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The concept of Chivalry, as a code of honor, and as a way of life, is rooted in the best values of humanity since ancient times. The Code of Chivalry, which thrived throughout the Middle Ages into the Renaissance period, was the core value system for a wide range of Chivalric Orders of knighthood. Most famously, it was upheld and advanced by the Order of the Temple of Solomon, the 12th century historical institution of the Knights Templar.

The Code of Chivalry was most commonly associated with the Crusades (which are widely assumed to be motivated by opposition to Muslims), only because the historical record of Chivalry was mostly preserved by European chroniclers, through a Christian cultural bias which emphasized the Crusades. However, not all Christian Orders were Crusaders, and not all Knightly Orders were necessarily Christian.

In the original Temple Rule of 1129 AD from Saint Bernard (Rule 2), the Knights Templar actually rejected and criticized the Crusades, blaming that it “did not do what it should” to “defend” the weak and uphold Justice, but only “strove to plunder, despoil and kill”. With that condemnation of the Crusades, the Templars further declared that their Order “revitalized” the tradition of “knighthood” as an institution, by restoring “the love of Justice” as its primary “duties” [1].

It is a well-documented historical fact that the Saracen (Muslim) Knights of Saladin also strictly followed the same Code of Chivalry. Many chronicles by the Knights Templar witnessed and recognized the Knights of Saladin faithfully upholding the same traditional and humanitarian values as the Christian Knights [2] [3] [4] [5] [6] [7].

Those shared values caused the Templars and Saracens to recognize each other’s humanity, and their common calling in a universal Faith in God. They saw in each other a shared passion for Justice, upholding “right over wrong”, and “good against evil”, regardless of which religion was ostensibly involved.

This mutual understanding, that both the Templars and Saracens actually lived by the same Code of Chivalry, is proven by the fact that Saladin himself requested and received the knighting ceremony of the Knights Templar, and swore the Templar Vow of Chivalry, ca.1190 AD [8]. It is also confirmed by the fact that this eventually led to the Treaty of Ramla of 1192 AD between King Richard the Lionheart and the Sultan Saladin [9] [10].

In the Temple Rule of 1129 AD (Rule 14), the Knights Templar were commanded to “rid the land of the enemies of Jesus Christ” [11]. However, despite the superficial cultural bias and prejudice of many historians, this did not necessarily refer to Muslims.
The Templars fully understood that the “enemies of Christ” were generally the same as the enemies of Islam. Indeed, evil-doers are essentially the enemies of all Faith, opposed to the principle of religion itself, and are thus the enemies of God.

These little-known aspects of history prove that the Templars were not “Crusaders” against Muslims, and did not agree with any such philosophy. Rather, the Knights Templar were Holy warrior-monks fighting for good against evil, and this defined their authentic understanding of the Code of Chivalry.

The Code of Chivalry, although actively taught by the Knightly Orders who lived by its principles, was apparently never consolidated into any one single historical document. Throughout the glory days of knighthood, the doctrines of Chivalry were mostly taught by living example of the Knights through their actions, and were indirectly but widely reported by their contemporary societies in the popular literature of Western Europe.

The first “popular summary” of the original 11th-12th century “Ancient Code of Chivalry” was diligently reconstructed from the historical record, by the prominent French historian Emile Leon Gautier (1832-1897 AD). Gautier was an Archivist of the Imperial Archives, and Chief of the historical section of the National Archives in Paris, France. [12]

Analysis of the Code of Chivalry restored by Gautier, in the context of authentic Templar history, allows a deeper understanding beyond the traditional cultural biases and prejudices of the Medieval and Renaissance periods.

The result, which is achieved in this unique presentation by the modern Templar Order, is a more objective Universal Code of Chivalry, which has greater relevance, and better practical application, in the modern era.

The resulting Universal Code of Chivalry, suitable for diverse real-world use in modern times, is developed here through the commentaries, and presented as the conclusion.

Here are presented educational excerpts, from the most contemporary and authoritative English translation by Henry Frith (1891), from the original French work by Leon Gautier (1883), which in turn was carefully researched, compiled and reconstructed from diverse medieval manuscripts.

The text uses the Chapter headings from the original 19th century editions, allowing to quote from the source material and to indicate the Chapter numbers in footnotes.
Chapter I – The Origin of Chivalry:

The Chivalry, of which we are about to examine the Code, is that of the 11th and 12th centuries — that of the Crusades, that of our national [heritage]. It will appear rude and barbarous to some people, but in truth it is strong and healthy, and has formed for us the powerful race whose glory has filled the world. ...

We may reduce the ancient Code of Chivalry into Ten “Commandments,” and we wish to express them here in a popular form so that they may be the more easily understood. It was in such a form that it pleased the Creator to set forth the Decalogue on Sinai, so as to engrave it in all its meanings in all hearts.

The following are the Ten Commandments of the code of chivalry:

I. Thou shalt believe all that the Church teaches, and shalt observe all its directions.

II. Thou shalt defend the Church.

III. Thou shalt respect all weaknesses, and shalt constitute thyself the defender of them.

IV. Thou shalt love the country in the which thou wast born.

V. Thou shalt not recoil before thine enemy.

VI. Thou shalt make war against the Infidel without cessation, and without mercy.

VII. Thou shalt perform scrupulously thy feudal duties, if they be not contrary to the laws of God.

VIII. Thou shalt never lie, and shalt remain faithful to thy pledged word.

IX. Thou shalt be generous, and give largesse to everyone.

X. Thou shalt be everywhere and always the champion of the Right and the Good against Injustice and Evil.
Chapter II – The First Three Commandments:

I. Thou shalt believe all that the Church teaches, and shalt observe all its directions.

The First Commandment of this almost unknown Code is the most important and the most sacred of all. ... This act of Faith was, in the eyes of our forefathers, the absolute equivalent of genuineness; it was the certain law. The thought of God then filled and animated all, and it was as the breath of their nostrils in those believing centuries. The Deity was present with them even physically, and at every breath they drew they believed they could feel His presence as behind a curtain. ...

The Faith of these rude warriors, that Faith which was so precise, had nothing namby-pamby in it: nothing dilettante [delicate] or effeminate. We have not to do with the little sugar-plums of certain contemporary devotion — but with a good and frank wild-honey. It is a grosser but a loyal Catholicism. One is not astonished to find that these Knights were rigorously logical. They knew too much to stand upon the sterile heights of theory: they knew that they ought to practice their Faith. ...

Our Knights did not remain content with the mere belief in God: they considered it their duty to abandon themselves wholly to Him and not to limit their trust in Him. This Faith (or trust) was an integral portion of the Code of Chivalry.

