The Templars, Sionists, and the Freemasons

Book One - Episode 10

King Arthur



This work is a translation of a book written and published originally in Turkish.
The book in whole consists of 23 episodes.

Previous Episode: Holy Bloodline

On the account of Joseph of Arimathea bringing the so-called “Holy Grail” to Britain and hiding it in Glastonbury Abbey at Avalon, we should also mention Arthur, king of the Britons in the first half of the 6th century. [Britons was the name given by the Romans to the Celts inhabiting the south of present-day England. Hence, this is the source of the name “Britain”].

If you ask in a status of chat who the most famous king of England is, some people will answer as “Arthur”. However, during Arthur’s lifetime, there was not yet a country named England. Arthur was the king of the Britons and fought against the Angles to prevent his country from becoming England.

However, the following question is also asked:

“Was there really a king named Arthur in the history of Britain, or is this just a legend?”

This is analogous to the question of whether there really was a Jesus in history.

The historical information available in Britain about that period is intertwined with legends. Historians cannot base their writings about King Arthur on concrete data. They had to present the results of their interpretations and evaluations, which they formed by analysing and rationalising a number of legendary stories as knowledge.

For this reason, the accounts of one historian and another are sometimes inconsistent.

*** * ***

In Continental Europe, the period from 5th to the 8th centuries is commonly referred to as the **"Dark Ages"**.

Some people attribute the reason for this term to the fact that no scientific development, culture, art and philosophy were allowed to flourish at that time.

However, if the criterion for calling a period "dark" is taken as such, it is actually necessary to extend this term to a later period, to 11th and 12th centuries, when the Renaissance movement was preparing to begin.

The period from 5th to 8th centuries inclusive is called the "dark age" mainly because of the scarcity of historical information and documents about what was going on at that time, and the fact that many things remained undetermined. In other words, the term "dark age" used in terms of science, art and philosophy is not identical with its historical usage. In historical terms, this term is not used in a figurative sense, but in the sense of "obscurity" due to the insufficiency or unreliability of direct historical data.

Moving on to Britain, it can be seen that historically this dark age covered a much wider period, beginning in the late 4th century and lasting well into the 9th.

The reason for this is that the Romans abandoned this country in the 4th century, leaving it as exposed to invasion by various tribes, and perhaps also because it was an overseas island beyond the continent.

Historians want to distinguish between myth and fact. But when it comes to the "dark ages" in Britain, they complain that it is like looking for a needle in a haystack.

In Continental Europe, we have already mentioned that the last active king of the Franks, Dagobert II of the Merovingian dynasty, has been erased from history for centuries. In other words, whether or not a person "exists" in history depends not only on the truth, but also on the preference and will of whoever dominates the information about that period of history, that is, whoever dictates this information.

Although the situation in Britain is slightly different from that in Continental Europe, the resulting anxiety is the same.

*** * ***

There are those who argue that King Arthur is not a hero of legend, as some have suggested, but that he definitely "existed" in a concrete and vivid form, who try to prove this, or who support it with all their might.

Who are they?

Those who claim to be descended from the Tudor dynasty, one of the kingly families of Britain.

Why?

Because, in this way they are able to prove that the trunk of the family tree, which they can only trace back to the period of the Tudor dynasty, i.e. to the end of the 15th century, goes back to King Arthur. As a matter of fact, the Tudors once claimed that the throne of England was their right on this ground.

However, it is not so simple. When King Arthur is placed in the trunk of the family tree, it means that the Tudor family has the phenomenon of the Holy Blood.

Just as the Merovingians claimed that Sigebert IV, the son of Dagobert II, united the Israelite tribes of Benjamin and Judah, and therefore was the original possessor of the sacred bloodline, a similar claim exists for King Arthur.

Let's say it is so!... Who opposes this?

