



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

10 1118.60

HARVARD COLLEGE
LIBRARY



FROM THE BEQUEST OF
CHARLES SUMNER
CLASS OF 1830

Senator from Massachusetts

FOR BOOKS RELATING TO
POLITICS AND FINE ARTS



LETTERS
ON
FREEMASONRY

ADDRESSED CHIEFLY TO THE FRATERNITY.

WITH AN APPENDIX,

SHOWING THAT FREEMASONRY IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE
ABDUCTION AND MURDER OF CAPT. WM. MORGAN,
OF BATAVIA, N. Y., FOR REVEALING THE
SECRETS OF THE ORDER.

ALSO, EXTRACTS FROM RENUNCIATIONS OF SECEDING
MASONS OF THE FIRST RESPECTABILITY.

BY JOHN G. STEARNS,
AUTHOR OF AN INQUIRY INTO MASONRY.

UTICA, N. Y.
T. W. SEWARD, No. 137 GENESEE STREET.

1860.

Sec 7118.60

1867. Jan. 14

Wm. G. Stearns

Wm. G. Stearns.

Entered according to Act of Congress in the year 1860,
By JOHN G. STEARNS,
In the Clerk's Office of the Northern District of the State of
New York.

P R E F A C E.

That freemasonry is a corrupt and dangerous institution—is antagonistic to the Christian religion, and to the free institutions of our country, and ought to go out of existence, no candid person, who will take pains to investigate the subject, can doubt for a moment. The boasted secrets of the order, its corrupt nature and evil tendency, were thoroughly developed about 30 years ago, in the books, pamphlets and periodicals, which were then issued from the press, and put in circulation in every neighborhood. People then were generally pretty well informed. And from what they read, and heard and saw, they became heartily disgusted with the polluted character of freemasonry. It was hoped that the system would pass away, be forgotten, and give us no further trouble. But we labored under a great mistake.

There is a manifest determination, on the part of some, to revive and perpetuate this secret abomination, though it stands before us stained with crimes of the deepest dye; kidnapping “and murder not excepted.” The warfare must be renewed.

This little volume is designed to meet the present state of things—not only by further exposing the deceptive character of the institution; but also, by showing the exceeding sinfulness of those, who, at the present day, are laboring to revive it, and to redeem it from merited disgrace. The writer would, if possible, persuade all good men, especially, to come out from among them, and be separate, and “to have no fellowship with these unfruitful works of darkness, but rather to reprove them.” May God bless the effort.

INDEX.

LETTER I.

The Antagonism between Freemasonry and Christianity, 3

LETTER II.

More about Secrecy..... 15

LETTER III.

Freemasonry confines its sympathies and benefits to an insignificant few of the human race,..... 26

LETTER IV.

The Masonic League,..... 34

LETTER V.

The Responsibilities resting on adhering Masons,..... 48

LETTER VI.

The subject continued,..... 65

LETTER VII.

False and profane traditions and representations of Freemasonry,..... 78

LETTER VIII.

Has not Freemasonry been changed?..... 97

LETTER IX.

The Warfare,..... 102

LETTER X.

Professed ministers of Christ poor blind candidates,.... 116

APPENDIX.

A Condensed History of the Abduction of Wm. Morgan. 123

Extracts from Renunciations of seceding Masons of the first respectability,..... 163

LETTERS ON FREEMASONRY.

LETTER I.

THE ANTAGONISM BETWEEN FREEMASONRY AND CHRISTIANITY.

GENTLEMEN OF THE FRATERNITY: You pretend, in all your standard authorities which I have examined, that freemasonry is a religious institution, and is founded on the principles of the Bible. This I have shown pretty extensively in a former work, *The Inquiry into Masonry*. I shall not, therefore, occupy much space on this point, in the present work. A few quotations will answer my present purpose. Elder Joshua Bradley, in his book entitled "Some of the Beauties of Freemasonry," a book which is acknowledged as a standard work by the craft, says: "Our principles being drawn from revelation do not require us to make the secrets of masonry known," (p. 4.) And he teaches the brotherhood to sing,

"Hail masonry divine."

