



The Company of the Rings

don Francesco Ricossa

I have before me a clipping of a newspaper from last year: October 20, 2010. The newspaper is *Avvenire*, the daily from the *Italian Episcopal Conference*. The news, on the theater page (p. 31), seemed insignificant, but it is not. Anyone who has had an opportunity to listen to my numerous lectures have often heard me speak on this topic, so the article published that day in a *Catholic* newspaper did not fail to get the attention of a priest who is a reader of *Sodalitium* and who sent it to me: *Theatre: Stars take the field for religious dialogue. A performance to be held in churches, mosques, and synagogues, this was the title; director Lamberto Puggelli brings to sacred places "Nathan the Wise", by Lessing. Starting off on October 22, at the Duomo in Catania, then on to Rome, and then to the Duomo in Milan with the greatest of actors in rotation, the daily newspaper explained. In her article, Angela Calvini (the name is an omen) wrote that Gianrico Tedeschi's stage reading of the play Nathan the Wise will be introduced by the Archbishop of Catania, Msgr. Salvatore Gristina and theologian Giuseppe Ruggieri (which they did, the following October in the Duomo of Catania). "But it doesn't end there," continued the Avvenire journalist enthusiastically, "Nathan will be*

The presentation of *Nathan the Wise* in the Duomo of Catania and in the Basilica of Milan under the patronage of two apparently Catholic prelates in communion with Benedict XVI is viewed as a faithful expression of the inter-religious dialogue promised by the Council of Vatican II and spread throughout the world by "blessed" John Paul II.

performed in January in the Duomo of Milan and in March in Rome in three symbolic places: the synagogue, the new mosque, and in a church. The idea is to spread this play around Italy in places of Catholic, Hebrew and Muslim culture, specifically as a message of brotherhood."

The *Corriere della Sera* of February 21, 2011 (p. 15) informs us that Lessing's *Nathan the Wise*, "a masterpiece of tolerance" and a "parable of interreligious dialogue" was on the program for that evening in Milan, in the Diocese of **Cardinal Dionigi Tettamanzi**, in the Basilica of San Lorenzo Maggiore, introduced on behalf of the Ambrosian diocese by Gianfranco Bottoni, responsible for **Ecumenism and Dialogue in the Diocese of Milan**. So let's give the floor to the Milanese Diocese: "A high-profile, cultural event Monday February 21, at 7:00 pm in the Basilica of San Lorenzo Maggiore in Milan. Great performers of Italian theatre, led by Gianrico Tedeschi, present the stage reading of *Nathan the Wise*, by G. E. Lessing: a classic of great contemporary value on the theme of tolerance and

intercultural integration. A text which, not surprisingly, will be performed in churches, synagogues and mosques throughout Italy in unique evenings with exceptional casts, to highlight the ethical potential of the spoken word, and its capacity to recreate a collective unity in the profound sharing of thoughts and feelings. Along with Tedeschi will be Paola Della Pasqua, Susanna Marcomeni, Piero Sammataro, Marianella Laszlo, Salvo Piro, Silvano Piccardi and Franco Sangermano. The direction is by Lamberto Puggelli and it is produced by Ingresso Libero, social production association for the rediscovery and safeguard of the Teatro d'Arte. The evening will be introduced by Gianfranco Bottoni, responsible for Ecumenist Services and Dialogue for the Diocese of Milan. Performing Nathan the Wise today, that great fable on tolerance, on faith in man and against violence, is not only beautiful and useful, it is "necessary". Today more than ever, the conflicts that torment the peoples of the earth display their absurdity if we listen once again to the words of the Jew,

*Postcard distributed by the Sermig
of Ernesto Olivero in the spirit of Lessing*



Nathan, words that everyone - Catholics and Muslims, Jews and Christians - should remember in a profound reflection on the absurdity of any alleged universality of one religion. Nathan, archaic and mysterious, with his piercing and moving humanity, enduring on his own skin the agony of religious struggle, by overcoming any spirit of revenge, acquired the moral strength to condemn fanaticism, blindness to reason, and obscurantism. In the name of right and correct action, and in that universal brotherhood that is the starting point and the ultimate utopia of the parable around which the drama revolves. In the name of a tormented and revolutionary humanism, capable of reestablishing the dignity and greatness of man, of a conscious man: "the wiser man" yet to come. In the name of love, of unique and irrepressible longing, of permanent suffering and nebulous hope, the feeling by which man loses himself in spirit and God becomes incarnate. A man renewed by the awareness of his value and his duty, a man capable of operating according to those precepts that give strength and validity to the utopian project enunciated by Nathan and supported by the wisdom of Saladin: 'It is enough to give up offending others, it is enough that every man tolerates his neighbor.'

The staging of this Nathan is part of Lamberto Puggelli's directorial research outside the usual theatrical spaces and circuits, with a view to recover the civil and sacred function of the stage as a place of true and authentic contact with

the public to remember the truth of poetry. The poetry of great art which is, as Nathan teaches, a humble truth nested in the wisdom and mystery of living. Poetry is, in itself, sacred: and the sacredness of the place is fundamental to the secular and religious implementation of this theatrical event, which can only take place in a church, with the commitment both civil and religious of a community that wants to grow in harmony of diversity. Around the Altar, on a simple platform and in a bare space, actors will say words that will resonate as a message of tolerance and peace. The Jew Nathan, the Sultan Saladin, the young Templar, the lovely female creatures, Recha, Daja, Sittah, the dervish Al-Hafi, the friar Bonafides, all interpreted by great actors of the Italian stage, this is also an evident sign of a productive commitment and a passionate participation by each member, which lives in the show and gives itself to a listening community. The Milanese evening - admission is free - is funded by the Ecumenist Service and Dialogue of the Diocese of Milan, by the Islamic Religious Community, by the Union of Young Jews of Italy, by the University of Studies of Milan, by the Faculty of Letters and Philosophy of the University of Catania, by the Italian Touring Club, and by the magazine Sipario”.

I apologize to the reader for this long quotation: the text that you just read, including the statement: **“the absurdity of any alleged universality of a religion”**, can be found on the “Webpage of the Ambrosian Diocese”.

Ecumenists recognize themselves in Lessing’s Masonic thinking.

The Archbishop of Catania, and the then Cardinal Archbishop of Milan, are admittedly ecumenists. In fact, they understand their episcopate as a dutiful application of Vatican II. And the Council of Vatican II consecrated ecumenism among the Christian confessions (*Lumen Gentium, Unitatis redintegratio, Orientalium ecclesiarum*), inter-religious dialogue with non-Christian religions (*Nostra aetate*) and “non-believers” (*Gaudium et spes*), and freedom of religion, conscience and worship (*Dignitatis humanae personae*). A Conciliar bishop in communion with Benedict XVI believes his pastoral mission consists in the application of ecumenism, declared “irreversible” by the “blessed” John Paul II and by his successors.

It is in this context that we must understand the above fact: that the presentation of *Nathan the Wise* in the Duomo of Catania and in the Basilica of Milan is under the patronage of two prelates, apparently Catholic, in communion with Benedict XVI. Lessing’s work, in fact, is clearly viewed as a faithful expression of the inter-religious dialogue promised by the Council of Vatican II and spread throughout the entire world by “blessed” John Paul II.

But who was this Gotthold Ephraim Lessing? Born in 1729 to a Lutheran pastor, died in 1781 in Brunswick, Lessing is one of the principal exponents of German

Enlightenment, and in his philosophical thinking tries to reconcile Leibnitz and Spinoza. But Lessing is, above all, a known and fervent adherent to Freemasonry, initiated on October 14, 1771 at the Lodge “Zu den Drei Goldenen Rosen” (“At the three golden roses”), of the Orient of Hamburg⁽¹⁾. Lessing is not a philosopher who is also accidentally a Freemason, rather he is a masonic philosopher, as is demonstrated for example by his *Masonic Dialogues* (*Gespräche für Freimaurer*, of 1778-1780), and his *Nathan the Wise* (Berlin, 1779). Lessing explicitly draws from Luther (“a great misunderstood man” “who liberated us from the yoke of tradition”) and Gioachino da Fiore (“the time of the New Gospel will certainly come, which is also promised to men in the books of the New Testament, the division of the history of the world into three ages was not a vain chimera”), and his remedy for the division among Christians is, for him, “the invisible Church” of Freemasonry⁽²⁾.

The baptized who - trusting their shepherds - crossed the thresholds of the Duomo of Catania and the Basilica of San Lorenzo in Milan to listen to Lessing’s words, instead of entering a church - entering The Church - were entering a Lodge⁽³⁾.

The Plot of Nathan the Wise, a kind of Masonic-Enlightenment serial novel.