Since the beginning of 20th century, the Windsor family, Queen Elizabeth II and the nobles who followed her, have held the throne of the United Kingdom... This is because the origins of this family are not actually British; it is based on the Saxe-Coburg-Gotha joint family of Northern Germany.

In order to prevent a member of the Windsor family from ascending the throne when Queen Elizabeth II dies, an intensive campaign and counter-propaganda has been waged for some time. This campaign is based on the allegations that Princess Diana, the former wife of Prince Charles, who had long since given up hope of the throne, was murdered in a well-orchestrated conspiracy and was not an accident, as had been claimed.

The aim is to uncover the true future occupant of the British throne and to ensure that this is so. King Arthur's place in the trunk of the family tree is considered very important in this respect.

Meanwhile, the husband of Queen Elizabeth II, Prince Philip, who bears the title "Duke of Edinburgh", is hardly ever mentioned. For some reason, he is only regarded as "the queen's husband".

However, in the context of the history of England, the opposite happened at the beginning of 17th century.

In the course of the succession of our topics, we will mention this event in due course.

Knighthood

In the late 12th and early 13th centuries, **Chrétien de Troyes**, a well-known and much-loved French historical poet of the time, wrote five romantic tales cncerning King Arthur.

Why does a French poet concentrate so much on a British king?

This is because Chrétien de Troyes has dealt with the subject of the “Holy Grail” in almost all his stories. Various stories about King Arthur are also closely linked to this.

It is interesting to note that the scope of these stories has changed considerably over the intervening centuries. These changes produce doubt on the historical truth underlying these stories because there are significant differences and even contradictions between the earlier and later versions.

It is clear that none of these stories is completely true from beginning to end, but it is unclear which one is closer to the fact.

The stories of King Arthur have been told in many countries, from Scandinavia to Spain, in culturally different adaptations.

There are two reasons for this.

One is, of course, the subject of the “Holy Grail”, and the other is the concept of “knighthood”, or “chivalry”, which is emphasised in these accounts.

* * *

In the first few centuries of the Middle Ages in Europe, chivalry, according to some, enjoyed a “golden period”. According to those who think so, knighthood in that period can really be called “chivalry”. This institution was later both corrupted and lost its meaning. Later on, every mounted soldier who carried a sword and wore armour was called a knight. Later, even unrelated people were called knights just to give them a title.

Originally, a knight was a warrior who pursued adventures in order to test his knowledge and skills, thus gain a sense of self-confidence. Moreover, he was not just a warrior. He was a person of honour, honesty, good social relations, benevolent, respected, and admired by all.



The knight had a strong wrist and a solid heart. For this reason, princes and even kings wanted to become knights.

However, in order to do so, it was necessary to start as a novice under a knight, to be trained through many stages over many years, then to serve as the knight's armourer, to learn the fighting technique as well as to improve himself as a social person envied by others.

Every armourer wished to become a knight one day. Only that knight could decide whether the man-at-arms next to him could become a knight. He would propose him to the other knights, defend him, and if it was approved, he would be knighted with a magnificent ceremony.

When the qualifications of a knight are put forward in this way, it is seen that this is similar to the concept of "valiant", which was very important and valued by the Turkic tribes in Central Asia at about the same time. However, here we will of course mention just the King Arthur connection.

Pendragon

In the second half of 5th Century, we meet the Celtic King Aediàn, also known as "Uther Pendragon" in the west of present-day England. [Pendragon or Bendragon, according to the Celtic language of that time, literally means "head of the beast"].

Aediàn, whose genealogy traces back to Joseph of Arimathea, founded the first British monarchy based on priestly order, and was crowned by **Saint Columba**, the leader of the Celtic Church.

The Catholic Church then raised an uproar, claiming that the right to crown any king could only be exercised by the Pope, or by a person authorised by him. The "Donatio Constantini", which took away the right to be Holy Roman Emperor from the Merovingian dynasty and gave it to the Carolingian dynasty, had not yet been issued, but when it came to the Celts, the Catholic Church could not remain unresponsive.