The historical beliefs and practices which developed into this rule all emphasize “Faith”, “belief in God”, and feeling God as a part of one’s daily life, as well as actively practicing Faith through one’s conduct and actions.

Describing this in terms of obedience to the Church is merely a presumption based upon cultural bias, and is not the true essence of the rule. Although following the teachings and directions of the Church was a practical reality in the context of medieval society, this was neither inherent in nor necessary to the actual rule itself.

The Templar Order had its own ancient Priesthood which it recovered from the Temple of Solomon, which was recognized as having its own ecclesiastical sovereignty by the Vatican Papal Bull Omni Datum Optimum of 1139 AD. [13]
Many of the Templars were also Cathars, who were Gnostics, practicing the principles of direct personal communion with God, in the tradition of the Essenes (of which Jesus the Nazarene was a High Priest). This is precisely the reason why Templars were accused of “heresies”, because the direct communion of Gnosticism implies that there is no need for the dogmas or dictates of the Church.

Accordingly, the Knights Templar were not bound by the teachings nor directions of the Church. Similarly, the Saracen Knights who also faithfully followed this rule did not follow instructions from any Christian Church.

Therefore, a more historically accurate summary of this rule, described in a more objective and universal form, would be:

“Believe in spiritual teachings and apply them in daily life.”

II. Thou shalt defend the Church.

The Second Commandment details the first, and the Christian soldier was compelled to have always before him these words, which were to serve with him for the battle-cry, “Defend the Church!” ...

Open the official book where it is carefully formulated – open the Pontifical and read:

“Receive this sword in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost; use it for your own defense, for that of the Holy Church and God, and for the confusion of the enemies of the Cross of Christ. Go: and remember that the Saints did not conquer kingdoms by the sword but by Faith.”

The key phrase “defense... of the Holy Church and God” evidences that Knights were not only defenders of the Church, but more generally were the defenders of God. More specifically, they were defenders against all “enemies” of God, regardless of which religion those enemies ostensibly claimed to belong to.

The reminder that “Saints did not conquer kingdoms by the sword but by Faith” is revealing. It indicates that the true purpose of knighthood was not really to “conquer”, but rather to spread “Faith” – and not only the Christian Faith, but indeed the pure principle of Faith in God. Accordingly, the Knights were essentially defenders of Faith itself, even more than defenders of any particular Church.

To sum up in a few words, Chivalry has never been, is not, and never will be anything but armed force in the service of the unarmed truth ...
As defenders of God, and defenders of Faith, Knights were also defenders of Truth. Such Truth includes the authentic doctrines of Holy scripture, including all historical scriptures. This Truth thus consists of all the traditions of the ancient origins of Christianity, which are also the foundations underlying other religions. Therefore, Knights were more generally defenders of the principle of Faith itself, and thus defenders of the traditions of all religion as a whole.

_The Knight... was bound to hold himself in readiness, sword in hand, behind the throne of the Sovereign Pontiffs, whose independence was necessary to the world._ ...

Consistent with historians here indicating the plural of “Pontiffs”, the Knights Templar did in fact defend multiple Pontiffs, of different denominations of Christianity, not only the Roman Catholic Church:

The Templar Order was founded in 1118 AD under sovereign patronage of the Kings of Jerusalem, which was formalized at the Council of Nablus in 1120 AD. The Knights Templar thus also defended the Patriarch of Jerusalem, who was the Pontiff of the surviving Holy See of Antioch under the Kingdom of Jerusalem. The Templars also protected Orthodox Pontiffs and Churches in the Templar Principality of Antioch since 1129 AD.

The Knights Templar also possessed inherent Pontifical authority of the ancient Priesthood which they recovered from the Temple of Solomon, which was recognized by the Vatican in the Papal Bull _Omni Datum Optimum_ of 1136 AD. Thus, the Templars were also defending their own Templar Priesthood, as the autonomous denomination of Ancient Catholicism.

This history confirms that Knights were not only defenders of “the Church”, but also of all Churches, and more generally the defenders of all religions of Faith.

The statement about the sovereignty of Pontiffs, “whose independence was necessary”, reveals an even deeper mission of all Knights:

The only system of checks and balances among sovereign historical institutions, was a balance of powers between Kingdoms, Churches and Orders of Knights. The only restraint on a King, to enforce royal obligations to respect the rights of peoples under natural law and canon law, was the Church. Only the Church could depose a King, by means of excommunication.

It was thus of paramount importance to defend the sovereign independence of the Church. Indeed, this was proven in the history of the Knights Templar:
When the French King Philip IV installed a Pope under his control (under duress of kidnapping and killing the two previous Popes), the Vatican lost its Pontifical independence. That forced the Vatican to disregard its own scriptures and canon law to bend to the secular will of the King, and resulted in persecution of the Knights Templar, in violation of all law and rights.

Therefore, the mandate for Knights to “defend the Church”, more specifically, requires to defend the principle of Pontifical sovereignty and independence. This was essential to the geopolitical balance of powers, and was a necessary condition for upholding the rule of law itself.

The inherent ecclesiastical sovereignty and independence of religion, of course, is necessarily part of the traditions of religion throughout world history. Thus, this aspect of defending sovereignty and independence of the Church can also be summarized as defending the traditions of religion.

It was he... who was born protector of all religious orders, and who was bound to say “Evangelize, teach, baptize, convert, expiate; I am present to defend you: go on.” Thanks to him the Benedictine could freely clear so much waste land, instruct so many ignorant people, undertake so many distant missions with so many powerful volumes. Thanks to him the Dominican possesses the freedom of speech and the Franciscan the liberty of poverty.

The concept of being “protector of all religious orders” confirms that Knights were the defenders of diverse traditions of different religious orders. As Knights were primarily dedicated to protecting God and Faith itself, this indicates that they could also be defenders of the traditions of any or all religions.

Works of charity, too, owe to him something of their utility and beauty: they increased under his care, and that is why the hospitals receive everywhere thousands of sick... the monasteries thousands of hungry people. ...

Here is the sum of it: ... Christian humanity was an immense crowd of feeble people for whom it was necessary to pray and fight. Above this multitude who had the right to prayer and protection were two chosen families, two aristocracies, two distinct and powerful groups. The one was composed of the Clergy, whom Providence had created for prayer; the other the Knights, whom God had made to protect those who prayed, and those for whom they interceded.

Following from all of the above history, a more accurate summary of this rule, described in a more universal form, would be:

“Defend the traditions of religion and the principle of faith.”
III. Thou shalt respect all weaknesses, and shalt constitute thyself the defender of them.