For the reader ignorant of Lessing’s drama, here is a reprint of the book’s plot from the internet: “The

munificent Saladin, Sultan of a Jerusalem both fabulous and permeated of a subtle aura of Freemasonry, Sultan tolerant to the point of desiring to marry into a Christian sovereign’s family, during a truce in the Third Crusade, pardons a Templar because he resembles a brother of whom he had lost trace long ago. Nathan, a wise and rich Jewish merchant, just returns from a voyage, to learn that his daughter Recha was saved from a fire by this same Templar. The fanatical German Knight, after a long distrust, accepts the thanks and friendship of the Jew. However, when he asks for the hand of Nathan’s daughter, Nathan puts him off and asks for more time. Meanwhile, put to the test by Saladin with the question of which was the true religion, the wise merchant explains the parable of three identical rings, symbolizing the three great monotheistic religions, in which one true ring was hidden along with two copies (see Boccaccio, Decameron, I, 3). By justifying in this way a universal humanism, Nathan wins over the friendship of the Sultan. But the Templar, lost in his love and wounded by the refusal, learns that Recha is, in reality, Nathan’s sole adopted daughter, and is a Christian although ignorant herself of this truth. He could obtain, by force, that which he desired, at the cost of ruining the Jew, but he is prevented in doing so by Saladin. In a conversation between Nathan and the good friar Bonafides, the background can be discovered, and the story can be resolved. Recha, as a child, was entrusted to

Nathan by the same friar after her entire family had been burned by the Crusaders. The friar gives the Jew a little book in which two revealing genealogies are noted in Arabic. Everyone converges in Saladin's palace. Nathan then reveals to Recha that he is only her stepfather, but also lets her know that she has a brother. This is the same Templar who, after his immediate delusion, accepts with joy his new sister. Nathan welcomes both of them as his children and adds the final revelation. The real father of the two youths, a friend of his, was not German, but one married to a German woman. The writing of the notes in the revealing little book, in fact, testifies that the father was none other than Saladin's missing brother. Saladin joyfully adds to this renewed family himself as second adoptive father and his sister Sittah as adoptive mother".

It feels like reading a *feuilleton* from the 19th century! But beyond the naïveté of the plot, the reader cannot escape Lessing's thinking. The three protagonists represent the three monotheistic religions (and, more generally, the variety of religious confessions), who each must become aware of their spiritual "kinship". It is no coincidence that the Christian is a Templar, that is, representing a chivalric order which was born in the "intolerance" of the Crusades, but which, then, became the model of syncretist and heterodox religiosity. The Muslims are represented by Saladin, whose figure, as we will see, has been synonymous with wisdom and chivalry since the middle

ages, in the Ghibelline environments. But over them all - the only one aware from the very beginning - is the unique consciousness of the Masonic "truth", the *deus ex machina* of everything that follows - the Jew Nathan, not surprisingly called "*the Wise*", for he does the work of illuminating Saladin and the Templar to move past their fanaticism (especially Christian fanaticism) to "tolerance". The heart of Lessing's work is found in the Legend of the "Three Rings", which the Jew recalls for Saladin (see the text in the appendix).

The Legend of the Three Rings and its Medieval Origin

In this regard, allow me a personal anecdote. Irene Pivetti was only a little-known MP of the *Lega Nord* party when I attended a conference that she had organized, during which the illustrious medievalist Franco Cardini spoke; he is well known to our readers (as past collaborator of the para-Masonic magazine *Ars Regia*, or as the laudator of the "pagan martyr" Hypatia). In his address, the Florentine historian, once a disciple of Attilio Mordini and a close associate of Adolfo Morganti (enthusiastic about all traditions), referred to the medieval legend of the Three Rings, clearly showing how he recognized himself in the spirit of that tale. On the other hand, to me, who listened with interest, the Legend of the Three Rings seemed to express the spirit of Freemasonry rather than that of the Christian Middle Ages, or the spirit of the

current inter-religious dialogue opened by the Conciliar Declaration *Nostra Aetate*, subsequently consecrated by the great meeting in Assisi, so strongly desired by John Paul II. In fact, a close connection between the Legend of the Three Rings evoked by Cardini, and that of Freemasonry, is amply demonstrated by Lessing's work. In any case I thank the well-known Tuscan scholar (who I first met at a medieval history seminar which the kind publisher Volpe organized with the support of *Alleanza Cattolica* in the 1970s at San Miniato al Tedesco, near Pisa), for having drawn my attention to the legend and its relevance.

I was convinced, then, against current thinking, that the Middle Ages were always synonymous with Christian civilization and Christianity. Now, certainly Christianity had its apogee in the so-called Middle Ages, but this does not mean that everything was of itself Christian, or that the Church, even in the epoch of greatest splendor of the social Kingdom of Christ, did not have to struggle against enemy forces always present in history to oppose the Reign of Christ. An example (surely not the only one) of the action of the Enemy even in the brightest centuries of Christian history may be found precisely in the Legend of The Three Rings which Lessing, in the eighteenth century, had resurrected from two Medieval sources: The *Decameron* by Boccaccio and, even earlier, *The Novellino*, which inspired Boccaccio.

The Legend of the Three Rings in Medieval Literature: *The Novellino*

The legend or fable of the "Three Rings" then, even before Boccaccio, made its appearance in Italian literature at the end of the thirteenth century, as the seventy-third short-story of *The Novellino* ⁽⁴⁾. The anonymous writer was perhaps a Florentine, but he surely was not the inventor of the short-story or the story's moral, partly transforming it and partly recovering it from an earlier tradition, about which I will return. For the moment it is enough to remind the reader of the environment into which *The Novellino* was born, vividly described by the pen of Msgr. Umberto Benigni in volume IV of his work *Storia Sociale Della Chiesa*:

"In fact, Frederick's influence in favor of Islam in the popular mentality had an echo that perhaps no one has thought of until now: The Novellino, whose compiler is a Frederick II enthusiast, willingly narrates Arabian tales where the Islamic world cuts no poor figure. Nor could the echo of Saladin's knighthood be missed, the tale of which is found in the Ciciliano Avventuroso of Bosone da Gubbio, and elsewhere (...) and the novelist, a worthy Frederician, recalls without repugnance, indeed with complacency, the sacrilegious comedy (true or invented, does not matter) where the Christian Knight Ugo of Tabaria confers Knighthood, with all due ceremony, to Christians' terrible enemy, the Sultan Saladin, an ideal for the Suevoian traitor and apostate, who envied

Saladin for not having a Pope... or the decalogue... over him” ⁽⁵⁾. The matter seemed so important to our author that he returned to it, even at the cost of repeating himself, in the next volume of the *Storia Sociale*:

“...In the 14th century, *The Novellino* gathered various short stories together. The spirit dominating them is that of a rhapsodizing, passionate Frederician, who sees his ideal in the anti-Christ Frederick, and that says it all” ⁽⁶⁾. “We insist on the great value of this little book for the study of the spiritual and moral crisis of the Middle Ages. It provides glimpses and flashes that are worth examining. Frederick II himself is revealed by the fanatic Frederician as one who very seriously orders the killing of one of his hunting falcons, because instead of catching a crane to which it had been launched, it grabbed an eagle which was “his Lord” (symbolizing the Frederician eagle, the imperial, nonreligious eagle, the master of the world). And this same story writer, a worthy admirer of the Sultan, gives acclaim to Ugo of Tabaria, a gentle and capricious Knight, who fulfilled Saladin’s wish to become a sacred Knight, a lord of great value and courtesy (‘*quel sacré chevalier*’, a French humourist would say); and the story describes the entire solemn ceremony with great pomp” ⁽⁷⁾.

The Novellino, therefore, was brought to life within the Ghibelline circles of Frederick II, the excommunicated and deposed Emperor, “a pagan with Muslim nostalgia” who “didn’t understand the Christian Empire,

that is, the reality within which and for which he lived” ⁽⁸⁾.

The legend of the three rings: The exoteric version of the blasphemy of the three imposters

Until now we have followed the events of the legend of the three rings. From modernist ecumenism we discovered Lessing’s Masonic Enlightenment; from there, we found traces of the legend in Boccaccio, and before him, in the court of Frederick II of Swabia in *The Novellino*. But Pope Gregory IX, the great friend of Saint Francis, in a famous epistle of 1239, accused Frederick II himself of advocating the blasphemy according to which Moses, Mohammed and Christ were three imposters ⁽⁹⁾. Menendez Pelayo (1856-1912) shows how this heresy was attributed to figures close to the Emperor as well, such as Pier dalle Vigne, or the necromancer Michele Scoto. But how is it possible to attribute such (apparently) dissimilar errors to the same character or to the same environment? How can it be said simultaneously that the three “monotheistic” religions are all true (the three rings), or, contrarily, all false (the three imposters)? Let’s read from Msgr. Benigni again. After having spoken of the dangers of the Hebrew-Arabic influence in Medieval Catholic philosophy, Msgr. Benigni moves on to examine - following Menendez Pelayo - “*the mythic blasphemy (not the book) of ‘De Tribus Impostoribus’*”. “As for the *De Tribus Impostoribus*, the still unresolved

question surrounding this blasphemy, according to which Judaism, Christianity and Islam were established by three imposters (Moses, Christ and Mohammed) is very interesting". "The late legend of its being a book has now been debunked: it was not a writing from the Middle Ages (the later published writings are apocryphal) ⁽¹⁰⁾, but rather an oral doctrine, attributed to various sources, among which was most certainly the wicked emperor Frederick II. But from what source came the idea of bringing together under the same formula those three founders of religions - Moses, Christ and Mohammed? The question arose among Christians who were, more or less, supporters of this blasphemy ⁽¹¹⁾. In our opinion, the source must be sought in the recesses of the Judeo-Arabic philosophy of the times we are examining. It was from that unclean font that the poisoned water infiltrated Christian soil; the Frederick court was one of the pestilential pools where water stagnated most visibly.

An evocative symptom is found in the exoteric formula of that blasphemy (i.e. not secret, but public, ed.): a formula that we find in *The Novellino* previously mentioned (that collection of short stories that exalts Frederick II and speaks appeasingly of the Jewish-Arabic world), and in the 'Avventuroso Ciciliano' by Bosone da Gubbio, another echo of that environment.