However, Saint Columba was very powerful in Britain. No matter what the Pope did, he was no match for him.

But Saint Columba was a human being; of course he would die one day.



The Catholic Church waited patiently.

Indeed, as soon as Saint Columba died, Pope Gregoire I immediately sent a bishop, Saint Augustine, to Britain.

Saint Augustine proclaimed himself Archbishop of Canterbury, and his main task in Britain was to dismantle the Celtic Church before introducing the Christian principles prescribed by the Catholic Church.

He was successful in his endeavours, but only to a limited extent in the south-east of what is now England. The south-west of the island and further afield, in what is now Wales, the northern regions, Ireland and Scotland, remained faithful to the Nazarene traditions introduced by Joseph of Arimathea in the first century, and resisted the Catholic Church.

This resistance was due in no small part to the fact that the kings there -as was also the case elsewhere- were not so much "kings of the country", whereas "kings of the people", and were therefore held in high esteem and respect by the inhabitants.

*** * ***

King Aediàn fell in love at first sight with Ygerna (Igraine) del Acqs, who was married to Gorlois (Hoel), Duke of Tintagel, who attended his coronation, and by whom he had three daughters.

Ygerna's mother, Vivianne, was descended from Jesus and Magdalena. In other words, Vivianne was the daughter of the Fisher King. In some of the legends about King Arthur, she is referred to as the **"Lady of the Lake".**

At this point, **Merlin**, the famous wizard oracle of the time, enters the picture.

Merlin helped King Aediàn in everything. So much so that he enabled him to accomplish many tasks that seemed "impossible" to others.

It came to centre on Aediàn's affection.

Aediàn, with Merlin's help, devised an intriguing plot. He had the Duke of Tintagel murdered. Then he married his widow, Ygerna.

Arthur was the only son born of this marriage. Therefore, he united the lineage of the families of Judah and Benjamin.



However, this favour to Aediàn had a price. According to a condition that Merlin had set as of the beginning, and Aediàn had accepted; if a boy would be born, he would be removed away from his father's vicinity and taken to another place, where he would be brought up specially.

A very clear bargain, and one that was fulfilled in practice...

Because of this, King Aediàn never saw his son until he died.

Excalibur

Arthur was only 15 years old when his father died.

Britain had long been under the threat of invasion by the Scandinavian Yuts on one hand, and Danish Angles as well as German Saxons on the other.

A strong king was needed to protect the Celtic people against them.

The rest is legend... There are many stories. The most popular one goes like the following:

"King Aediàn had daughters by Ygerna, but it was not known that he had a son. Even though everyone was afraid of Merlin and believed anything he said, no one could trust him when he raised this subject. Besides, how could a boy who was not even out of adolescence be king?

Merlin thrust a large sword, which he called ***"Excalibur"*** *(Calibum), vertically into a rock. This sword was magic; it would protect the Briton people. If used well, it could even make them "rulers of the world". Whoever drew it out would prove that he could be the king, the true leader of this country. And this could only be achieved by a single person from the royal family who had the right to the throne.*

One after another tried to do it, but in vain.... It was Arthur's turn. When he grabbed the sword by the handle, he pulled it out of the rock as if he was pulling it out of its scabbard. Merlin then crowned Arthur with his own hand and placed him on the throne. No one could raise an objection."



The summary of another account is as follows:

"One day the Lady of the Lake (Vivianne) appeared in the centre of Lake Avalon. In her hand was a great sword. She handed it to Arthur and said, «This is how you will win, for you are king.»

When Arthur got this magic sword, which had so many tricks up his sleeve, no one could resist him becoming king of the Britons."



Although various names are given in the legends, this sword, which is referred to as "Excalibur" in most of them, is at least as important as Arthur. It even comes to the forefront. Because this is not an ordinary sword; it is talismanic. It is the most important symbol in the stories about King Arthur.