Mr. Town, in his "System of Speculative Freemasonry," says, "The principles of speculative freemasonry, have the same cœternal and unshaken foundation, contain and inculcate the same truths in substance and propose the same ultimate end as the doctrines of christianity." (p. 13.)

Another masonic author of a more recent date,

“Charles Scott, A. M., grand master of the grand lodge of the State of Mississippi,” says, “that Freemasonry is founded on the truths contained in the Holy Scriptures.” And that its design is “to teach those doctrines which essentially relate to the temporal and eternal destinies of our race.” That “the masonic institution is in fact founded on the Bible.” And, furthermore, that members of the society, “at this day, in the third stage of masonry,” that is, in the third degree, “*confess themselves to be christians.*” (See his “Analogy of Masonry,” &c. pp. 13, 14, 18, 25.)

Now as I have said in the “Inquiry into Masonry,” if these things be so—if masonry be what these and other standard authorities pretend that it is, what is the difference between it and christianity, and what matter is it which men believe and on which they rest their eternal hopes? There is no essential difference between the systems, and it can therefore make no material difference with men, in the end, which they embrace, and on which they rely for salvation, otherwise these pretensions are utterly and totally false, and the system is a delusion. If masonry contains and inculcates the same truths in substance, or proposes the same ultimate end as the doctrines of christianity, then the man who trusts in it will as surely be saved as if he trusted in christianity. For salvation is the end of both. If there be such a coincidence, such a harmony, such identity in principles, in design and end, there certainly can be no difference in the two systems. Then may it truly be said, as Mr. Scott argues, that the members of that society,

do in the third degree "*confess themselves to be christians.*" Yes, they are as surely christians, as those are who embrace christianity. And how often do you hear it said that a good mason is a christian, and every good christian is a mason! Gentlemen, I ask you, who profess christianity, and yet belong to the fraternity, do you believe these things? you who profess to be Christ's ministers, and are laboring to revive and sustain freemasonry, do you believe these pretensions? If you do, you are certainly of that class who "believe a lie:" for these pretensions are false from beginning to end, and thousands are deceived,—are made to believe them, and rest their immortal hopes on masonry. Hoping for the "grand lodge above," where, as Mr. Scott says, "we are told, all good masons expect to arrive, by the aid of the theological ladder," (p. 63.) Why should they not indulge this hope, when they are further taught, on the same page, that "masonry is founded on faith in God, hope of immortality and charity to all mankind." And, "*it is by the practice of these virtues, that the mason expects to find access to Him who is the subject of faith, the object of hope, and the eternal fountain of charity.*" And on another page "Christ is our Mediator and the Spirit our comforter, through their blessed interposition we may all find our way to the grand lodge above," (p. 189.) If Christ be the Mediator of masonry, and the Spirit of God the comforter there, why may not masons expect to find their way to the grand lodge above? This they do expect. Will they be disappointed? But my object at present is to show that freemasonry and christiauity are antagonistic. And here I begin with hope.

1. THE HOPE OF MASONRY AND THE HOPE OF CHRISTIANITY. The hope of masonry is founded on the *practice of masonic virtues*, the hope of christianity is founded on the mediation of Christ. There is a class of masonic members, and not a small class either, who expect to enter the grand lodge above by the practice of masonic duties. These men are to be found, in perhaps every lodge in the country. They are, in heart, Infidels, Deists or Universalists, or something worse. Such men I know personally, some of them I know to be profane and irreligious, and care no more for the Bible than they do for the Koran, yet they hope to be saved. Bring them to the Bible and test their hope, it vanishes! But the hope of the christian rests on the mediation of Christ, not on the practice of moral duties, whether taught in a masonic lodge, or any where else. And those christians who are members of masonic lodges, and I suppose there may be some such, do not hope for heaven through masonry. No, brethren, your hope rests on a surer foundation. Though you may argue that masonry is a good institution, that it is founded on the principles of christianity, and is doing a great deal of good in the world, yet not one of you I presume, will tell me that your hope rests on the system of freemasonry; here then is antagonism. The hope of freemasonry is a delusion. The hope of christianity is a good hope through grace. Those who indulge the former, and die with it, will perish in their sins: those who indulge the latter, will die in triumph, and reign in glory.