It is the formula of the three rings. The Sultan of Egypt, needing money, wants to extract it from a rich Jew by forcing him to answer the very

compromising question: which, of the Islamic, Judaic or Christian religion, is the true one? And the witty Jew responds with the parable of the three rings. 'Here was a father of three sons, who owned a ring with a precious stone, the finest in the world. Each of the three sons prayed to the father that at his end, he would leave him the ring. The father, seeing the ill will that might ensue, sent for a fine goldsmith and said: 'Master, make me two rings as fine as this one, and put a stone in it that looks like this'. Thus having obtained the three rings, he secretly gave a ring to each of the sons, so that each believed they had the true ring, and no one but the father knew the truth'. And so the Jew, by applying the three rings to the three religions ('the Father above knows best, and the children, that is, each one of us, thinks he has the right one'), comes to be admired and is ultimately released by the Sultan.

That such a story is the exoteric formula of the doctrine *De Tribus Impostoribus* seems clear, since that tale leads even the least insightful reader to deduce that God is the author of two false religions and the disguiser of the true one: a nonsense that opens the door to conclude that all three rings are false, and that the three goldsmiths who prepared them were imposters, having had the commission of a father who does not exist or is not a father".

For Msgr. Benigni, "the lies within this exoteric formula which penetrated among Christians under the mantle of a Judao-Islamic short story" "indicates its origin": precisely Judao-Islamic, and he

believes he found a written origin of the blasphemy of the Three Imposters in the “philosophical poem” by the Arab poet Ma’arry. “Of course” Msgr. Benigni continues, “we do not say that Ma’arry was the inventor of the formula (which most likely came from the Kabala), but it is enough for us to find in him the clear formula of the proposition, since this is enough to show us the environment in which it was born”. “Such was the teaching” - concludes Msgr. Benigni - “and propaganda of that Semitic school of Jewish and Arab rationalists, materialists, pantheists, or skeptics, who penetrated the medieval Christian world, from the school of Averroist philosophers, to the Frederican storytellers’ conversations. Thus we will see, how Israel, who, once the historical moment of Arab culture had passed, secretly kept among us the poison *De Tribus Impostoribus* and passed it on to the various sects and converts who prepared for the triumph of the Revolution”⁽¹²⁾, in particular Freemasonry.

In fact, Msgr. Benigni alludes in his conclusion precisely with Lessing’s *Nathan the Wise*: “At the same time that this esoteric or initiatory philosophy of Arab-Judeo rationalism and pantheism poisoned the intelligence of our Averroist doctors and the like, penetrating into the solemn halls of the universities, the Talmudic thought of hatred toward Christianity married with the aforementioned rationalism, sprinkling these small coins of satire and blasphemy around the Christian courts and among Christian people, when these same halls

and courts were in compromised and compromising hands. We recall here the confession, or rather the cynical boast, of a Jewish writer, a fanatic sectarian in the guise of a Renanian scientist named James Darmesteter ⁽¹³⁾ in the book we have already mentioned: ‘Under these visible activities (philosophy, physics, etc. of Medieval Jews), a voiceless and invisible action, unconscious for those who implement it and those who suffer it, and which justifies, post factum, hatreds of the Church (sic): it is the religious controversy that darkly gnaws at Christianity... The Jew intends to reveal points of vulnerability for the Church, and has at service to discover them, in addition to the comprehension (sic) of the Holy Books, the fearful sagacity of the oppressed. **He is the doctor for the unbeliever**; all the rebels of the spirit go to him, in shadow or in the open. He is at work in the immense blasphemy laboratory of the great Emperor Frederick (II) and of the princes of Swabia and Aragon; it is he who forges all that deadly arsenal of reasoning and irony that he will leave as a legacy to the skeptics of the Renaissance, to the libertines of the great century; and some of Voltaire’s sarcasm is nothing more than the last sonorous echo of a word murmured six centuries earlier, in the shadow of the ghetto, and even earlier, at the time of Celsus and Origen, in the very cradle of the religion of Christ’. (...) By mentioning Frederick II, this circumcised writer evidently alludes, with the ‘immense blasphemy laboratory’, to the affair of the *Tribus Impostoribus*. Another confession of the

*Semitic origin and diffusion of that blasphemy: we will add, in this regard, that once the moment of Arab culture had passed, it will be Israel which will preserve among us, in the secrecy of the initiates to the Kabbalah and its accomplices, the tradition of the Tribus Impostoribus. It will resurface as the great convulsion as the end of the eighteenth century approaches. Then we will see Gottoldo Efraim **Lessing** (the friend of the Jewish philosopher Moses Mendelshon, poorly regarded by both his co-religionists and Christians, which says everything about his philosophy) who publishes *Nathan the Wise* - note the Hebrew name of the symbolic character - an assertion, barely veiled out of prudence, of the doctrine of the “the three imposters”. And the whole essence of the *Encyclopedia and Voltairianism* is there, as Ma’arry had put it in verse and as the skeptical Jews and Saracens repeated it in the halls of the cursed Swabian”, i.e. Frederick II”⁽¹⁴⁾.*

Interreligious Dialogue is the Path to Atheism (Pius XI)

As we have seen, and according to Msgr. Benigni, even “the least insightful reader” understands, reading the fable of the three rings, that if God is the author of the two false rings, and that if He deceives all three of the sons making each believe he has the one true ring in his possession; therefore it follows that God is no longer Truth itself, but the author of error and of lies. Not only, therefore, must two of the three rings be false, and

all three can be (since no one can know which of them is true), but as Lessing has the judge say in his tale “**all three of you are cheated cheaters**. All three of your rings are false. Most likely the true ring was lost, and your father had three made to conceal the loss and to substitute for it.” Actually, in the parable, all three are swindlers, as each claims he has the real ring, when no one knows who has it; and all three are cheated by the Father, who makes them believe that they have the real ring, each to the exclusion of the other. From such a swindler Father, it can be expected therefore, as the judge speculates, that all three rings are fake, and that the real one had been lost (or perhaps, instead that by the Father, Lessing thinks that the true ring is held by the Lodge... or Lucifer). God, therefore, would be a swindler, and would swindle those who claim to hold to Divine Revelation. This is how, from the Three Rings, a parable in favor of tolerance and the brotherhood of all religions all of which come from God, we move on to the blasphemy of the three imposters, in which God and Religions are lies and deceits, and for whom “*God is either a father who does not exist, or isn’t a father at all*” (as Msgr. Benigni concludes).

It is the same teaching that we find in the Encyclical *Mortalium animos* of Pope Pius XI (January 6, 1928), and it would be good to reread this passage after the recent meeting in Assisi so desired by Joseph Ratzinger on the 25th anniversary of the one longed for by Karol Wojtyla. Speaking about

‘pan-Christians’, or Ecumenists, Pope Pius XI wrote:

*“Persuaded that it is very rare to meet men totally devoid of any religious sense, you see them harboring the hope that it would be possible to lead people, without difficulty, despite their religious differences, to a fraternal understanding of the profession of certain doctrines considered as a common foundation of spiritual life. Consequently, they usually hold congresses, meetings, conferences, attended by many listeners, inviting everyone to their discussions without distinction, infidels of all kinds as well as the faithful of Christ, and even those who, unfortunately, have separated from Christ or who, with persistence and harshness, deny His divinity and the nature of His mission. Such initiatives cannot, in any way, be approved by Catholics, since they rely on the erroneous doctrine that religions are all more or less good, or praiseworthy, in the sense that all, although in different ways, manifest and signify the natural and innate feeling that leads us to God, and pushes us towards recognizing his power with respect. In reality, the partisans of this theory not only err and deceive themselves, but more so, they pervert the notion of a true religion and repudiate it, **gradually turning to naturalism and atheism.** The conclusion is clear: to sympathize with the partisans and propagators of similar doctrines means to move away completely from revealed religion”.*

Judaic origins of the parable of the three Rings

From Msgr. Benigni we have seen how the blasphemy of the three imposters had Judaic origins. The same can be said of the legend of the three rings, which is its exoteric version. Its origin already appears evident in the fact that the protagonist of the short story is a Jewish sage (he is anonymous in *The Novellino*; in the Decameron he is Melchisedech; for Lessing, Nathan): it is he who tells the story; it is he who, threatened by Saladin, deceives or convinces him; and it is from him, from the Jew, that the origin of the tale is found. And indeed, scholarly research leads us to the same conclusion as that blasphemy of the three imposters: to search for the origin of this parable, and its blasphemy as well, among the Medieval Spanish Jews. A short essay by Claudio Tugnoli (*La parabola dei tre anelli*, 2003) informs us about the studies made by Gaston Paris and Mario Penna on this subject. Gaston Paris (1839-1903), philologist, Academy of France, in a conference held in 1884 and then published in 1906 ⁽¹⁵⁾, held that the origin of the parable of the three rings must have circulated among the Spanish Jews (who lived in close contact with Christians and Muslims) in the Middle Ages. This original source, would then have been retold, much later, at the end of the fifteenth century, in *Scévet Jehudà* by Salomon ben Verga. According to Mario Penna, who wrote in 1952 ⁽¹⁶⁾, the original version of the parable is, instead, Christian, and he

attributes the distortion of this tale in favor of tolerance (or skepticism) to the Spanish Jews. In the earlier, Christian version of the tale from about the thirteenth century, the father is presented as having one legitimate daughter, while his wife, having been unfaithful, had other daughters whom she tries to present as legitimate. The father then gives to his own daughter, the legitimate one, a miraculous ring: so that only his true daughter will have this miraculous ring. The other youngsters forge other rings, manufactured in a similar way, but false however. The wise judge, having tested the virtue of the rings, declares that only one of his daughters was legitimate, and the others were illegitimate. It was then that in a Jewish environment, and probably in Spain, with a polemical purpose, the tale was distorted into a parable with two alterations: the ring lost all its miraculous virtue (so one could no longer distinguish which was true and which was false); and, which is a significant change, the author of the false rings are no longer the illegitimate children (and in this version, all three children are instead legitimate and loved by the father), but is the father himself. Thus, the author of all the religions, the true one as well as the false ones, is God himself, while in the Christian version God is the author of the True Religion, and men are the authors of the false ones.