The... Knight’s mission was to defend all weaknesses. ... [I]t is a mission which one must highly esteem, it is an ideal which we must admire ... [T]he Knight was bound to defend in this world all that was defenseless, and particularly the priests and monks “who serve God;” the women and children, widows and orphans. ...

This Commandment, which resembles an article of Faith, was not always so easy in practice. But commonly enough it was the devotion to the priesthood which sometimes cost our Knights the most difficult and cruel efforts. ... It is quite certain that between the soldier and the priest... In time of war they love and esteem each other, holding hand to hand, but in time of peace they are visibly antagonistic. The cruelties of the soldier disgust the priest, the placidity of the priest irritates the soldier. ...

It was not a certain category of wretched ones nor a certain class of human weakness that the Knight was bound to defend; it was, all the weak, all the poor, all the little ones, who had a prescriptive right to this protection. ... The Ordene de Chevalerie... is naturally much more precise and more fully expressed:

“The duty of the Knight is to constitute himself the guardian, the protector, of the poor, so that the rich shall never injure them. ... The duty of the Knight is to sustain the weak so that the strong shall never oppress them.” Whenever he perceives a poor man or a stranger, “every gentleman, every Knight, is bound to accompany him, so that no one molest him or strike him, for he is poor who has a haughty courage.” ...

In the most ancient mass-book, in which one can read the prayers composed for the benediction of a Knight used in a ceremonia in the opening years of the 11th century, the Christian soldier is invited “to be the living protection of all weaknesses;” and in the 13th century, at the consecration of a Knight in the Basilica of Saint Peter’s, the Arch-Priest said solemnly to him – “Be thou the defender and the bold champion of the Church, the widow, and the orphan!” And we have the pleasure to find today in the Roman Pontifical the expression of the same doctrine... [in the 19th century].

Considering the practical reality that the weak need protection only because of abuses by the strong, a more complete summary of this rule would be:

“Respect and defend the weak against abuses by the strong.”
Chapter III – The Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Commandments:

IV. Thou shalt love the country in which thou wast born.

[T]raditional nations... possess in their traditions the best elements of their unity, and their strength. ... The ancient Celtic country, formerly so much loved, ended, thanks to the violence and the skillfulness of Roman politics, by being fused with the Empire itself... On the other hand, we cannot call by the beautiful name of “love of country” the coarse attachment which the mighty and powerful Frankish warrior... felt for his nomad tribe or his clan. ... At length these wanderers halted and installed themselves as victors in the grand country which is bound to preserve their name...

Each tribe at first retained its independence and its code of laws, but these are now innumerable fragments and endless tatters. New kingdoms were created and even made – by chance, by the force of circumstances, and by the fancy of the Merovingian Princes, who desired to have an extensive kingdom... Thus there is still the great division... which has nothing factitious about it, and represents two civilizations, two tendencies, and so to speak two different races. Who can find the “love of country” in all this scattering of badly-disposed forces without a common aim, or unity? ...

This demonstrates the clear perspective and judgment of historians, that the governments of temporal kingdoms, artificially created by political clans promoting only their own power and control, are not at all the “country” for which Knights should “love thy country”. Rather, this allegiance should be to “traditional nations”, defined by “the best elements of their unity”. This definition can only mean the people of a nation, based upon their own cultural identity and traditional values.

It is noteworthy that the primary historical clan, which is blamed for promoting “great division” undermining the unity of peoples, is the Merovingian dynasty. The Merovingian political clan is described as a competing “civilization” with its own contrary “tendencies”, seeming to behave as a “different race”.

This introduces an entirely new theme, of political clans versus the people of a traditional nation. The allegiance of Knights, then, is to “love the country” consisting of its people, even against the ruling political clans who behave as an opposing self-styled “race”, representing only their own “civilization” which is very different from the cultural traditions of the people.

The Carlovingians appeared above the horizon and hastened the blessed hour in which we should possess a “native country.” To tell the truth they were Teutons (Goths)... but Goths also had the appreciation of unity...
It appears at first sight that nothing could be more antagonistic to this love of country, of which we are seeking, not without some pain, to determine the sources, but this “country” and this “love” were decidedly impossible amid all the Merovingian string-pulling, and it was necessary – most necessary – that a powerful unity should be newly founded in our Western world. This unity no doubt was not of long duration, but it gave to modern nations the power and the time to recognize themselves. ...

This passage again highlights the history of “Merovingian string-pulling”, meaning the manipulation of peoples by political clans behaving as a self-styled competing “race” of ruling elites. It emphasizes that the true “love of country” was made “decidedly impossible” by such “antagonistic” political manipulations of the people. The historical record thus proves that the Merovingian clan mentality of governance is inherently opposed to any true “love of country” based upon the goodness of traditional peoples.

This explains the dire need, and indeed the overriding core purpose, of the Code of Chivalry, that it was “most necessary that a powerful unity should be newly founded”. This Commandment, to “love thy country”, was thus for all Knights to be reminded and motivated by the love for their cultural people, to defend the organic nationality of traditional peoples against abuses by elitist political clans.

To the somewhat insecure monarchs of the 10th and 11th centuries succeeded the kings on horseback, the kings militant of the 12th century... But there is no need to come so far down to have the pleasure of saluting the “native country” definitively constituted and dearly loved.

In the Chanson de Roland – which was composed between the years 1066 and 1095, the country beloved “is our Northern France with its natural boundaries on the east and having all Southern France for its tributary.” ... The country... has taken centuries to build up, to form herself; but in the beating of our hearts we feel that she lives, and that she is beloved!

The “beloved country” is here more clearly defined by its “natural boundaries”, and by its native cultural identity which took “centuries to build up”, characterized by its harmony with the native environment, which lives “in the beating of our hearts”.

This concept introduces the principle of national sovereignty, that an indigenous cultural identity is sovereign and should not be manipulated or corrupted by political clans, and that its natural boundaries are sovereign and should not be infringed. That culture, which a traditional people have developed over centuries in their native land, should never be corrupted by any political clan by mere fiat nor by brute force.
Therefore, the Commandment for Knights to “love thy country” also requires to uphold and defend the principle of national sovereignty. By definition, and by practical realities, the violation of the sovereignty of any one country thereby implicitly threatens the sovereignty of all countries. Accordingly, Knights are required to respect and protect the sovereignty of all countries, as the most fundamental and universal application of the rule of law.

*Such is the nation which our poets have celebrated; such is the country which the Code of Chivalry commands our heroes to cherish to the death; such is the country they have loved!*

*The last wish of these iron-clad Knights was often for their little native place. ... It was not the native country, it was the homestead. It was the whole country which our Knights were bound to love... This is the charming country “which abounds in the woods, in rivers, in meadows, in virgins and beautiful women, in good wines and in brave Knights.” This is the splendidly endowed country in which people are so open-handed. [It] is a country in which one surely finds “honor and loyalty and all good things;” and besides, “in no country is there a greater or a truer people.” This is indeed the native land of proud hearts. ... It is the soil blessed of God from which such a fine race has emanated. ...

