

House of Windsor's masonic cult scored

by Mark Burdman

The first political explosion after Britain's June 11 national elections came on a surprising flank. A Church of England working group headed by Exeter University professor Dr. Margaret Hewitt issued a discussion paper that had taken two years to prepare, the essence of which is a stunning denunciation of the cultish, anti-Western belief structure of British freemasonry. The report reopens political warfare against the House of Windsor, especially at a moment when the Windsors are already being embarrassed by revelation after revelation in the British press about the degenerate behavior of the family's younger generation.

As the *Daily Telegraph* pointed out June 19, "Freemasonry has had strong royal links almost from its beginning." Indeed, June 24, 1987, is the 270th anniversary of the founding of the Mother Grand Lodge of the Order of Freemasonry in 1717. Even if the ensuing history of freemasonry has been complicated by "infiltration" efforts by republicans like Benjamin Franklin, the founding of the Mother Grand Lodge was inextricably tied up with the post-1714 victory of the House of Hanover/Windsor over republican currents represented by Jonathan Swift and Gottfried Leibniz.

Today, the foremost Master of what is now called the United Grand Lodge, is the royal family's Duke of Kent. The June 19 *Daily Express* stressed that the Church of England report "will come as a blow to the Duke of Kent." Commander Michael Higham, Grand Secretary of the United Grand Lodge and aide to the Duke of Kent, said: "We were not expecting this at all. . . . It is disappointing that Grand Lodge was not offered a chance of replying to the accusations before the report was published."

An individual involved in preparing the Church of England report, told *EIR* that the freemasonry's link with the monarchy "is particularly interesting. . . . The Queen, after all, is Supreme Governor of the Church of England. She should be raising her eyebrows, when the Church Synod debates the freemasonry, whose head is her cousin!"

On a second level, perhaps even more profound in potential consequences, the Hewitt report directs attention to one of the core components of what has come to be known as the ideology of the anti-Christian "New Age."

"In Christian theology," Hewitt et al. state, "the name of God must not . . . be replaced by an amalgam of the names of pagan deities." Yet, in freemasonic ritual, they note, a compound name for God is used, derived from combined

Chaldean, Hebrew, Syriac, and Egyptian words for the Supreme Being. This, the report charges, is blasphemous.

Especially by bringing the question of Chaldean and Syriac elements to the fore, the working group has identified that British freemasonry is a continuity of the ancient practices of the "Magi" who ran, from the inside, the empires of Babylon, Assyria, etc. Chaldean-Syriac hocus-pocus was later at the core of the Roman imperial army's Cult of Mithra, and has been at the core of all Mithra-like cults since that time, including the Mithraic components of the pagan "Matushka Rus" belief-structure in Soviet Russia today.

In fact, all "New Age" cults ultimately derive their ideas from these Near Eastern practices; the "New Age" is as old as the hills. The main British proponents of "New Age" beliefs in recent decades—classical translator and poet Robert Graves, historian-philosopher Arnold Toynbee, satanist Aleister Crowley—have all based their ideas on such Syriac-Chaldean "Magi" roots, whether or not all of these individuals were practicing freemasons. Many of these same individuals, like Graves and Crowley, were so intertwined with the evolution of the "drug culture," that the House of Windsor relations to freemasonry, might give pause to those media magnates who find *EIR* founder LaRouche's allegations about the Windsors and drugs, to be a cause for derision.

The Church of England group takes the polemic one step further, emphasizing that the core of freemasonry is trickery: The language used in rituals is similar to that used in Christian liturgy, but omits all mention of Christ. This "would appear to be a denial of divinity of Christ."

'Reprehensible, offensive, positively evil'

Exacerbating the problem, the secrecy surrounding freemasonic rituals must necessarily arouse constant suspicion: "Is it right to expect Christians to swear on the open Bible that they will not reveal the secrets of an organization whose rituals clearly state that they will only be received when the candidate has accepted the obligations of membership? . . . To have to pretend that the Holy Name is the property of an exclusive, explicitly non-Christian society, and to swear on Holy Writ not to reveal it to others, is at best absurd, and might deservedly be labeled both reprehensible and offensive to the Christian conscience."

Also: "From the evidence we have received, it is clear that some Christians have found the impact of Masonic rituals disturbing, and a few perceive them as *positively evil* [emphasis added]." To emphasize the latter point, the report quotes from traditional freemasonic oaths, which define the punishment meted out to those who reveal secrets of the freemasonic rites: "My throat cut across; my tongue torn out by the root and buried in the sand of the sea at low-water mark; being severed in two; my bowels burned to ashes, and these ashes scattered over the face of the earth."

The essence of all this, as emphasized by the British press, is that the report is establishing the blasphemy and heresy of the core of British freemasonic beliefs.