The originating environment of the version that passed into *The Novellino* and the *Decameron*, that is, Judeo-Islamic Spain, leads us back to the

same environment of the blasphemy of the three imposters: Medieval Judeo-Islamist Averroism, so much in vogue in the court of Frederick II.

The reader might object that it is unlikely that in Judaic circles, the law of Moses would be declared false or in doubt, or on equal footing with the laws of Christianity or the Quran. One must consider, however, that the tale presents itself clearly as a ruse by the rich and wise Jew at Saladin's expense: he insinuates doubt between Christian and Muslim as to the truth of their religions, and even on the scriptural foundation of their religions (the Old Testament). The Jew, as already mentioned Darmesteter says, is the doctor of the unbeliever, or, as Saint Paul teaches us, "*They are contrary to all men, as much as they impede us from speaking to the Gentiles that they may be saved*" (1 Thess. 2, 15-16).

But we can go even further. Let's not forget, for example, that Jesus himself - to the Jews who claimed the advantage of being the sons of Abraham - said to them that on the contrary, "*they have the devil as their father*" (John 8, 44) and that "*they have abandoned the commandments of God to follow their own traditions*" (Mt 15, 3-9). The Pharisees, like the Kabbalists, are certainly not heirs of Moses as they pretend to be. Anomistic [against the law] currents are frequent in Judaism (think of Sabbatai Zevi and Jacob Frank); for Erik Peterson, the Gnostic interpretations of Genesis and the fall of humanity must be traced back to a Jewish environment, and still today

the concept of struggling with (against) God or of judging Him is widespread in Judaism. So it is not surprising that one of the nations in which atheism is most widespread is Israel itself.

The three rings today: Freemasonry

What about the parable of the three rings today? Following Lessing's *Nathan the Wise* (which had posthumous success thanks to Schiller and Goethe), Freemasonry is seen today in the parable of the Three Rings as an excellent representation of Masonic ideals: "*The dramatic poem of brother Lessing, Nathan the Wise, is strongly Masonic. (...) The naming of Lodges and not a few Masonic newspapers with the name 'Three Rings' is a fraternal tribute to the genius of Lessing*" ⁽¹⁷⁾. Jean-Pierre Laurant, for example, writes: "*A Lodge of Guénonian inspiration that reunites Christians, Muslims and Jews, the so-called Three Rings, must be created*" and it was. "*A René Guénon Lodge exists in Milan, in the sphere of the Grand Orient, reposing the symbol of the three rings (the three religions)*" ⁽¹⁸⁾. Since 2010, the René Guénon Lodge, which has the symbol of the three rings, has left the Grand Orient group to rejoin the Grand Italian Lodge.

The three rings today: Judaism

We have seen that the tale of the "three rings" originated in a Jewish environment. But what is the form in which current Judaism offers a sort of

"salvation" to the other two "rings", Christians and Muslims? The answer is what has been repeatedly offered by the chief Rabbi of Rome, Riccardo Di Segni, and it is that of the so-called **Law of Noah or Noahidism**. *Sodalitium* has already talked about it in an article of June 2002 (no. 54): "*To speak clearly is to be understood better. Noahidists and Head Rabbi Di Segni*". Rabbi Di Segni, editor of the reprinting of the infamous *Toledoth Jeshu* (see *Sodalitium* no. 47), speaking on the 17th of January 2002 before a large number of prelates at the seat of the Seminario Romano Maggiore, explained to Catholics (?) what salvation there may be for Gentiles (non-Jews), or how they too may have a part, in some way, in the future world. Only the Noahidists (sons of Noah) who respect the seven laws of Noahidism will be able to "save themselves", explained the Rabbi. And one of these laws is that of the strictest monotheism, respected by Muslims, but not by Christians, due to their adoration of the Trinity and of Christ. Christians are idolaters (and idolaters must be put to death). But there is "hope": the one for Christians, if they do not know how to renounce the divinity of Christ, and they admit, at the very



*The Livornese
Rabbi Elia
Benamozegh
(1823-1900)*



Logo of the René Guénon Masonic Lodge

least, that “*the Jews, by virtue of their original and irrevocable election, and their possession and observance of the Torah, possess their own autonomous, full and special path towards salvation which does not need Jesus*”. Perhaps, just perhaps, in this case, Christians could be considered Monotheists and then Noahidists. Like the Freemasons, who do not recognize a Trinitarian God, they must, according to the words of Anderson’s Constitutions, “*observe the moral law as a true Noahidite*” (*ibid* p. 40). The 60th issue of *Sodalitium* (pp. 57-58) informs us of the fact that Di Segni, himself the son of a Freemason, had explained the Noahide law to the “Brothers” of the Italian Grand Orient in 2003 and to the Grand Lodge of Italy in 2006. In the same article, I pointed out that **Professor Andrea Riccardi**, the founder of the **Comunità di Sant’Egidio**, now a minister and the promoter of the first historic conference held at Assisi 25 years ago, is also a convinced follower of the Noahidite doctrine, that which was expressed by the Livornese Rabbi Elia Benamozegh (1823-1900) (*Israel and Humanity, a study of the problem of Universal Religion*, Livorno, 1885; Genoa, Marietti, 1990). The rabbi (one of those rabbis closest to Masonic ideals, wrote Liana Elda Funaro)⁽¹⁹⁾, who saw

Freemasonry as the vanguard of this (Noahidite) religion, hoped that Christians and Muslims would recognize Israel as the ‘Priest of Humanity’, thus becoming part of the universal Noahide religion (see *La Stampa*, January 17, 2007; Don Nitoglia in *Sodalitium* no. 34 pp. 18-34). Benamozegh perfectly expresses the ideal nature of the parable of the “Three Rings” and its final purpose.

The three rings today: Islam

We have already seen how the tale of the Three Rings found its origin in the Judeo Islamic environment of Arabic Averroism, first in Spain and then at the court of Frederick II. In a review to the reprinting of *Nathan the Wise*, Cardinal Ravasi writes how the playwright compares the words of the judge in Lessing’s version to those of the Koran: “*If God had wanted, he would have constituted a single community, but he did not do this, to test you in what he gave you. Compete, therefore, in good works so that you may all return to God and at that time He will inform you of those things about which you are now at odds*” (V, 46, 48). “*He loved all three of you equally - says the Freemason judge - he did not want to humiliate two of you in order to favor just one. Strive to imitate his incorruptible and unprejudiced love! Let each compete to demonstrate in the light of day the virtue of the stone in his ring*”. The similarity is, indeed, striking. The aforementioned Guénon (René Guénon 1886-1951), eminent esoterist

and Freemason, as is known, was an adherent to Islam (the esoteric version of Sufism). His disciple, among others, is the Milanese Felice Pallavicini, aka Sheik Abd al-Wahid Pallavicini, born in 1924, apostate from the Faith in 1951, Guénonian, repentant Evolian (although he affirmed it was Evola who actually directed him to Sufism), host of the *Centro Studi metafisici René Guénon*, and, as a Muslim, of the Co.re.is (*Comunità religiosa islamica*), the ambassador of the Mosque of Rome to the Vatican Secretariat for Interreligious Dialogue, and a member of the Council of the Elders at the Grand Mosque of Paris. The apostate in question participated at the first meeting in Assisi, so desired by John Paul II. It may appear strange to the uninformed that he is a good friend of the Honorable Mario Borghezio, clearly known to be an enemy of the Muslims; or that our Muslim is in good standing with the Hebrew community, or that there is a photograph of him dressed as a Knight of Malta. How many personalities can there be in one person! Now, in the Italian daily, *Sole 24 Ore* (August 15, 2010, p. 29, *Riparlamo di Tradizione primordiale*) our Sheikh spoke out on the very topic of the tale of the Three Rings, in reference to an article published in *Sole 24 Ore* by a regular contributor, **“Cardinal” Ravasi** (August 1, 2010). Contrary to the Guénonians of the Milan Lodge, and to Cardinal Ravasi, the Sheikh, even though a Guénonian, does not seem to totally recognize himself in the story. *“Cardinal Ravasi seems to share in the opinion of those who would*

see in this story the antidote to the extremes of fundamentalism and relativism or ‘concordism’ if you prefer, not realizing that in fact, this leads to a sort of indifference to the truth...”. This Medieval novel, then, is too modern, even for Pallavicini, and more so because Ravasi updated it with Karl Rahner’s theology. After the Sheikh gave the Cardinal this lesson (one as much a Cardinal as the other is a Sheikh), Pallavicini proposes a more traditional version of the Three Rings, that of the *“unique primordial tradition, what Islam calls din al qayyima, Axial Tradition, and in Hinduism, the Sanatana Dharma, or Perennial Law”*. *“This primordial Tradition”* continues Pallavicini, *“despite being well known, at least at a conceptual level by Ravasi himself, and after having been duly labeled as ‘Gnosticism’ in Catholic environments, is constantly silenced”*. In reality, Pallavicini’s *“Primordial Tradition”*, via Guénon, dates back precisely to the Catholic Traditionalism of the Restoration age, condemned by the Church for its fideism, even if not all its exponents were condemned (de Maistre, de Bonald, Donoso Cortes, Lamennais, Ventura di Raulica, Gioberti, Bonnetty and his *Annales de philosophie chretienne*, Ubaghs and the Loviano school, Bautain, etc), Traditionalism which was one of the ancestors, always in fideism, of Modernism (Laberthonniere headed the *Annales* from 1903 to 1915). The Traditionalist Pallavicini, rather prefers to quote a much older authority: *“Islam recognizes it ab origine, just as ab origine*