This passage further confirms that the “beloved country” of Knights is defined as the cultural identity of its people and their traditional values, as the goodness of its people, being the “native land of proud hearts”.

Therefore, following from all of the above history, a more accurate summary of this rule, described in a more objective and universal form, would be:

> “Love the people and sovereignty of your country and others.”

**V. Thou shalt not recoil before thine enemy.**

*The Code of Chivalry is more clear upon this than any of the other Commandments... a single coward was sufficient to discourage an army! ... When they plunged into the thick of the fight they would turn to their companions and exclaim in bold accents, “We will slay all, or all be slain!” They were most desirous to meet their foes hand to hand, to feel him at the point of their swords. ... [T]he poets of our time have happily popularized: “Cursed be the first who bent a bow. He was a coward and did not dare to come to close quarters.” Javelins and arrows appeared to our Knights the arms of villains, and this prejudice... ended by being fatal to [them]. ...
To this law, all the heroes of our history and legend have been gloriously faithful; and it seems that those two groups of Knights – the real and the imaginary – rival each other in moral greatness and magnificent bravery. ... Legend is in this case, as in so many other cases, only the condensation and the quintessence of history. ...

The Code of Chivalry which we are endeavoring to make clear, is not, like other codes, a dry and barren text, and our fathers as a commentary upon it recounted the examples of great Knights. ...

The mural paintings... which covered the walls of chateaux and the open spaces of the enormous chimneys, the dull-toned tapestry, the brilliant mirrors, the quaint sculpture on the portals, all told of these models of Chivalry, and the gaze of youth could not fail to dwell on them. ... There were, in fine, all our epic Knights who vied with each other in repeating this grand sentence from one of our oldest poems – “See, death approaches! But as becomes brave men, let us die fighting!”

The Knight must always take pride only in one thing, that it is his duty, his honor, his calling from God, and indeed his very identity, to stand up to the enemies of God and the enemies of humanity, determined to destroy their evil plans in the name of everything right, good and Holy.

A Knight must never be discouraged from battle by fear. Any cowardice from fear can be infectious, causing other Knights to be discouraged from battle. Therefore, this Commandment requires that a Knight must never display any cowardice, and must bravely and confidently face any and all enemies, ready for battle.

This rule, essentially to “not be a coward”, requires to directly “face the enemy in close quarters”. That means not to hide in the shadows from afar, taking anonymous pot-shots, but rather to openly engage, with full force, publicly declaring the righteousness of the cause, and visibly demonstrating the moral and lawful authority to stand up to defend what is good and right.

To avoid cowardice, and “face the enemy”, also means to use direct force. When confronted with a fight or battle, you do not run and hide and hope the aggressors go away: You do not just complain to some “authorities” asking to stop the offenders for you; You do not go off to make some charity organization to merely “raise public awareness of the social problem” just so that people can feel good about how “aware” they are.

The only way to “face the enemy” is to take active measures, using direct and equal force, to put a stop to the offenses committed by the aggressors:
If they confront you (or others in your presence) with a credible threat of deadly force, you kill them in lawful self-defense (which by law includes defense of others); If they violate laws and rights, you expose their crimes with facts, evidence and law, and mobilize criminal charges and prosecution; If they are abusing some official authority, you make sure they lose that claim of authority by exposing their violations; If they engage in sabotage by deception or false defamation, you expose their lies and destroy their own credibility; If they are corrupting morals of society, you expose their evil and educate people against their evil agenda; If they are sabotaging your relationships, you expose their evil manipulations, and make sure to keep company only with people of good values with a strong moral backbone.

In the modern era, “battle” is very rarely by armed conflict, which is generally reserved for secular armies of governments, and certainly not for religious chivalric Orders. Even the official military agencies increasingly use alternative strategies of “destabilization”, “psychological operations” and “information warfare” to accomplish military goals, although this is precisely the cowardice which is condemned by the Code of Chivalry.

Nowadays, the “battles” which Knights and Dames are confronted with come from the cowardly agendas of elitist political clans, through covert sabotage of humanitarian projects, subversive but systematic violations of human rights to rule over an oppressed humanity, legal harassment and false public defamation campaigns against the defenders of goodness and righteousness, and general unlawful interference in private affairs such as the right to use one’s own earned money or to practice one’s profession.

Thus, in modern times most “battles” are fought in a court of law, in the forum of public opinion through mass media or social media, or through a social battle for the hearts and minds of colleagues or networking contacts who are important to the profession or humanitarian projects of the Knight or Dame.

The historical record abundantly proves that Knights were fully prepared to – and for centuries actually did – fight to the death, and willingly “die fighting”, in the most physically painful and bloody ways imaginable. For the Knights and Dames of today to shy away from a modern “fight”, where nothing more is at stake than merely one’s reputation or bank account, or the petty inconvenience of doing some work to use evidence and laws against the agents of evil, would be beyond shame, and beyond disgrace.

To claim to be a Knight or Dame in these times, only to back away from a fight out of fear of inconvenience caused by the immoral and cowardly actions of the agents of evil, would be supreme hypocrisy, and an ultimate sacrilege of everything which knighthood has stood for throughout all of human history.
Therefore, a more accurate summary of this rule, described in a more universal form, would be:

“Do not be a coward, face the enemy, and use direct force.”

**VI. Thou shalt make war against the Infidel without cessation, and without mercy.**

*Quotations are useless, and all our romances, to tell the truth, are only the recitals of this grand and formidable struggle. All that was not Christian became Saracen in our ancestors’ eyes. …*

*This hatred of the Pagan was carried to the verge of madness, to spasmodic rage against them. … Many are scandalized by the exhibition of so much anger, but these people speak at their ease, and our fathers were better able than we to estimate the danger with which Islam threatened Christianity. … Two races, two religions, were there in the presence of each other. It was necessary… and the Crusade was only a process of driving back the invasion. …*

These passages best evidence the cultural bias which prejudiced the writings of centuries of historians, in derogation of the true historical facts of the authentic Code of Chivalry. “All that was not Christian” was attributed to Muslims, and called “Pagan”. Although “Pagan” by definition means ancient pre-Christian polytheism such as Greek or Roman, and Islam was more recent 7th century and was distinctly monotheistic, even recognizing Jesus as a Prophet of God, the same one creator God of the universe as for Christians.