No understanding christian, though a mason, will undertake to controvert this position. Free-

masonry, as a professedly religious system, is a delusion—one of the devil's strong holds. It is what the Apostle would denominate, "a damnable heresy." Thousands on thousands are led, "*hoodwinked*," by it, to perdition. Of all the delusions of the present day, I know not of one more captivating and dangerous.

2. Another thing in which this antagonism is manifest, is, this class of masons who are hoping for the grand lodge above through masonry, who are warmly attached to the institution, and are its most zealous promoters, are, at the same time, hostile to christianity. Some of them may not openly oppose it, but they manifest no relish for it,—take no interest in promoting it,—are seldom, if ever, seen in the sanctuary on the Lord's Day, sustaining the institution of the public worship of God. Now, if masonry be what it professes to be—founded on the Bible, teaching the same truths, inculcating the same duties, proposing the same end—why are these men so enamored with the one, and so disgusted with the other? Scarcely a mason in the land who will not tell you that masonry is, at least, "the handmaid of christianity." If these men are so in love with the handmaid, why do they not love the mother? Can they love the one and not the other? Can they love Bible-truths when adopted into the system of masonry, and not love those truths in the system of revelation, where they belong? Here is perfect antagonism. And I leave those who advocate that masonry is founded on christianity, to reconcile this thing. Show us why it is that some of your number are so charmed with masonry, and yet

so indifferent to christianity. Show us how they can hold to the one and despise the other, if both are alike, or if there be even a family resemblance.

3. **SECRECY AND PUBLICITY.**—Christianity is a public institution, holding forth its blessings, instruction, requirements, duties and obligations, to the entire race.

I need occupy but little space to prove this proposition, for who will controvert it? Who will say that christianity is not, in every sense of the word, a public institution? If we turn to the Old Testament, we find Jehovah addressing the patriarch, Abraham, like this: "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." This sentiment was held forth by all the holy prophets, from the days of Abraham until the coming of the Messiah. In Him, the promised seed, were all the nations, and even "all the families of the earth, to be blessed." When He appeared and began his ministry, it was not in masonic lodges, in their secret chambers—not in a grand lodge at Jerusalem—but in public. Hence, when He was apprehended and brought before the high priest, and interrogated concerning His doctrine, He answered: "I spoke openly to the world, and even taught in the synagogue and in the temple, whither the Jews always resort, and in secret have I said nothing. Why askest thou me? Ask them who heard me, what I have said unto them: behold, they know what I said." And on another occasion, warning his disciples to beware of false Christs and false teachers, He said, if they shall say, "Behold, He is in the desert, go not forth; behold, He is

in the secret chambers, believe it not." He is not there, and never was. That is the place for false Christs and false prophets.

If masonry originated at the building of the first temple, and was kept up until the coming of Christ; if there was a grand lodge at Jerusalem, and if Christ, as represented by some masonic authors, was grand master; if John the Baptist and John the Evangelist were masons, eminent patrons of the order, and are now, as is held forth, "*patron saints of masonry*,"—why did our Lord use such language? Why did He solemnly declare to the high priest, "In secret have I said nothing," and to the disciples, "If they shall say to you, He is in the secret chambers, believe it not"? Even admitting that there were lodges in Israel, and even a grand lodge at Jerusalem, (which we do not believe,) one thing is certain—Christ was never there. He never taught the mysteries of His Gospel in those secret chambers. He shunned them as He would dens of thieves and robbers. To represent Him as grand master is little, if anything, short of blasphemy. Mr. Scott, in his "*Analogy of Ancient Craft Masonry*," says, in allusions to Christ: "It is highly important to consider whether we have served our most worshipful grand master with freedom, fervency and zeal, in our probationary state." Again: "Who is he that stands at the door and knocks? One who has a right to come in. He is our grand master," (pp. 315—386.) Here our Lord Jesus Christ is profanely held up to the world as a grand master mason, and even most worshipful grand master!! Let those who thus reproach

the Son of God, answer it: most surely they will be called to give an account for this.