it recognizes the legitimacy and salvific validity of all the messages that have occurred throughout the history of humanity through divine messengers, a central theme of the Holy Quran, and not the fruit of some late, questionable speculation". Islam, which recognizes (in its own way) the mission of Moses and Jesus, as well as Mohammed, is ab origine for the "Three Rings". The Sheikh's criticism of Lessing's short story can be compared to the Freemason Guénon's critique of Modern Freemasonry in favor of a more Traditional Freemasonry. But in the end, it's six of one and half a dozen of the other. That the Sheikh is "Traditionalist" confirms the fact that he prefers... Cardinal Scola to Cardinal Ravasi: "Cardinal Scola uses another effective neologism when he claims he is open to 'pluriformity in unity', a phrase that recalls the concept expressed by our master, René Guénon, regarding the plurality of 'religious forms'. Which testify to the various aspects that come together in the reality of the oneness of God. This 'neologism' of the Cardinal allows us to hope that our first Italian Muslim Mosque in the city of Milan itself, could constitute the harbinger of a summit agreement between the monotheistic Abrahamic revelations" (II Sole 24 Ore, July 31, 2011, p. 24). Scola is more Guénonian than Ravasi, then...

The three rings today: Supporters of Vatican II

The Catholic Church has always condemned false religions and Freemasonry. So how is it possible that Lessing's *Nathan the Wise* is presented in a Cathedral? The new fact which cannot be ignored, is Vatican II. It was then that Ecumenism, condemned in the Encyclical *Mortalium animos* by Pope Pius XI, came to be welcomed, instead, as a doctrine and irreversible mission of the "Church" (with *Lumen Gentium*, *Unitatis redintegratio*, *Orientalium ecclesiarum*, *Dignitatis humanae*). It was then that "inter-religious dialogue" came to be consecrated, founded on a positive vision of non-Christian religions (*Nostra aetate*), dialogue to be extended even to atheists (*Gaudium et spes*, 19-21) in the conviction that Christ, by his Incarnation, unites Himself in a certain way to every man (*ibid* no. 22) and that the religion of God Made Man meets with and does not contrast with the religion of Man Made God (Paul VI, speech at the close of Vatican II). The Conciliar declaration *Nostra aetate* regarding Judaism, so desired by the Jewish-Masonic association, B'nai B'rith⁽²⁰⁾, for the first time presents non-Christian religions positively: Animism, Hinduism, Buddhism (no. 2), Islam (no. 3) and above all Judaism (no. 4), condemning any discrimination on religious grounds (no. 5). John Paul II tried to connect this positive evaluation of non-Christian religions, abusively linking it to the patristic doctrine of the "Semi del Verbo" ["Seeds of the Word"] (see *Sodalitium*, no. 48 p. 39) and to the Incarnation (*Gaudium et Spes* no. 22; address to the

Cardinals after the meeting in Assisi) making these doctrines ‘visible’ by practicing the ritual gestures of these religions himself. For John Paul II, “*the firmness of belief of the members of non-Christian religions is sometimes an effect of the Spirit of Truth that operates outside the visible boundaries of the Mystical Body*” (Encyclical *Redemptor hominis*) and “*The Holy Spirit is even mysteriously present in non-Christian religions and cultures (...) It could be said of the Holy Spirit: each has its part, and all have its entirety, so much is His generosity inexhaustible*” (March 26, 1982). But most of all, it is with respect to Islam and Judaism (the current Pharisaic anti-Christian Judaism, that has nothing to do that of the Patriarchs and the Prophets), those other two rings of the Judeo-Arabic-Masonic parable, that John Paul II built his new doctrine. Even in this case, gestures were significant: the visit to the Synagogue and the Mosque, the prayer according to the Jewish custom at the Western Wall, all repeated several times by Benedict XVI - Ratzinger. In Paris, and on many other occasions, he declared that “*the Muslims are our brothers in faith in the one God*”: as he did also to the Jews, as our “*older brothers*”, or rather “*our fathers in faith*” with whom God maintains His covenant “*never abrogated*”⁽²¹⁾. For Ratzinger (in Jerusalem, May 31, 2009) the life of the ‘believer’, whether Christian, Muslim, or Jew, is similar because it comes from and leads to God: “*This same dynamic is found in individual believers of the three great*

monotheistic traditions: in tune with the voice of God; like Abraham, we respond to His call, and set out seeking the fulfillment of His promises, striving to obey His will, tracing a path in our own particular culture (...) Abraham’s first step in faith, and our steps to and from the synagogue, the church, the mosque, or the temple, walk the path of our individual human history, paving the way, we might say, towards the eternal Jerusalem (see Ap. 21, 23)”. For the new Conciliar doctrine, Christians, Muslims and Jews: 1) adore the same God belonging to the three great monotheistic religions; 2) belong to the spiritual descendants of Abraham, as if Faith in the Holy Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, the Incarnation and the Resurrection were secondary. How can supernatural faith be given when these revealed dogmas are not only ignored, but openly denied?

The meeting of all religions desired by John Paul II in Assisi went even beyond the tale of the Three Rings.



Above: Hon. Borghezio together with Felice Pallavicini

Left: The same Sheikh Abd al-Wahid Pallavicini, dressed as a Knight of Malta

Freemason Grand Master Corona wrote: “*Our Interconfessionalism earned us excommunication in 1738 by Pope Clement XI. But the Church was certainly wrong - wrote GrandMaster Corona - if it is true that the current Pontiff gathered men of all religious confessions in Assisi on October 27, 1986 to pray together for peace. What else were our Brothers looking for when they gathered in their Temples, if not the love between men, tolerance, solidarity, the defense of the dignity of the human person, considering themselves equal beyond their political beliefs, their religious beliefs, their skin color?*” (the magazine *Hiram*, spring 1987). Father Rosario Esposito SSP, previously quoted by us, writes: “*On October 27, 1986, John Paul II invited the supreme heads of many religions to Assisi. Everyone prays for peace, each remains in their own religion, and prays with their own formulas. The **spirit of Assisi**, which had already expressed itself countless times, albeit in terms less solemn and public, then took many other steps. **Freemasonry was established precisely to establish this spirit and has codified it since the first day of its foundation...***” ⁽²²⁾. Joseph Ratzinger, who had already beatified the one responsible for the first meeting in Assisi, has promoted, for the 25th anniversary, a second meeting of this great modernist Lodge presided over by him, which will be held shortly.

The three rings today: in our environment, the curious case of Msgr. Bux

It's not titles that he lacks: born in Bari in 1947 and ordained (?) in 1975, he carried out research at the *Ecumenical Institute* at the *Biblicum* in Jerusalem and at the *Istituto San'Anselmo* in Rome; Monsignor Bux is professor of Sacramental Theology at the *Facoltà Teologica* and *Istituto Superiore di Scienze Religiose* at Bari, Consultor to the Congregation for the Cause of Saints and of the Doctrine of Faith, as well as in the Office for Pontifical Celebrations, peritus at the Synod of Bishops of 2005 and 2010, and consultant to the magazine “*Communio*” (that of the *Nouvelle Theologie*), author of innumerable publications on dogmatic theology and liturgy, and, according to *Disputationes Theologicae*, “*among the most esteemed collaborators of Holy Father Benedict XVI*” (in 1977 Joseph Ratzinger wrote the preface to one of Bux's books). When the illustrious Monsignor made his priestly ordination (?) under the new rite in 1975, the Lefebvre case was known to everyone and the question of the liturgical reform was put into discussion; news from Don Bux in this regard: not received. Also not received was news of his celebration of the so-called rite “of Saint Pius V”, when this celebration, now declared “never forbidden”, was most assuredly forbidden. But after the *Motu Proprio Summorum Pontificum* of 2007, we hear nothing but Don Bux, or rather Msgr. Bux. Often present when the “extraordinary rite” is celebrated, always in the front row at conferences on the ancient liturgy, an exegete of Ratzinger's

“Reform of the Liturgical Reform” (see Bux, *La riforma di Benedetto XVI*, with a preface by “Cardinal” Cañizares, pub. Piemme) Msgr. Bux warns us, a little late, but encouraged by Vittorio Messori, that going to mass (?!) today can lead to the loss of the faith (see Bux, *Come andare a Messa e non perdere la fede*, pub. Piemme), even if he himself contributed to the problem, if what they write at *Effedieffe* [Italian publisher] acclaiming him is true, that he collaborated with the Benedictine Bishop Magrassi on the post-conciliar reform of the liturgy in his diocese (Bari). Should we be jealous, perhaps, of this last minute worker? Should we scorn such an illustrious conversion? The problem lies elsewhere. The problem is that many “traditionalists” now hang on every word of a character who, imitating Benedict XVI, is a master of Ecumenism and interreligious dialogue. Indeed, Nicola Bux, then in 2005, and again in 2011, is collaborator with Michele Loconsole (who writes such blather as “*The Trinitarian God who became incarnate*” - wasn’t only the second person incarnated?... or that Mohammed “ascended into heaven” from Jerusalem), and Philippe Farah of the “**Calendario comparato Ebraico Cristiano Islamico**” [The Comparative Jewish Christian Islamic Calendar] edited by *Enec* (Europe-Near East Center). Even Nicola Bux, then, is a disciple of the Three Rings... in the extraordinary rite. The “Reform of the Reform” consists, therefore, in this: to put Extraordinary Rite Modernists in charge of Traditional Catholics.