Accordingly, even the very definition of the anti-Christian wrongs attributed to Islam betrayed and revealed the fact that Islam was not the “enemy of God” which Knights were sworn to fight against.

It was a temporary reality of past history, that Muslim forces (who also believed they were defending Faith in the same monotheistic God) were invading some Christian territories. Thus it is true that “the Crusade was only a process of driving back the invasion.” This must also be colored by the fact that those territories of the Middle East inherently belonged to the native Arabs of that region to begin with.

However, those temporary circumstances of the Middle Ages did not touch upon the true nature of the Code of Chivalry as the timeless principles of the institution of Chivalry. All historical evidence of the Code itself reveal that Knights were sworn to defend the principle of “Faith”, and the worship and belief in God, and uphold Truth and Justice, not merely to oppose Muslims.
Moreover, Chivalry was much more than only some Crusades against Muslims in the Middle East, which lasted less than 300 years from 1095 AD until about 1390 AD. In contrast, Chivalric Orders have existed for thousands of years, since ancient pre-Christian times, and still persist even to the present day. The institutions and traditions of Medieval Chivalry, and many of those same Chivalric Orders, persisted well into the Renaissance period and beyond.

Therefore, the “Infidel”, who the Code of Chivalry authentically commands Knights to “make war against” relentlessly “without mercy”, is decidedly not Muslims. Rather, the “Infidel” is all enemies of Faith, enemies of God, enemies of the principles of all spiritual religion, and the enemies of humanity. In short, Knights are required to relentlessly fight against the enemies of good, showing no mercy to those agents of evil.

The command to fight the enemies of good “without cessation” does not mean to provoke or instigate battles, nor to wage perpetual war. The true meaning of this is the practice of vigilance, to always be vigilant, ready and able to detect and identify the enemies of Faith, expose them, and whenever necessary to counter them with direct and proportional force. It also means that when battle is necessary, the Knight must fight relentlessly, until the end, to make sure that the evil plans or deeds of the enemy are decisively terminated. It is the enemies of good who start a fight, but it is the true Knight who must finish it.

The requirement to fight “without mercy” is not about vengeance or vindictiveness, nor any desire to cause unnecessary suffering even to an enemy. However, it does uphold the principle that evildoers must fully face the consequences of their own wrongful actions, as a natural law of God. Indeed, without facing the unmitigated consequences of their own evil with full impact, wrongdoers can never learn their lesson, to change their evil ways. Therefore, the Knight must not allow anything to soften the blow of that inevitable divine retribution.

The enemies of good know no boundaries and no limits to their aggression, recognizing no rights, respecting no laws, and showing no morals and no mercy to all innocents who are their victims. Yet, whenever their evil plans are thwarted and they must face the consequences, they hypocritically invoke all morals in their own unworthy defense, expecting mercy.

The enemies of good cause very real harm and serious damages to innocents, and they do so repeatedly, habitually and systematically. Such aggressors also act based upon their own “beliefs”, although what they believe in is evil, and they follow some “philosophy” giving false justification to their acts of evil. Driven by egotism, often fueled by elitism, they typically believe in some claimed right or mandate to oppress others.
This mentality compels aggressors to take advantage of every opportunity for their evil deeds. Any kindness is only perceived as weakness, and any compromise only serves as a provocation of more aggression. Any ideas to “rise above” or “live and let live” only work with normal ethical law-abiding people who make innocent mistakes or have an honest difference of opinion, but will never work against the enemies of good. If one chooses to “take the high road” and hope they go away, the aggressors will always come back, again and again, every time escalating the brutality of their attacks.

Therefore, any show of mercy only exacerbates the problem, puts more innocents in harm’s way, and makes the next battles bigger and harder to fight.

It is for these reasons that the Knight must literally “show no mercy”. By choosing to serve as agents of evil, the enemies of good waive and forfeit the benefit of any “mercy”, which they never show to others. The Knight must apply full and proportional direct force, relentlessly, and making sure to finish the job, so that the aggression will be decisively terminated, and with residual deterrent effects.

We also know that this scourge of Chivalry has delivered the world by protecting it... We have seen – we can see to what depths [people and society] can descend, and the rapidity with which they lose all moral sense, all honor of existence, all social vitality. Without chivalry, the West, vanquished by fatalism and sensuality, might today have been as decomposed and as rotten as the East!

Thanks to those of its Commandments which appear the less modern, the Code of Chivalry has freed and preserved us. It would be perhaps only fair to preserve its memory in return.

This evidences that historians credit the institution of Chivalry, advanced by the Code of Chivalry, with having saved the world from losing all morals, honor, purpose and meaning in life, and social enrichment, which would have all been destroyed by atheistic fatalism and materialism.

Presently, in the modern era, all religion as a whole is under aggressive attack, besieged by mass media undermining morals, and materialism subverting all meaning and enjoyment in life. This offense against humanity, which is perpetrated in reliance upon a systematic dismantling of all human rights, is being perpetrated by the same types of secular political clans of elitist rulers as in the Middle Ages.

Now more than ever, all religions must stand together and fight for Truth, Justice and the goodness of humanity. The authentic Code of Chivalry, when properly understood without the historical cultural biases and prejudices of past centuries, still remains the best defense, to save the world once again.
Therefore, a more accurate summary of this rule, described in a more objective and universal form, would be:

“Fight the enemies of good relentlessly and without mercy.”

Chapter IV – The Last Four Commandments:

VII. Thou shalt perform scrupulously thy feudal duties, if they be not contrary to the laws of God.

The strict performance of all feudal duties, and fidelity of the vassal to his lord, are the obligations of the Seventh Commandment of Chivalry. The vassal was bound to obey his lord in every particular, so long as the latter demanded of him nothing prejudicial, nothing contrary to the Faith, the Church, and the poor. ...

Simply explained, this basic rule is that one should perform all secular duties, but never contrary to the higher laws of God.

We have... recorded our protest against this doctrine, so strange and so widely disseminated, which confounds feudalism with Chivalry. ... and we may state that feudalism, so disastrous to the Church and to the Good, was really inevitable in the midst of the terrible troubles of the 9th century. No union was possible: the central power lost its head and abdicated; a thousand ambitions surged on at the same time; ... the last waves of Saracen invasion alarmed the people... and barbarism threatened to descend like a pall upon the astonished world.

It was then... that the weak entertained the very natural idea of seeking the protection of the strong; and, rallying round them, cried, “Defend us, defend us!”

These passages evidence the judgment of historians, that feudalism was “disasterous to the Church and to the Good”, revealing that feudalism itself was a product of some of the real enemies of God, and enemies of the people.