Turn to the great commission given by our Lord on Mount Zion: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." Wherever human creatures are found, whether amidst Greenland's icy mountains or India's coral strands, to them the Gospel, the whole Gospel, all its heavenly principles, is to be preached: nothing is to be kept back or concealed from any creature. On another occasion, Jesus said to His disciples: "There is nothing covered that shall not be revealed, and hid that shall not be known. What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light; and what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the housetops." Here is a solemn charge to make known His whole Gospel in the most public manner possible: to proclaim it upon the housetops. Paul well understood this injunction of his master, and for what purpose grace was given him, and that was "to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God." Grace was given to enable him to make this mystery known—not to conceal, but to reveal it. To whom? To masonic lodges, or to the poor blind candidates of masonry? No: but to "*all men*"—"to every creature." It is the duty of all Christ's ministers, and of all his disciples, to employ themselves in making known the principles of His religion, as far as possible. Look at the mighty array of instrumentalities employed by Him to accomplish this end! For what purpose are churches organized? To carry out the great

commission—to make His Gospel known to all men. All their energies are to be directed to this grand purpose. Nothing pertaining to the organization, ordinances, principles and government of a church is to be kept a secret. Everything is of a public character. And thus it is that a church is like a “city on a hill,” or, to use another figure, “the light of the world.” Jesus, therefore, commands his disciples to let their light shine before men, and not to put it under a bushel, or under a bed, or in a secret chamber.

Now, look at the antagonism. Freemasonry is a secret institution; it is professedly such. No one disputes this. It is founded on the most terrible oaths of secrecy in everything pertaining to what are called the mysteries of the order. Every individual member is under the death penalty to observe this secrecy. If he shall disclose any, the least item of these mysteries or secrets, he forfeits his life. He is, therefore, made to swear, in the presence of Almighty God, that he will “always hail, ever conceal, and never reveal any art or arts, part or parts, point or points, of the secret arts and mysteries of ancient freemasonry, which he has received, is about to receive, or may hereafter be instructed into,” &c.; that he “will not write, print, stamp, stain, hew, cut, carve, indent, paint, or engrave it on anything movable or immovable under the whole canopy of heaven, whereby or whereon the least letter, figure, character, mark, stain, shadow, or resemblance of the same may become legible or intelligible to himself or to any other person in the known world, whereby the secrets of masonry may be unlawfully obtained through his un-

worthiness." Then comes the death penalty in its most terrific form: "To all which I do most solemnly and sincerely promise and swear, without the least equivocation, mental reservation, or self-evasion of mind in me whatever, binding myself under no less penalty than to have my throat cut across, and my tongue torn out by the roots, and my body buried in the rough sands of the sea, at low water mark, where the tide ebbs and flows twice in twenty-four hours: so help me God, and keep me steadfast in the due performance of the same." Language cannot be put together so as to form a more binding obligation to secrecy.

Look at christianity and its sacred obligations! All the disciples, from the highest to the lowest, ministers and lay members, male and female, are to do all in their power to make the principles of their religion public among all nations, to every creature under heaven—to make all men see what is the fellowship of this great mystery of redeeming love. Nothing pertaining to this system is allowed to be concealed—not a particle of its light to be put under a bushel—not a precept to be hid. Look at the contrast: if the poor hoodwinked dupe of masonry shall utter one syllable, or one letter, or make any figure or mark in any shape whatever, whereby any of the so-called secrets of the order shall become intelligible to any person in the known world, he forfeits his life! On one hand, the followers of Christ, so far as they discharge their duties, are busily employed, at home and abroad, on the land and on the sea, in making known the mysteries of redemption to all classes of men in all the

world; on the other hand, the members of "ancient craft masonry" are employing their time and talents and property, to conceal their arts and mysteries in the dark abodes of the lodge-room, and from all but the few who enter there hoodwinked and cable-towed. It is not intended that these things shall ever be communicated to any other class of human beings, or that the light of day shall ever shine upon them. The masonic husband receives what is termed sublime and useful knowledge, which he must not impart to the wife of his bosom; he passes through ceremonies which he must not disclose to her, on pain of death. No two systems can be more at variance in all their essential features.