According to the legend, Excalibur becomes a great power in the hands of Arthur only when it comes together with him. For anyone else, it is just a heavy piece of iron that is difficult to lift.

*** * ***

King Arthur's knights used to meet in a castle called "Camelot" to discuss matters of state.

According to the accounts, these meetings had two very important rules:

"1. Although there were twelve knights in attendance, there was an empty chair next to each of them. No one could sit on those empty chairs; they were the chairs of the apostles of Jesus.

2. The HolyGrail was wrapped in a cloth and placed in the centre of the round table. Everyone knew what it was, but no one, not even King Arthur, could unveil it."

Thus Arthur is clearly identified with Jesus.

Let us continue the legendary narrative a little further.

"Much of Arthur's life was spent fighting those who tried to take over this country.

Let's continue a little more with the legendary narrative.

"Most of Arthur's life was spent fighting those who tried to invade this country. He fought twelve battles, one after the other, and emerged victorious from them all. He not only defended his own country, but also took control of parts of Continental Europe as far as Scandinavia. For this, he was also called a conqueror."

These accounts identify Arthur with King David of the Israelites.

"After the death of King Arthur, the Britons lost their defence against invading tribes. There was no longer the Holy Grail or Excalibur. The Angles in the east and the Saxons in the south took over the country. The Celts had to retreat to the west, but that was not enough. They had to cross the famous Hadrian's Wall, built in Roman times to prevent the Picts in the north from encroaching southwards, and settle in what is now Scotland." [The Picts are the original dark-skinned people of present-day Scotland].

*** * ***

Since the sword named Excalibur is as important as King Arthur in all these legends, after Arthur's death, the question of what happened to this sword is asked.

This question is also answered in the legends:

"When King Arthur went on a campaign in Europe, he left the affairs of the country in the hands of his wife Guinevere and Mordred, the son of one of his sisters. Mordred took advantage of his absence and tried to become king. Arthur then had to return to Britain and fight him to keep his kingship.

Arthur defeated Mordred in this battle, but he was severely wounded. He went to Lake Avalon to recover. His wife Guinevere was already frightened and locked herself in a monastery there.

As King Arthur breathed his last, he asked his loyal friend Bedivere to deliver Excalibur to the Lady of the Lake. Bedivere did as he was told."

The Round Table

Among the legendary accounts of King Arthur, the earlier ones focus on Arthur as a hero with extraordinary powers. Later ones, however, leave Arthur a little behind and emphasise the Knights of the Round Table.

The reason for this is obvious. While the king was the sole sovereign power in a country in the past, feudalism was gradually becoming established, and the sovereignty in countries was dominated by barons and knights rather than kings. Thus, in later stories, the Round Table became a more important element than the king.

As a matter of fact, in 9th Century in Continental Europe, Charlemagne established a round table council consisting of twelve people in state affairs. Attempts have also been made to emphasise the British origin of this practice.

In fact, this round table was not objectively Arthur's. His wife Guinevere had brought it as part of her dowry when she got married.

Guinevere had a lover. The interesting thing was that this lover was under Arthur's vision every day, every moment: Arthur's number one knight: **Lancelot**.

King Arthur knew that his wife was having an affair with Knight Lancelot. He didn't mind. After all, Guinevere had no children, so Arthur had three mistresses. Each of them - whatever their real name - was called "Guinevere" like his wife.

In the separate stories, Arthur's children are named differently. It is not clear which one was born to which mistress.

In addition, it is also stated that King Arthur slept with his half-sister Morgawse and that Mordred, who is shown as his nephew in history, was actually his own son.

It should also be noted that not all the stories about King Arthur are heroic tales. Many of them also have a tragic content. One of them is the story of Arthur killing his own son.

The Castle and Grave of Arthur

As regards the scope of the subject matter of this book, the most important point in connection with King Arthur is the castle named **Camelot**...