It was the Merovingian dynasty which ruled over France for almost 300 years from ca. 457 AD until 752 AD, and remained firmly entrenched as the nobility of dominant land ownership, which directly developed into feudalism by the 9th century less than 100 years later. It was the continuing power and influence of the Merovingian political clan, and its strategies of governance as nobility, which provoked and even created the “terrible troubles of the 9th century” which compelled society to accept feudalism.
With the perfect hindsight of the historical record, the exact method used to install the tyranny of feudalism is abundantly clear:

Manipulated domestic destabilization, combined with foreign wars provoking the wrath of artificially created enemies, was used to promote fear that “barbarism threatened to descend... upon the astonished world”. That manufactured fear then forced the people to demand a solution, from the same lords who had secretly created the problem. Of course, that solution was precisely what the political clan wanted from the beginning – the people giving up more of their rights, for the clan to consolidate more power for itself.

In the modern era, this very same strategy was repeated, in every detail, also implemented by dynastic political clans in the United States and European Union:

Manipulated domestic destabilization mostly by provoked financial crises, combined with illegal foreign wars draining national resources and creating new enemies, all used to promote the manufactured fear of “terrorism”. Once again, the people were forced to demand a solution from the same political clans who created the problem – giving up more of their rights, to give the political dynasties even more power.

That true history of feudalism, being an infamously oppressive system, demonstrates that secular obligations can often be manipulated and corrupted by the enemies of God. This illustrates why the present Commandment of the Code of Chivalry requires to perform one’s secular duties only under the higher laws of God, which must never be forgotten, and must always be observed and upheld.

*Such was feudalism. There was nothing divine or perfect about it: it was merely a phenomenon that took place from force of circumstances, necessary and... inevitable. ...*

*From this compact arose the incomparable strength of the feudal bond. It was gratitude extended to the condition of social law. ... A brutal and gross species of gratitude... but both sincere and lively also. ...*

This indicates that in the tradition of Chivalry, the feudal system (or any other current system of governance) only holds any legitimacy insofar as it creates the “condition of social law”, to give society the stability of a genuine rule of law.
However, whenever rights under law are suppressed or dismantled, violating God-given human rights under the higher laws of God, the governing power loses any and all legitimacy. In such situations, the Code of Chivalry clearly requires all Knights to fight against that injustice, with all their worth, and all their might.

Indeed, in the modern era, feudalism has been merely replaced with the economic debt slavery of corporatism, backed by currency manipulations of a privatized central banking system. Under this modern form of oppression, private elitist political clans have become the new version of feudal lords, dictating to supposedly “democratic” governments through their dominating corporate interests.

Accordingly, the present rule is just as relevant and necessary today as it was in medieval times. More compellingly, the need for true Knights and Dames to step up, and live by the Code of Chivalry to defend the weak, is more acute than ever.

The Code of Chivalry tempered this rudeness, but was also careful not to whittle it down too fine. The Church itself understood what would have become of these young and wild people if, in the excess of a false sensibility, they had undermined the fidelity of the vassal, if they had destroyed that barrier, if they had ameliorated the rudeness of those customs.

[The Church] was satisfied by giving to the duties of the sovereign lord the same relief as the vassal, and by throwing into their somewhat savage relations the spirit of toleration, and the spirit of sacrifice. ...

For many centuries, the social goodness of the Code of Chivalry, by its knightly guarantees of basic humanitarian values, served to counterbalance the harshness of secular obligations. This knightly code was thus supported by the Church, to promote the “spirit of toleration” for peace and prosperity in society. But the same code was also a mandate for Knights to strictly enforce human rights under the rule of law, against any abuses by governing elites.

Therefore, a more accurate summary of this rule, in a more universal form, would be:

“Perform all secular duties under the higher Laws of God.”
VIII. Thou shalt never lie, and shalt remain faithful to thy pledged word.

Another Commandment for the Knightly ones... is “Beware of falsehood; have a horror of lying.” “Do not lie,” is one of the conditions of Chivalry which remains fixed and living amongst modern peoples. ...

If we wished also to go back to the true origin of the most justly praised of our modern sentiments, one would easily perceive that “respect for one’s word” can be traced back to the epoch of Chivalry. ... Not to tell lies, and to keep to one’s word, are, to this day, the two chief traits in the character of a gentleman.

It mattered little whether the word of honor had been passed under the form of an oath... or whether the promise had been made simply by the Knight extending his ungloved hand, or whether the engagement was unaccompanied by any rite at all. The parole [speaking of the words] was in itself sufficient. ...

One word will suffice to indicate the estimation in which our fathers held Sincerity, the name of which is synonymous with Honor. Amongst all the titles with which the troubadours associated the name of God, the most in use was, “The God who never lies.” This formula is more significant than all our texts, and more eloquent than all our commentaries.

Knights are sworn to uphold Truth and Justice. Truth is sincerity, sincerity is expressing your genuine beliefs, and faithfully representing your beliefs is Honor. Telling the Truth is practiced not only to be good, and not only because lying is bad. Rather, telling the Truth is a declaration of the legitimacy which one represents, by the sincerity of one’s words, that one’s position or intentions have Honor. Telling the Truth, and thereby showing the legitimacy of having Honor, thus openly demonstrates to everyone that one’s position and intentions have true merit, and real value.

Those who represent only wrongful intentions must hide in the shadows, forced to rely upon lies and deceit to cover up their real agenda, or else no one would willingly accept it. Thus, they cannot keep their word, because their words need to be lies, which cannot be reconciled with their wrongful intentions.

However, those who uphold goodness must rely on the Truth to advance the righteousness of their cause, and to inspire others to accept that goodness. Thus, they are compelled to keep their word, because their words genuinely express their true heart’s desire of their good intentions.
Telling the truth is not for the sake of being nice. Much Truth is not at all what people want to hear, and yet it is often what they need to hear, whether they like it or not. Most of all, it is what you need them to hear, so that all will know the seriousness of your dedication to your knightly missions, and will know to either support them, or get out of your way.

Telling the Truth does not require disclosing any confidences. The primary purpose is to uphold the Honor and merit of one’s righteous beliefs and intentions, not to betray or compromise one’s strategies for doing God’s work. Nonetheless, one should not fear to tell the Truth even to enemies. In the immortal words of Saint Augustine: “The Truth is like a lion – you do not need to defend it; Just set it free, and it will defend itself”.

Another core aspect of this Commandment is to “keep your word”. The concept of keeping your word is not only about making and keeping promises. The benefits of being true to your word are not about what people want you to give or do which you may have promised. Rather, the more essential principle of keeping your word is to become a force of reliability, to serve as a rock of stability to those around you. By keeping your word, you define yourself by a character of integrity, living by the principle that “I do what I say, and I say what I do.”

