course be easier not to deal with this subject, and save me from what I know will be angry comments by loyal Catholics. I'm sorry to say this because of the pain I know it will cause, but all you have to do is look at the facts of history to know this is true.

To give a few examples, the 1213 Charter, where King John gave all of his holdings to the Pope, based on the fraud and misrepresentation by Pope Innocent III, the supposed moral leader of the Catholic Church. This truth would have excluded him from being a party to this Charter, had this truth been known. King John would not have given his holdings to the Pope if he had known the Pope was not a representative of God Almighty, or vicar of Jesus Christ, but instead an imposter. The king surrendered his holdings under duress and threat of eternal damnation, by the Pope, the alleged appointed vicar of Jesus Christ. This fact voids the 1213 Charter, and all others signed by the Pope, or any representative of the Vatican acting as the agent of Jesus Christ, brought about by the authority acquired by the Pope, as a result of the Papacy's claim to be the Vicars of Jesus Christ.

The Pope's rejection not once but twice, of the 1215 Magna Charta, as a party "witness" to the document, as a result of his being a party to the 1213 Charter, is without any legal standing. However, I have said the document was not a legal document because king John was forced under duress, by threat of death to sign the document. It would have been legal if the Barons threat had been carried out, removing the monarch and his heirs, instituting a new government, which would make the Magna Charta redundant, because they could have put in place the laws of their choosing.

Another proof as to who the Catholic Church "Pope" answers to, is the recent events exposing the Catholic Church for what it is. The hundreds of homosexual priests preying on young boys, as a matter of policy being protected by the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church appointed these priests with the common knowledge homosexual priests were being admitted to the Church. If it were not Church policy and just an isolated event occurring now and then, with swift defrocking of the reprobate priests, they might could argue against their being a satanic Church. This however, is far from the case and proves the Catholic Church is an arm of Satan. Jesus Christ said: "you are either for me or against me." There are only two sides, Good "Jesus Christ" vs. Evil "Satan". Jesus Christ declared homosexuality is an abomination. Those that practice it are turned over to a reprobate mind. The priest of the Catholic Church would reject this totally and say I was full of hate, and not mindful or tolerant of others feelings, and was not a true Christian because I showed no love or mercy, never mind what Jesus Christ Word says on the subject. Which, thank you, proves my point, as to who these Catholic priests serve. Have you noticed how the priest and Catholic hierarchy never bring up verses that condemn the homosexual behavior. Jesus Christ made it clear, homosexuality is evil and is never condoned in His Word and says those that practice it will be barred from entering the Kingdom of Heaven. I'm not saying that a homosexual can't be saved, quite the contrary, but it is rare. Jesus Christ said, Satan comes as an angel of light, an imposter. Am I calling the Pope the anti-Christ? No, but his actions expose the Catholic Church for what it is, also revealed in Revelation 17, as he that was, and is not, but yet is. Look at the millions of people killed in wars started by the Pope, look at all the people tortured by the Catholic Church during the inquisition, not to mention the betrayal I've already written about. Remember what Jesus Christ said: "Satan comes to kill, steal and destroy." The child "Catholic Church" has always immolated its father "Satan". Another scripture to remember: 1 Peter 5:8, John 10:10.

I'm sorry for the pain this will cause, but the truth has to be told. The World has lived under this illusion long enough. I know we are far removed from the middle ages, however the World we live into day is a direct result of the Papacy's false claims as the Vicars of Jesus Christ. You cannot, I repeat, cannot separate the spiritual aspect of the Papacy's effect on History. The effects of the Papacy has been on secular governments, which has shaped the whole of World history. The Catholic Church a religious institution, brought with it the Roman Empire. Why do I say that? It's a matter of history, the Emperor Constantine after making the Catholic religion the official religion of Rome, began issuing edicts making them part of the Catholic Church. The effect was, the

Priests of the Catholic Church became ambassadors of Rome. Just as when the Catholic priests went into England, many laws of Rome were interwoven into English common law. So the Catholic Church has effected in a major way the whole of the civilized World, secular and religious, they cannot be separated. So the issue of the Pope's false claim as Vicar, is directly responsible for the World in which we live. You can argue whether or not that is good or bad, or if you would want to change the status quo, that is not the issue. The fact is the Papacy's policies are totally against freedom, personal rights, or any government that is not a monarchy, this is a matter of history and Treaty. In conclusion, KNOWLEDGE IS FREEDOM.

09/11/02

James Montgomery