How can it be that King Arthur, about whom so much has been told, is said to have never even been known to have lived?

It's like this: The whereabouts of King Arthur's castle were not known with certainty even until recently. The fact that no remains of such a castle have been found in England has led to continuing doubts as to whether King Arthur really existed as a real person in history. Of course, this was also due to the fact that many of the narratives that had previously been referred to as undisputed realities, were nothing more than legends.

This remained so until the 1960s. Archaeological investigations between 1966 and 1970 revealed that the castle was buried beneath a natural-looking hill, a large mound, about 20 kilometres from Glastonbury in south-west England, in a place known as **"South Cadbury"**.





It is quite interesting: This was not the result of a standardmethodology, but of a centuries-old, and obviously superstitious belief of the villagers living in the area.

According to those peasants, King Arthur was not dead, and he came there regularly every seven years with his knights. In fact, this belief stemmed from the legends about Arthur.

In this context, there is a saying: ***"He was once a king and will always be a king."***

In a way, this saying emphasises again the identification of King Arthur with Jesus. For the same saying, though in a different sense, was also used of Jesus. It is common even today.

However, let us not pass without saying this: The discovery of the castle is not enough to prove that King Arthur actually lived in history. It is just the remains of a castle in the ground.

*** * ***

In 1191, monks at Glastonbury Abbey, constructed on the site where Joseph of Arimathea had once built the first above-ground church in the world, discovered the tomb of King Arthur. Reportedly, there was also the body of a woman in this tomb, considered as his wife Guinevere.

This was not a random event. Nor was it a discovery. Two years earlier, King Henry II of England had asked the monks there to find this tomb, but he had died before his request reached the monks. Then his son Richard (the Lionhearted), who ascended to the throne of England, sent a bishop he trusted to the monks for this very purpose.

Why?... Was it that important?

Yes!... It was very important... At least the new King, Richard of England thought it as being very important. He hoped to find "something of great value" in King Arthur's tomb. He was following a lead that he had learnt his father had picked up.

When the tomb was found and opened as a result of the investigations, the "thing" that was expected to be there did not come out. But it should have been there... Was a mistake involved.... Or was it somewhere else?... If it was somewhere else, where could it be?

*** * ***

King Richard did what his father had failed to do in his lifetime. In co-operation with King Philippe II of France, he decided to embark on a crusade to Jerusalem, which had fallen back into Muslim hands a few years earlier.

Was his aim to repeat Godfrey de Bouillon's mission of a hundred years earlier? Was he going to look for the "thing" he had failed to find in Glastonbury, this time in Jerusalem, on the Mount Sion? As if no research had ever been carried out there...

Was he thinking: *"Many people searched before me but could not find it. So their skills were not enough. If they had found it, I would know. Since there is no such information, they obviously didn't find it. Maybe I'll find it."*

Usual thinking of many!

In one of the later episodes of this book we will return to King Richard and see how he became disappointed upon travelling to Jerusalem.

The crusades have always been described in a straightforward and regarded as having a pure religious aim.

In fact, most of them were; otherwise, why would they be called "crusades"?

However, there is no doubt that both the First Crusade and the Third Crusade, the latter having been organised jointly by King Richard of England and King Philippe II of France, had other purposes. The Second Crusade, which fell in between the two, may have had the same purpose, but its adventure was a completely different story!

* * *

King Arthur's tomb at Glastonbury, if it was ever found, has since disappeared.

Did somebody took it from there and carried to somewhere else.

Who knows... Maybe, but it was never found again until today.

Therefore, it is doubtful whether it was found at that time or not.

Some people still hold out hope that the "thing" they are looking for is actually somewhere in the south-west of England.

Because it is not known whether anything was ever found on Mount Sion.

Let's have a look, and see what happened there!

For this, we need to go back to the time just after the First Crusade.

Next Episode: Poor Fellow-Soldiers of Christ