Just as with telling the Truth, keeping one’s word is not for the sake of niceties. It is just as important to keep one’s word, and to demonstrate one’s reliability, even with enemies. Indeed, giving your word can also take the form of a stern warning to enemies, such as: “If you take that wrongful action, I will have to take measures to stop you.” Then, if they cause harm or wrongdoing anyway, you must keep your word, and take forceful action to terminate or defend others from their misconduct.

Showing reliability to enemies can also serve as a deterrent, actually helping to prevent conflict. When enemies see that you are not against them personally, but are dedicated only to not allowing their wrongful actions, this can de-escalate a conflict while deterring them from misdeeds. When enemies see that you consistently keep your word as an opposing force against wrongdoing, this can teach them to stop their misdeeds.

By demonstrating to enemies that you are solidly reliable in this way, this creates a fair opportunity for people to learn the boundaries, and to make their own choice (thus accepting their own consequences) whether or not to fall afoul of your openly declared Knightly mandate to uphold and defend the good.
Chivalry is a timeless institution, and a Knight or Dame must embody that institution by one’s living example. The individual as a person must radiate the honor and reliability of that institution, in all one’s words and deeds. Only in this way, can the Knight or Dame shine the light of Chivalry upon society, for its hope, inspiration and example to benefit the people.

Therefore, a more complete and accurate summary of this rule, in a more universal form, would be:

“Never lie nor breach your word, be reliable for friend or foe.”

**IX. Thou shalt be generous, and give largesse to everyone.**

The Code of Chivalry cannot be assimilated to the Decalogue in the Old Testament consecrated by the New Law, popularized by the Church, a truly divine and universal covenant for all centuries, and adapted to all nations. The rules for the use of Knights are necessarily of a more restricted and of a more special character than the sacred Commandments. ... So with charity, which is the essence of Christianity, and which must not be confounded with liberality, which is the essence of Chivalry. This liberality embodies the Ninth Commandment of the legislation which we are attempting to set forth; and, to tell the truth, charity holds but a small position in it.

It is worth noting, that this passage confirms that the Code of Chivalry, and accordingly the chivalric way of life itself, is much broader in scope than only Christianity, and thus cannot be limited to interpretation by Christian cultural biases.

Sometimes, nevertheless, these heavy mail-clad warriors, living amid the license of camps, had really fine accesses of charity. ... It is recorded of our heroes, that, in times of great danger they did not scruple to register vows, as sailors do in the midst of a great storm; and one of these vows was to found a hospital, an almshouse, wherein all the poor could be accommodated. ...

The virtue – the true chivalrous virtue – is liberality, and, to use the proper word, largesse. This beautiful term “largesse” is French as well as Christian, and it expresses a good deal in our language. Would you sum up the praise of a Knight... They say of him that he is courteous and wise, and ‘larges pour donner’ [giving generously].
To give “generously” with “largesse” does not necessarily mean giving grandiose gifts, and does not require possessing or making contributions beyond one’s means. Giving with “liberality” does not imply needing or disposing of resources beyond what one possesses or can obtain. Rather, this means that when making contributions, they should be given with a grand spirit, and one’s actions should be large within the context of one’s capabilities.

The essence of giving with a grand spirit is acting with wholeheartedness, without reservation, not reluctantly, and displaying the positive energy of enthusiasm, which reflects the goodness of one’s intentions. It means the spirited readiness and energetic willingness to contribute whatever one can, for the greater good.

This spirit of wholeheartedness carries positive effects far beyond the gift itself, as this manner also serves to inspire others to follow your example, making their own contributions.

Another central aspect of giving wholeheartedly is that the contribution should reflect one’s sincere intention to do as much good as possible. This means that what is given should be reasonably calculated to have a meaningful positive impact.

Accordingly, whatever is given should be sufficient to accomplish some positive result, or to empower others to achieve some needed goal. Merely a token symbolic gesture, which leaves people still needing to fend for themselves or solve a problem on their own, is not enough. What one contributes, no matter how small, should be intended and expected to have some meaningful impact, at least to some measurable degree.

Therefore, a more complete and accurate summary of this rule, in a more universal form, would be:

“Give generously and wholeheartedly, for meaningful impact.”

X. Thou shalt be everywhere and always the champion of the Right and the Good against Injustice and Evil.

We must confess that the Tenth Commandment of Chivalry has not been clearly formulated by our poets, and that we owe it to the Church as a matter of fact. “To combat all evil, to defend all good,” would not have come naturally to the minds of those... who had not been affected by the water of their baptism. ...
Nevertheless humanity... had need of clear decisions, and it is the Church which has furnished them to mankind. The liturgy here rises on golden wings, and we rise with it to the highest summits. When William Durand collected, in the 13th century, the elements of that pontifical to which his name is attached, he took care to choose for the Benedictio Novi Militis [“Blessing of New Knights”] this magnificent prayer:

“O God, Thou has only permitted the use of the sword to curb the malice of the wicked and to defend the right. Grant, therefore, that Thy new Knight may never use his sword to injure, unjustly, anyone, whoever he may be; but that he may use it always in defense of all that is Just and right!” Omnia cum gladio suo Justa et recta defendat. ...

When a new Knight was dubbed at Rome in the splendid Basilica of St. Peter, which was the center of the Christian World, a sword was very solemnly handed to the warrior, “So that he might energetically exercise Justice, and that he might overturn the triumphant edifice of iniquity, ‘ut vim aequitatis exerceret, et molem iniquitatis destrueret.’”

And again, farther on: “Remember, O Knight, that you are to act as the Defender of Order and as the avenger of injustice. ‘Ulciscaris injusta, confirmes bene disposita.’” And the conclusion addressed to him in a grave voice, was, “It is on this condition, living here below as a copy of Christ, that you will reign eternally above with your Divine Model.” ...

The poet of this [19th] century... Victor Hugo – has spoken of Chivalry in terms scarcely less magnificent. In one of the most beautiful verses which the 19th century has ever produced, he defines the Christian Knight such as the Code of Chivalry conceived him; such as the Church wished him to be:

“He listened always if one cried to him for help.”

There are ten words which one may engrave upon one’s memory. ...