Msgr. Nicola Bux

The Three Rings Today: in our environments, marching toward Assisi! (the Assisi of Wojtyla, not that of Saint Francis)

Conference invitation for Oct 1, 2011 of the "traditionalists" version of the "Motu proprio" who set themselves off towards... the meeting of the religions of Assisi

Pellegrini della Verità verso Assisi
Un approfondimento sui passi di Benedetto XVI
SABATO 1 OTTOBRE 2011
ROMA - Casa Urban Pastor, via Aurelia 308

9.15 **Messa in Rito Romano Antico**
Celebrazione: **Mons. Guido Pozzo**, Segr. Pont. Comissariato Ecclesiale Del

10.30 **Rev. do Prof. Serafino M. Lanzetta**
Bless. "L'Incontro della Meditazione"
"La Dominica Assisi - Pluralità salvifica di Cristo e della Chiesa"

11.15 **Rev. do Prof. don Mauro Gagliardi**
Pont. Università Regina Apostolorum
"La Giornata di Assisi: l'interreligiosità magisteriale, l'immagine verso mondo e il nostro compito"

12.00 **Prof. Giuseppe Ferrasi**
Segretario Nazionale dei GRGI
"Verso forme di religiosità, quale dialogo è possibile?"

14.00 intervento di **S.E. Card. Raymond Leo Burke**
Presidente del Supremo Tribunale della Segnatura Apostolica

15.30 **S.E. Mons. Hon Tai-Fai Savio**
Segr. della Congregazione per l'Evangelizzazione dei Popoli
"Evangelizzazione e dialogo interreligioso. Quali le tappe, dalla giornata di preghiera per la pace in Assisi"

A seguir intervalli e dibattito con:

- Rev. Prof. Manfred Hauke**
Facoltà Teologica di Lugano
"Senza Verità oppure "spinoz dualista"? I Padri della Chiesa sulle religioni pagane"
- Rev. Prof. Don Nicola Bux**
Istituto Nazionale di Bari
"Si adortano quelle che comuicatore (Gv 4,22). Verità, Chiesa e carità."
- Prof. Corrado Guerri**
Università Europea di Roma
"Pellegrini della Verità verso Assisi"

Associazione Culturale "CATHOLICA SPIN"
- Confessio, ego vici mundum - (Lu 18,28)

Pilgrims of Truth toward Assisi. An in-depth look at the steps of Benedict XVI... On Saturday, October 1, the “traditionalists” version “Motu proprio” sets off toward...the meeting of religions in Assisi, incredible but true! A Mass (?)

by Bishop Guido Pozzo, participation by the Franciscans of the Immaculate Conception and the usual Bux (see the poster) etc. At the World Youth Day in Madrid were already present ex-Lefebvrians, and even Bishop Fernando Rifan acclaiming Kiko Arguello (Neocatechumenal Way), and a mass (?) was celebrated in the so-called “ancient Roman Rite”. And now, nothing less than “the Spirit of Assisi”. Paul VI persecuted those who wanted to remain Catholic, Ratzinger makes them Ecumenists. So ahead with the “Ancient Roman Rite” (celebrated perhaps by priests ordained in the anti-Roman, modern rite) towards the universal religion of Rabbi Benamozegh!

The three rings today: in our environment, traditionalists for what tradition?

If the more or less “traditional” clergy enters the ranks of the Company of the Rings thanks to Joseph Ratzinger, many lay people have always militated there. We speak of those who in the 1960s and 1970s and even after arrived to “Catholic traditionalism” (of every shade) from previous experiences, Guénonian and/or Evolian, often through the example of Mordini. *Sodalitium* has talked about this many times, for example about *Massimo Introvigne and Freemasonry* (no. 35), *Introvigne, the Black Masses at the Grand Lodge* (no. 38), *The lies of Massimo Introvigne* (n. 39), *Julius Evola, Traditional man or Kabbalist?* (no. 42), *Between Esoterism and Devotion* (no. 43), *Masonic*

Alliance...? (no. 46), *A Great Initiate: René Guénon* (no. 47), *Joseph de Maistre esoteric* (no. 49), *Karol, Adam, Jacob* (no. 49), *We will build Cathedrals again: Christian esotericism by Giovanni Cantoni and Massimo Introvigne* (no. 50), *Cristina Campo or the Ambiguity of Tradition* (2005), etc. etc.

The series of articles began from a report in the Freemasonic magazine, *Ars regia* ⁽²³⁾ on which Massimo Introvigne collaborated with Franco Cardini, staunch defender of Israel (and he’s not the only one), the former being a staunch defender of the Islamic world (and he’s not the only one). The historian Cardini (about whom we spoke concerning Hypatia: *Sodalitium* no. 64, *Il mito di Ipazia*) was also, for a long time, president, and is still a supporter, of the cultural association *Identità Europea*, publisher Adolfo Morganti from Rimini (*Il Cerchio* editions) ⁽²⁴⁾. We would like to seek information from Morganti. The magazine founded by the Rotary Club of Rimini, *Ariminum* (May-June 2010, pp. 51-52) published an article by Arnaldo Pedrazzi, “*Pedagogy of liberties*”, apologetic directed towards the Grand’Oriente d’Italia. Not so shocking for the Rotary Club (even if generally it uses greater discretion, and even if the nearby Rotary Club of Novafeltria-Alto Montefeltro counts among its members the most Ratzingerian Bishop of Italy, **Msgr. Luigi Negri**, “Bishop” of San Marino). What is surprising, however, is the high-profile quote that the said article gives us of a conference by Adolfo Morganti, designated as head of the



The "Comparative

Jewish-Christian-Islamic Calendar" edited by Eneq (Europe-Near East Centre) whose editorial team also includes Nicola Bux

diocesan GRIS (*Gruppo di Ricerca e Informazione Socio-Religiosa*) for the Diocese of Rimini: "The affirmation of the communist ideology in the East pushed the Church to make peace with its former enemies. It was above all Pius XII who opened a dialogue with Freemasonry". Now, it is certain that under Pius XII some religious (traitors) tangled with Freemasonry; that Pius XII, as Head of State, had to speak with politicians who were Freemasons, is undeniable; but that **Pius XII** had opened a dialogue with Freemasonry and made peace with it (??), is incredible. Here then is the question for Professor Morganti: did you really utter this phrase, and when, or was it falsely attributed to you by Pedrazzi? P.S. A brief research on the site of GRIS of Rimini reports the following words by the Professor: "Later however, - explains Morganti - **something changed**. The affirmation of communist ideology in the

East pushed the Church to **make peace** with its former enemies. It was above all Pius XII to open a **dialogue** with Freemasonry and, in fact, contact between the two entities became practice" (...) "The two institutions **can collaborate** for example for charitable initiatives, but they are mutually irreducible". I doubt that Morganti contradicts GRIS of Rimini, or denies it himself. We must then conclude that for him: 1) Church and Freemasonry are reconciled, 2) Church and Freemasonry can collaborate, 3) that it was most of all Pius XII who opened the dialogue among Catholics and Freemasons (he does not tells us how, where and when). Oh, and the conference of this professor took place at Acquaviva Picena in May 2009, at the *Centro ricerche personalistiche Raissa e Jacques Maritain*, and was entitled 'Freemasonry and the Catholic Church'.

Against the "three rings": Christ, the way, the truth and the life. Integral Catholicism

Much more could be said, since there are countless regiments of the "Company of the Rings". However, I conclude with a message of hope. One can, still today, resist the seductive invitation to enter into the Universal Ecumenical Temple of Religions. However, one must be willing to be rejected by the world, and believe not only in words but in fact, that Christ is the Way, the Truth and the Life, to the exclusion of anyone else, that the only true Church is His, Catholic, Apostolic

and Roman, outside of which there is no salvation, and that it is necessary to reject every form of Modernism and NeoModernism, denying them every authority and legitimacy. It was the program of Saint Pius X, and of those who, along with him, the Integral Catholics, struggled against the Modernist heresy. Today, it is our turn. It is not enough to condemn the modernists who are now dead and judged by God, who can no longer do harm (except through their writings). Today's modernists are quite alive, powerful, prestigious and influential, and they must be denounced, and from them we must separate ourselves. Few have the courage to do it.

Appendix

To be thorough, we publish the three versions of the tale of the Three Rings.

The Legend of the Three Rings in the text of *Il Novellino*

II Novellino (LXXIII)

The Sultan and the Jew

As the Sultan, having need of money, wanted to entrap a Jew.

The Sultan, having need of money, was counseled to entrap a rich Jew who was in his land, and then take his possessions, which were great without number. The Sultan sent for this Jew and asked him which was the true faith, thinking: If he says Judaism, he will make an insult against me. And if he says of the Saracens, I will then say "Then why are you a Jew?" The Jew, hearing the question of the lord, answered: "Sirrah, there was a father who had three sons, and he had one ring with a most precious stone, the finest in the world. Each one of them prayed to the father that he would leave this ring to him. The father, seeing that each one desired it, finally sent for a goldsmith and said "Master, make me two rings exactly like this one". The Master made the rings identical, so that no one knew except the father. He sent for his sons, one by one, and to

each he gave one in secret. And each believed that he had the one, and no one knew the truth except the father. And so I say to you that same thing is of the three faiths. The father above knows the best one, and the sons, which we are, each believe we have the one." Then the Sultan, upon hearing this stirring, did not know how he could entrap him, and set him free.