In view of these plain matters of fact, are we to be told that "masonry is founded on the Bible"—that it inculcates the same duties and proposes the same ultimate end that christianity does? I am reminded of an anecdote concerning Jack, the mill-boy, who, in attempting to practice on the popular sentiment, "no matter what a man believes provided he is sincere," found himself plunged into the stream which he undertook to ford. Crawling up on the flood-wood, all dripping wet, he exclaimed, "a bigger lie the devil never got up." I think so, and say so, of masonry. It is Satan's master-piece. He has thrown over it the borrowed robes of christianity, and, to an unthinking world, made it appear very pretty—like the base prostitute, dressed out in silks. When the fact is, there is not a word of truth in these high pretensions. There is no more resemblance between the principles of masonry and of christianity than

there is between light and darkness, or truth and falsehood. And here you have a forcible demonstration of the fact—one is a public institution, the other is an oath-bound secret.

This antagonism extends to all the free institutions of a free government and a free people; to all those of a religious character—church meetings, associations, conventions, conferences, presbyteries, synods, general assemblies, missionary and bible societies, and all the great benevolent organizations of this day and age. None of these are secret. So, also, to our literary institutions, from the meeting of a school district up to the great gatherings of the people to sustain our colleges and universities. No oath-bound secrecy here, under death penalties. Then look at all our civil and political institutions, which are designed to sustain our free government—from a town meeting up to the Congress of the United States. The great gatherings of the people to sustain these institutions, what are they? All of a public character—open to the inspection of all. Every person who is disposed, and will take the pains, may acquaint himself with the doings of the people in all the various departments of our free government. But when lodges and grand lodges, chapters and grand chapters, encampments and grand encampments gather, they do so in secret, with closed doors, guarded by drawn swords; and every member is under a death penalty not to divulge to the uninitiated what is done within. Who knows what secret wires are pulled in these secret chambers for the purpose of bringing about some mischievous design, as in the out-

rage upon Morgan? The antagonism is perfect as can be. And the wonder is, that people under this free government will countenance the existence of such a secret, oath-bound, murderous combination. The first penalty for a violation of its laws is a most horrible and inhuman death.

LETTER II.

MORE ABOUT SECRECY.

Gentlemen, you may tell me, as Elder Bradley does in his "Beauties of Masonry," "Our principles, being drawn from revelation, do not require us to make the secrets of masonry known." I take quite opposite ground. If masonry be what you say it is—founded on the Bible, teaching the same truths, and accomplishing the same ultimate end that christianity does—I argue that its principles require you to make these things known throughout the world as extensively as christianity is published. Those principles forbid secrecy. You say the secrets of masonry are good, and tend to promote the present and everlasting well-being of our race; yet you say that the principles of revelation justify you in keeping these things hid in the lodge, in withholding them from those whose present and future good they are adapted and intended to promote. This is one of the greatest absurdities in the world. Show us these principles in the Bible. The statement is its own refutation. How can these principles or secrets promote the good of those who know nothing about them? Does the Gospel of Christ promote the good of those

who are ignorant of it—who never heard it? If there be any good in your wonderful secrets, tell all men what that good is; let them understand and embrace it, and be benefitted by it. But the fact is, you have evil covered up in the lodge, under death penalties. Will good men get together and solemnly swear, in the presence of Almighty God, and place themselves under such brutal penalties that they will ever conceal and never reveal what they are taught and made to believe is for the benefit of their fellow-men generally? The thought is too absurd to be credited a moment by any person of sane mind. Good men are always pleased to make public, as far as possible, everything of this character. Why, suppose a christian church were to form such a league—make all its members bind themselves under death penalties that they will “ever conceal and never reveal” the principles of their religion out of the church—what would you think of such a church? This, you will say, would be monstrous, and everybody would shun such a society. But why is this course any worse for a church than for a masonic lodge, if both embrace the same principles? Just look at the subject a moment. You tell us over and over again, in all your standard authorities, that your principles are drawn from revelation, and through Salem Town, in his “System of Speculative Masonry,” which has the sanction of the highest masonic authorities in the United States, through him you tell us, “that the same system of faith and the same practical duties taught by revelation, are contained in and required by the masonic institution;” yet you solemnly swear,

under these horrid death penalties, that this same system of faith, and these same practical duties, you will conceal and never reveal! Reconcile these things. Who can? No man living. Here, again, is perfect antagonism.