Such is the Code of Chivalry, and one should not be astonished that anyone tried to oppose to it a Satanic Counter Code. ... This Contra Code finds more than once... its brutal and perhaps exaggerated expression. It is to the race of the Mayençais, to that race of traitors, that the honor of this astounding legislation belongs:

“Thou shalt never be loyal to anyone; thou shalt never keep thy word... thou shalt betray and sell honest men; thou shalt uphold evil and abase the good; thou shalt ravish the poor and disinherit the orphan; despoil widows; dishonor the Church; thou shalt lie without shame; and violate thine oaths.”...
“Mayençais” is the French word for people of “Mainz”. The Republic of Mainz was located on the northwest end of Bavaria (the southeast region of modern Germany), and officially existed only during the year 1793 AD. Mainz was the primary source of resistance against the French Revolutionary Army (which represented the people opposing elitist feudal lords), defended by mostly Bavarian army forces.

In that same region of Germany, a secret society called the “Bavarian Illuminati” had been discovered and exposed by government authorities in 1785 AD [14]. Vatican historians documented that the Bavarian Illuminati was also active in France, and expanded there as a result of its suppression by the authorities in 1785 AD. [15] This also caused its resurgence only 8 years later as the Mayençais (Mainz) on the outskirts of Bavaria in 1793 AD.

The Bavarian Illuminati was exposed by an accidental leak of its manuscript called “Protocols of the Elders”, presenting a detailed evil agenda of global domination through systematic methods of lies, deception and sabotage of all religion. Those Protocols traced back to 1773 AD, from an elitist secular political clan of nobility [16]. The agenda of those Protocols originated from a manuscript of 1489 AD, in correspondence between the Illuminati in Bavaria and feudal lords in Provence, France [17].

The historical record evidences that both the Bavarian and French Illuminati, advancing this evil agenda as a secular political clan, were behaving as a self-styled “race” of Khazarians. Therefore, the Mayençais, described by the 19th century historian Emile Leon Gautier as a “race of traitors” who promoted the “Satanic Counter Code”, were the very same political clan as the Bavarian Illuminati, who advanced the evil agenda of their Protocols since 1489 AD.

The historically verified text of the “Protocols of the Elders” of the Bavarian Illuminati also evidence a direct connection with the Merovingian political clan:

“Protocol 14” plans to impose a new form of feudal “serfdom”, through precisely the same methods used by the Merovingian nobility in the 9th century; “Protocol 15” declares the method of relying on the “mysticism of authority”, using “the emblems of inviolability from mystical causes”; “Protocol 24” states that descendants of a supposed “dynastic [line] of King David”, referring to a claimed bloodline of Jesus Christ, would be the advisors to future Kings of a global dictatorship. [18]
The “Merovingian” dynasty was named after the legendary figure Merovech, believed to be the 5th century son of the “Quinotaur” Sea-God of the Salian Franks [19]. This mythological past was needed to promote Frankish rule in Western Europe [20]. That legend of being “descended from a fish” was used to claim Merovingian lineage from the bloodline of Jesus Christ, merely by loose association with early Christians using a “fish” symbol, with no other basis.

The name “Merovech” is actually a Latinized form of the Old High German name Marwig, meaning “famous fight”, proving it is solely of Germanic origins [21]. This evidences a connection of the Merovingian dynasty to the tribal political clan of Bavarian nobility, and indicates that it is likely to be the earlier origins of the Bavarian Illuminati.

This is the same Merovingian political clan which the historian Gautier described (in Chapter 3) as causing “great division”, promoting the “competing civilization” of its own political clan with its “tendencies” against the people, behaving as a self-styled “different race”. Again, this closely mirrors Gautier’s description of the Bavarian “Mayençais” as a “race of traitors” who promoted the “Satanic Counter Code”.

It was these same Merovingian manipulations, using the same methods declared in the Bavarian Illuminati “Protocols of the Elders” and Mayençais “Satanic Counter Code”, which Gautier describes (in Chapter 4) as being used to impose the serfdom of “feudalism, so disastrous to the Church and to the Good” in the 9th century. It is precisely those same methods which were used by similar political clans to establish “economic debt slavery” (of corporatism with privatized central banking) as the new form of “feudalism” in the modern era of the 20th century.

Therefore, the historical record abundantly proves that a tradition of European agents of evil has in fact existed, through quasi-dynastic secret societies since at least the 5th century, which became more active since the 18th century.

Furthermore, our modern experience has increasingly demonstrated that offshoots of the same evil groups, or at least revivals of their same evil agenda, have persisted into the modern era to continue inflicting suffering upon humanity.

It is those political clans and factions who are the historically proven enemies of Faith, enemies of God, enemies of good, and enemies of humanity. It is specifically those same agents of evil, who all Knights are truly sworn to defend and fight against, and to destroy their plans.
These are the true reasons why the Temple Rule of 1129 AD (Rule 14) commands the Knights Templar to “rid the land of the enemies of Jesus Christ”, and the Code of Chivalry (Second Commandment) requires to fight “the enemies of the Cross”.

This is why the Code of Chivalry commands “To combat all evil, to defend all good”, and to “listen always if one cries to you for help”; The Church’s Blessing of New Knights commands “to curb the malice of the wicked and to defend the right”, and to use one’s sword “always in defense of all that is Just and right!”; The Vatican’s Dubbing of Knighthood commands to “energetically exercise Justice” to “overturn iniquity”, and “to act as the Defender of Order and as the avenger of injustice”.

Moreover, all of these compelling mandates of the Code of Chivalry remain highly relevant – indeed even a dire necessity – in modern times.

Therefore, the medieval world of Chivalry, the true and authentic Chivalry of Truth and Justice, which was the sworn Holy creed and sacred way of life of our ancestors, calls to us now in the present. It is the moral duty, and profound human responsibility, for each and every one of us who hears that call, to take up the Code of Chivalry, and fight for all of humanity and all goodness in our time.

Following from all of the above history, a more direct and concise summary of this rule, described in a universal form, would be:

“Always uphold right and good, against all evil and injustice.”
The Universal Code of Chivalry
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The authentic medieval Code of Chivalry was reconstructed from the historical record, and thus restored, by the prominent historian Emile Leon Gautier, an archivist of the Imperial Archives and the National Archives in France, in 1883 AD. The authoritative English translation was made by Henry Frith in 1891 AD.

Analysis, in the context of authentic Templar history, has resulted in the present Universal Code of Chivalry, which has greater relevance, and is more suitable for practical real-world use, in modern times:

1. Believe in spiritual teachings and apply them in daily life.
2. Defend the traditions of religion and the principle of faith.
3. Respect and defend the weak against abuses by the strong.
4. Love the people and sovereignty of your country and others.
5. Do not be a coward, face the enemy, and use direct force.
6. Fight the enemies of good relentlessly and without mercy.
7. Perform all secular duties under the higher Laws of God.
8. Never lie nor breach your word, be reliable for friend or foe.
9. Give generously and wholeheartedly, for meaningful impact.
10. Always uphold right and good, against all evil and injustice.
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