The Legend of the Three Rings in the *Decameron* by Boccaccio

First day, third short story.

It's Filomena's turn to narrate.

You must know, my dear companions, that, just as folly often leads people out of their happy estate and casts them into the utmost misery, even so, good sense extricates the wise man from the greatest perils and places him in assurance and repose. How true it is that folly brings one and many from fair estate unto misery is seen by a multitude of examples, the recounting whereof is not our present concern, considering that a thousand instances thereof do every day manifestly appear to us. But that wisdom of consolation is the cause, as I promised, with a little story I will briefly show.

Saladin,—whose valor was such that not only did he make the king of Babylon a small man, but he gained many victories over Saracen and Christian kings, having spent his entire treasury in diverse wars and in the exercise of his extraordinary munificences, and having an urgent need to replenish his treasury, and seeing not whence he might avail to have it as promptly as it behooved him, he recalled a rich Jew, by the name Melchizedek, who lent money at interest in Alexandria, and bethought himself that this latter had so much he could come out whenever he pleased, and although he could, he was so miserly that he would never have done it of his own freewill. But Saladin was loath to use force with him; wherefore, his own needs constraining him, he set his every wit at work to find a means how the Jew might be brought to serve him in this, and presently concluded to do him a violence yet coloured by some show of reason.

Accordingly he sent for Melchizedek and receiving him familiarly, seated him by himself, then said to him, "Honest man, I have understood from diverse persons that thou art a very learned man and deeply versed in matters of divinity; wherefore I would fain know of thee whether of the three Laws thou reputest the be true, the Jewish, the Saracen or the Christian."

The Jew, who was in truth a man of learning and understanding, perceived but too well that Saladin looked to entrap him in words, so he might fasten a quarrel on him, and bethought himself that he could not praise any of the three more than the others without giving him

the occasion he sought. Accordingly, sharpening his wits, as became one who felt himself in need of an answer by which he might not be taken advantage, there speedily occurred to him that which it behooved him reply and he said:

“My lord, the question that you propose to me is a nice one and to acquaint you with what I think of the matter, it behoveth me tell you a little story, which you shall hear. If I am not mistaken, I recall to have many a time heard tell that there was once a great and rich man, who had, among other most precious jewels in his treasury, a very goodly and costly ring, whereas, due to its worth and beauty, he was of the mind to celebrate it, and wishing to leave it in perpetuity to his descendants, he declared that whichsoever of his sons should, at his death, be found in possession thereof, by his bequest unto him, should be recognized as his heir and be held of all the others in honor and reverence as chief and head.

He to whom the ring was left by him did the same with his own descendants, even as his father had done. In brief the ring passed from hand to hand, through many generations, and came at last into the possession of a man who had three goodly and virtuous sons, all very obedient to their father, wherefore he loved them all three alike. The young men, knowing the custom of the ring, desiring each for himself to be the most honored among his folk, as best he might, besought his father, who was now an old man, to leave him the ring when he came to die.

The worthy man, who loved them all alike and knew not himself how to choose to whom he should leave the ring, he bethought to promise it to each, to seek to satisfy all three and privily let make by a good craftsman other two rings, which were so like unto the first that he himself scarce knew which was the true.

When he came to die, he secretly gave each one of his sons his ring. Wherefore each of them, seeking after their father's death to occupy the inheritance and the honor and denying it to the others, produced his ring, in witness of his right. And the three rings being found so like unto one another that the true one might not be known, the question, of which was the father's very heir, bode pending and yet still pendeth.

And so say I to you, my lord, of the three Laws to the three peoples given by God the Father, whereof you question me; each people deemeth itself to have his inheritance, His true Law and His commandments; but of which in very deed hath them, yet like the rings, the question yet pendeth.

Saladin perceived that the Jew had excellently well contrived to escape the snare which he had spread before his feet. Wherefore he concluded to reveal to him his need and see if he were willing to serve him. And so accordingly he did. The Sultan confessed to him that which he

originally had it in mind to do, had he not answered him so discreetly.

The Jew freely furnished him with all that he required, and the Sultan afterwards satisfied him in full. Moreover, he gave him very great gifts and kept his friendship, still maintaining him about his own person in high and honorable estate.”

The Legend of the Three Rings in “*Nathan the Wise*”, by G. E. Lessing

In the work by Lessing, the little story of the three rings is found inserted within the play of *Nathan the Wise*, a much larger writing. Here is the part where Nathan recalls the ancient legend to Saladin:

Saladin: That which I ask of you is your learning, so much better than others. That you are so wise, tell me, once and for all, which is the faith, for you being the law, is that most convincing over all others?

Nathan: I am a Jew.

Saladin: I am a Muslim. And the Christian stands between us. But of these three religions, only one can be true.

Nathan: Allow me, O Sultan, to narrate a little story?...Many years ago there was a man, in the East, who possessed an inestimable ring, a dearest gift. The stone, an opal beautifully colored in the center, having a secret power: to render to whomever carries it faithfully graces from God and man. Who would be surprised that the man never left it off his finger, and that he studiously provided that it was always secure in his house? He left the ring to his most beloved son; and he left a writing that when he died, that son would leave it to his most beloved son, and each time the most beloved son of the father would be the heir, the head and lord of the household, regardless of his birth, only by the strength of the ring. Do you follow me, O Sultan?

Saladin: I follow. Go ahead.

Nathan: And so the ring passed from father to son, until one father had three sons. All three loved him equally, and he could not do less but love them in the same way. At times, one or the other seemed more worthy of the ring, but when he was alone nothing could divide his affection for them in his own heart. So, with affectionate weakness, he promised the ring to all three. This went on for a while. As his death approached him, the father found himself in a quandary. He could not bear to disappoint his two sons, who trusted his promise. What was to be done? So he secretly called a jeweler, and ordered that he make two rings equal in every way, and ordered that he spared nothing, neither money nor effort, to make them perfectly equal. When the jeweler brought them, not even the father

could distinguish which was the true ring. Happy, he called his sons one by one, and to all three he gave them a ring. Then he died. Are you listening, O Sultan?

Saladin: I am listening, I am listening. Finish up your tale. Is it soon ended?

Nathan: It is ended. That which follows you yourself know. The father having died, each son went ahead with his ring, each son wanted to be the head of the household. They fought, they are indignant, they accuse each other. All in vain. It was impossible to prove which had the true ring. How then is it for us (after a pause, during which he waited for a comment from the Sultan) to prove which is the true faith.

Saladin: This is your answer to the question?

Nathan: I beg the Sultan to excuse me, if I dare not try to distinguish the rings that the father made so perfectly that it is impossible to distinguish them.

Saladin: The Rings! Don't mock me! The religions that you name can be distinguished even in the clothes, the food, the drink!

Nathan: And yet therewith not in the fundamentals. Are they not all based on written or handed-down history? And history must be accepted only by faith and fidelity, is that not true? And what faith or loyalty will we doubt less than that of the others? That of our ancestors, blood of our blood, that of those who give us the proof of their love from childhood, and that never deceived us. If they deceived us, would it be to our health? Could I believe my own father less than yours? Or vice-versa? Could I, perhaps, believe your fathers, without accusing my own fathers of lying? Or vice-versa? It is the same thing for Christians, isn't it?

Saladin: (By the living God! He is right! I must stay quiet!)

Nathan: But let's return to the rings. As I said, the children each accused the other in court. And each took to the judge that he received the ring from the hand of his father (and that was true), and that it happened a long time before the privileges granted by the ring (and this also was true). The father, as everyone surely said of him, could never have deceived him, always being ready to think of the good, so each could only accuse his brothers of it. And so each was ready for revenge.

Saladin: And the judge? Speak out!

Nathan: The judge said: Bring quickly to me your own father, or I will scatter you from my presence! Do you think you are here to resolve puzzles? Or do you want to stay here until the ring itself speaks to us? But...wait! You say the ring has magical powers to render to its owner the love of God and men. This will decide. False rings cannot do this. Come, tell me, which of you is most esteemed by the other two? Come one! You are quiet? The effect of the ring is only

reflexive not transitive? Each of you only loves himself? Then all three are fakes and scoundrels. Probably the true ring was lost, and the father made three to conceal the loss and replace it.

Saladin: Magnificent! Magnificent!

Nathan: If you have no further desire, continued the judge, I will offer counsel but not a sentence. Go! But my advice is this: accept things as they are. Everyone has a ring from his father, and each one is sure that it is authentic. Your father, perhaps, was no longer willing to tolerate in his household the tyranny of a single ring. And of course he loved each and all three of you, he didn't want to humiliate two to favor one. Come now! Strive to imitate his love, incorruptible and without prejudice. Let each one race to bring to the light of day the virtue of the stone in the ring in him. And help your virtue with sweetness, indomitable patience and charity, and with a profound devotion to God. When the virtues of the ring appear in your children's children, I invite them to return to court a thousand-thousand years hence. And on this seat a greater one than I shall sit upon it, and decide. Go. And so said this modest judge.

Saladin: God! God!

Nathan: Saladin, do you feel yourself to be that wise man that the judge promised...

Saladin: (Leaning toward him and offering his hand, he could no longer let it go until the end) I, dust? I, nothing? O God!

Nathan: What say thee, Sultan?

Saladin: Nathan, my dearest Nathan! Tis not yet that the thousand-thousand years are passed. His wisdom is not mine. But, go. You are my friend.