But there is evil, and only evil, covered up under the veil of secrecy. If you had anything good there, common sense teaches that you would not be ashamed nor afraid to have all the world know it. It would be no disgrace, but an honor. Here the following Scripture is appropriate: "Light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light because their deeds were evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved. But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God." When men do evil, as a general thing, they incline to do it secretly, in the dark: the darker the better. As one of the three who sunk Wm. Morgan in Niagara river has confessed: "The night was pitch dark; we could scarcely see a yard before us, and therefore was the time admirably adapted to our hellish purpose." (See Inquiry into Masonry, p. 313.) But he that doeth truth, he that performs good deeds, cometh to the light; does not fear the light; is willing that all the world should know what he is about. Ask every good man under the light of the sun if these things are not so.

But an evil work has been going on secretly in your lodges. For a few years past, especially, you have been reviving up your profane mysteries. In a clandestine way, masonry has been

coming upon us again. We have been quietly slumbering over this subject, and in our slumbers have *dreamed* that masonry was *dead*, and had no apprehensions of its ever coming to life, so as to trouble us again in this part of the land. But we awake, and we find that this is a delusive dream. We look around, and behold! lodges are reviving and multiplying on every hand, and at "*work*," making masons, about as fast as ever in former days. And to our astonishment we learn that some professed ministers of Christ have been caught in this "snare of the devil," and are lending themselves as his tools, to revive up this "mystery of iniquity," and to draw others into it. Almost the first intimations we have that the institution is reviving is, that this minister and that and the other are masons. They have secretly joined that fraternity, and have for a long time kept the thing in the dark. Some of these men once stood in the anti-masonic ranks. Every now and then some new case occurs, in which it becomes known that such a minister is a mason and has been, perhaps, for years. The Lord knows their hearts.

An ecclesiastical council was called, not long since, by a Baptist church to ordain a young brother to the ministry. In the course of his examination, it was ascertained that he was a mason. The council refused to ordain. In a subsequent conversation with a mason of that village, he assured me that the act of the council had been a great benefit to the lodge, for, since that, they had initiated two ministers, and a third one had made application; but he declined telling who they were. They (the ministers) did

not wish the thing known, neither did the lodge. This was, indeed, masonic: doing things secretly, and then keeping them as a secret, has always been characteristic of freemasonry. These ministers had joined the lodge secretly, and then wished it to be kept a secret. Was the deed an honorable one, of which they had no reason to be ashamed? Why, then, not perform it in broad daylight, and let the whole community know it, as when they united with the church, or were ordained to the ministry? Why manage the thing as they would some dishonorable act that would sink their ministerial reputation, if publicly known? In this truly masonic method ministers and others have, for some years past, been creeping into the lodges, unknown to the churches. In this way the young brother, whose ordination was declined, had become a member of the order: it was not publicly known until his examination before the council. And how many more such there are, who are covered up under the veil of masonic secrecy, the future will disclose.

Do you say, as one brother has said, that "to an impartial and candid inquirer, secrecy is no proof of the evil character of an institution; that, though evil works are wrought in secret, it does not follow that all secret works are evil; that the sacred things of friendship and love would perish if exposed to public gaze; that the most sacred and holy place on earth is a secret place; that the noblest emotion of the christian's heart—benevolence—is to find expression secretly"? All these things may be true; but what analogy is there between them and a secret *institution*—

B*

an over-grown secret organization, founded on the most profane oaths that ever fell from the lips of human depravity—in which the candidate, after swearing to keep secret he knows not what, but anything which shall be committed to him as such, in masonic style, binds himself under no less penalty than to have his throat cut across and his tongue torn out by the roots, &c. This is horrible and profane. Satan could not invent language of a more diabolical character. I ask again, what analogy is there between the sacred things of love and friendship, the christian's closet for secret devotion, and the unostentatious expression of the benevolence of his heart in works of mercy? What analogy is there between these things and an institution founded on such bloody oaths? And these oaths, if possible, are more blasphemous the higher you ascend the masonic ladder.*

I argue that, to every candid and impartial inquirer, secrecy *is* proof of the evil character of an institution; and I summon the common sense of all christendom to sit in judgment on the case.