Footnotes on the Article

(1) Michel Gaudart de Soulages, Hubert Lamant, *Dictionnaire des Francs-Maçons européens*, Dualpha, Paris, 2005, p. 587; Michele Moramarco, *Nuova*



Gotthold
Ephraim
Lessing

enciclopedia massonica, Bastogi, Foggia, 1997, vol. II,

p. 138; H. de Lubac, *La posterité spirituelle de Joachim de Flore*, Lethielleux, Paris, 1979, vol. I p. 275.

2) See DE LUBAC, *op. cit.* 257, 269, 275; de Lubac dedicated an entire chapter of his “Spiritual Descendants of Gioachino da Fiore” to Lessing, and the same Moramarco, a Freemason, defined Lessing’s philosophy as Illuminist-Giochimita (*op.cit.* p. 139)

3) De Lubac always made note that the first translator of *Nathan the Wise*, the Freemason Bonneville, in one of his works entitled *La Bouche de Fer*, defined the word Church thusly: “a Greek word, synonymous with Lodge...” (*op.cit.* p. 275, footnote 1). It is what the modernists want to make it, to transform churches and, if possible, The Church, into a Lodge.

4) Originally called *Libro di Novelle e di bel parlare gentile*, then *Cento novelle antiche*.

5) Msgr. UMBERTO BENIGNI, *Storia sociale della Chiesa*, vol. IV, tome I, Vallardi, Milan, 1922, p. 87.

6) *ibidem*, vol. V, p. 416

7) *ibidem*, vol. V, p. 427-428

8) *ibidem*, vol. IV, tome I, pp. 427-428

9) The first truly suspicious name is that of Frederick II; Gregory IX accused him in a famous letter of having said “the world was deceived by the three imposters (*tribus baratoribus*)...”; MARCELINO MENENDEZ PELAYO, *Historia de los heterodoxos españoles*, book III, Chapt. IV, V. La impudat avorroista - Fray Tomàs Scotto - El libro ‘De Tribus Impostoribus’; Espasa-Calpe Argentina, Buenos Aires, 1951, p. 224.

10) On this question see Georges Minois, *Il libro maledetto. La storia straordinaria del Trattato dei tre profeti impostori*, Rizzoli, 2010 (original French ed.: *Le Traité des trois imposteurs*, Albin Michel, Paris, 2009). The author, far from recommendable, following Massignon, finds the thesis of the three impostors in some Arab-Muslim sects of the 10th century; but there were already two impostors for Celsus, who was abundantly indebted to the Talmud for his arguments (and not vice versa; see pp. 26-36).

11) Menendez Pelayo cites among these Fra’ Tommaso Scotto (almost the same name as Michele Scotto, and like him, a necromancer), apostate friar both from the Franciscans and Dominicans, who “*conversed night and day with Jews*” and taught that “*the three imposters were in the world, Moses deceived the Jews, Christ deceived the Christians, and Mahommed deceived the Saracens*” (pp. 20-226 and CXXXVIII-CXL)

12) U. BENIGNI, *op. cit.*, Vol. IV, tome I, pp. 91-94.

13) James Darmesteter (1849-1894), an Alsatian orientalist, teaching at the College of France.

14) U. Benigni, *op.cit.* vol. IV, tomo I, pp. 101-103.

15) GASTON PARIS, *La poésie du moyen-âge*, 3rd printing, Paris 1906, II, pp. 131-163.

16) MARIO PENNA, *La parabola dei tre anelli e la tolleranza nel Medioevo*, Gheroni editore, Torino, 1952.

17) ALBERT G. MACKEY, *Enciclopedia of Freemasonry*, revised and expanded edition by Robert I. Clegg, *The Masonic History Company*, Chicago, 1953, vol. I, pp. 585-586, under Lessing. The classic Masonic dictionary reports the plot of Nathan the Wise, as well as the full text of Lessing’s Three Ring version.

18) J-P. LAURANT, René Guénon. *Esoterismo e tradizione*. Italian edition, edited by PierLuigi Zoccatelli, pub. Mediterranee, 2008, pp. 124 and footnote 60. PierLuigi Zoccatelli is already well known by our readers in his double role as a scholar passionate about Crowley, Guénon, and Charbonneau, and at the same time Massimo Introvigne’s right arm at *Alleanza Cattolica* and *Cesnur*. A suivre...

19) FULVIO CONTI (editor), *La massoneria a Livorno dal Settecento alla Repubblica*, Il Mulino, Bologna, 2006, pp. 390-398, specifically p. 397. Elio Toaff has written on this: *La Torah universale dei Benéi Noach in Rassegna mensile di Israel*, LIX, 1-2, 1993, pp. 137-140. “*As F. Conti informed me, there actually exists a branch of Freemasonry that refers to the principles of Noahidism*” (p. 398, footnote 118). The Protestant Sento Stari, who Vittorio Feltri always supports, interviewed the Patriarch of the Noahidist Rite, Umberto Verza in *Libero* (December 30, 2006), “*(Noahidism) was born to strengthen and develop the foundational ethics of Freemasonry which according to the Anderson Constitutions must patronize the Seven Laws of Noah handed down from the Talmud*”. The title of the article on page 19 is “*Christianity, Judaism and Islam reunited under the God of Noahide Freemasonry*”.

20) E. RATIER, *Misteri e segreti del B’nai B’rith*, Centro Librario Sodalitium.

21) “John Paul II often took the initiative to develop this declaration in his magisterium. In the course of his visit to the synagogue in Magonza (1980), he said ‘*The meeting between the people of God of the Ancient Covenant, which was never abrogated by God (see Romans 11,29), and those of the New Covenant, is at the same time a dialogue within our Church, in some way, between the first and the second part of its Bible*’. Later, he revealed it to the Italian Hebrew community during a visit to the synagogue in Rome in 1986, where he said ‘*The Church of Christ discovers its ‘ties’ with Judaism, “scrutinizing its own mystery” (see Nostra Aetate, 4). The Jewish religion is not extrinsic to us, but in a certain way, is intrinsic to our religion. We therefore have toward it a relationship that we do not have with any other religion. You are our favorite brothers and, in a certain way, one might say our older brothers.*’ Finally, during a conversation on the roots of anti-Judaism in Christian environments (1997), he declared: ‘*This people is gathered and led by God, Creator of heaven and earth. Its existence is therefore not a pure fact of nature or culture... It is a supernatural fact. This people perseveres towards and against everything because they are the people of the Covenant and because, despite the infidelities of men, the Lord is faithful to his Covenant.*’ This teaching was sealed by the visit of John Paul II to Israel, during which he addressed the Chief Rabbis of Israel in these terms: ‘*We (Jews and Christians) must cooperate to build a future in which there is no longer anti-Judaism among Christians and anti-Christianity among Jews. We have much in common. Together we can do much for peace, for justice and for a more fraternal and human world*” (Pontifical Biblical Commission, *The Jewish people and their sacred writings in the Christian Bible*, n. 86, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2001. In the preface, Cardinal Ratzinger wrote: “*Christians can learn much from the Jewish exegesis practiced for 2000 years*”. For a refutation of these errors, Don Nitoglia in *Sodalitium*, no. 57, pp. 30-49).

22) R. ESPOSITO SSP, *Chiesa e Massoneria. Un DNA comune*, Nardini, Florence, 1999, pp. 12-13 quoted also and more amply in *Sodalitium* no. 60, p. 9.

23) *Ars Regia* ceased publication. Published in Florence in 1993, *Ars Regia* counted among its collaborators, along with others, the following “brothers”:

Mauro Mugnai, Director and Editor, then President of the Grand Lodge of Italy of the Symbolic Italian Rite, assistant supervisor of the Loggia Nuova Italia-Honor of the GOI (Fulvio Conti), in 1952 head of the Lodge ‘Honor’. Under his scientific direction, we find two Freemasons, Bianca and Rossi:

Mariano Bianca, of the University of Siena, but also director of the magazines *Massoneria oggi*, *Hiram*, *Arket* and of the *Atanor* editions.

Paolo Aldo Rossi, of the University of Genoa. Director of *Airesis, le ragioni dell’eresi*, a member of the cultural association *Le Tarot*, a participant at the conference for the Study of Alchemy at Pavone (Oct 2008) from GOI; at the conference of Triora of the Grand Lodge of Italy, Piazza del Gesù, Palazzo Vitelleschi near Viterbo for his book “*E farai in modo che nessuna strega viva*” (“*And you will ensure that no witch lives*”) (Publ. Mimesis) on which Franco Cardini participated; rector of the “History of Thought” section of *Hiram* magazine, and he wrote the preface to “*E Dio creo l’uomo e la Massoneria*” (“*And God Created Man and Freemasonry*”) by Clara Miccinelli, Genoa 1985.

In the scientific committee there are many Freemasons:

Michele del Re: University of Camerino, lawyer, member of CNR, wrote about Crowley and satanism, new cults and sects. Was affiliated to the Lodge P2 of the GOI. One of his studies was on satanic temples published in a work by Bianca (Publ. by *Atanor*). Collaborates with *Hiram*. **Paolo Chiozzi**, University of Florence, but also on the scientific committee of the magazine *Hiram*. **Enrica Tedeschi**, University of Rome, but also collaborator of the magazines *Hiram*, of the GOI. Other members of the committee, such as **Servadio** and **Salvini**, had already been reported by us as Freemasons. That leaves, among these others... Cardini and Introvigne.

24) The publishing house catalog is a clear example of the publisher’s interest in religious tradition and Guénonian spiritualism. To stay on topic, I would like to point out only one book by Cardini, *Fratelli in Abramo* (*Brothers in Abraham*), published by *Il Cerchio*, dedicated to our Islamic and Jewish “brothers”.