Is it necessary that we should organize secret societies in order to do good to our fellow-men—to promote, as Mr. Town says masonry does, the present and everlasting well-being of our race, as christianity does? I ask, gentlemen of the order,

*NOTE.—Well does John Quincy Adams say, "that the Entered Apprentice's oath, obligations, and annexed penalty, is in itself vicious, and such as ought never to be administered by man to man." "My fifth objection is to the horrible *ideas* of which the penalty is composed. It is an oath of which a common cannibal should be ashamed." "Have I proved that the Entered Apprentice's oath is a breach of law, human and divine?—that its promise is undefined, unlawful, and nugatory?—that its penalty is barbarous, inhuman, and murderous in its terms?" (*Letters on Freemasonry*, pp. 59, 64, 94.)

and those of you, especially, who profess to be christians, does God's Word enjoin it upon us to get up and sustain such societies? Can we not do our whole duty to God and to men without their aid? If not, tell us what we cannot do: what duties we owe to either which we cannot perform without them. Point out one thing; let us know what it is.

Your former Grand Chaplain of Washington Encampment — Bradley — teaches us, in his "Beauties of Masonry," that "masonry is the most perfect and sublime institution ever formed by man for promoting the happiness of individuals, or for increasing the general good of the community. Its fundamental principles are *universal benevolence and brotherly love.*" (p. 42.) Now, gentlemen, let me ask you, what are you doing in any part of the world to promote the general good of community, or the cause of universal benevolence and brotherly love, by means of your secret societies, which might not, or could not be done without them?—done by christianity and christian churches—the Saviour's own instrumentalities. You may be doing good to individuals of your own fraternity, but this is not the question. What are you doing to promote universal benevolence which could not be done otherwise? Show us one thing.*

*Here I quote the language of that same Joshua Bradly, in his renunciation of Masonry. He says: "Seriously inquire what all these labors, consumption of time and property, have benefited millions who have been connected with the Order in all its mutations and progress amid civilized nations. A few well-organized churches of Christ have done more in instructing the ignorant, in comforting the sick, in feeding the hungry, in clothing the naked, and in proclaiming glad tidings to mankind, than the whole host of Masons have done around the globe, since the commencement of their existence." (See his renunciation in the Appendix.)

Again: show us a community, neighborhood, or village, where the people enjoy a state of moral, social, intellectual refinement, and of religious prosperity, which they could not enjoy without the existence of a masonic lodge among them. What is the lodge doing in any of these respects, or in any other, that might not be done without it? that might not be done by christian churches and ministers, and lay members? Are the people generally, young and old, male and female, more moral, more refined and social and intelligent, more pious, more like Christ, and more active in doing good to all men as they have opportunity, and especially to the household of faith, where there is a lodge of free masons, than where there is not? If not, of what benefit to the world is such a secret, oath-bound society? If your lodges are not doing these things in a way and manner, and to an extent which they could not be done by any other instrumentalities, then, to say the least, their existence is not called for.

Do you, in your lodges, teach the arts and sciences? What branches? What "art or arts, part or parts," which the poor blind candidate swears that he "will ever conceal and never reveal," do you inculcate? Do you teach astronomy, geography, mathematics, rhetoric, logic, history, natural and moral philosophy, music, &c.? do you make it your business to teach these and other branches of literature and science? and, in connection with these, do you teach the sacred science of morality and religion? If so, what need of a secret organization? Why not throw wide open your doors, as all our literary

and theological institutions do throughout the land, and admit all classes and both sexes — our youth, our sons and daughters—who are disposed to enter and reap the benefit of your sublime instruction? Admitting that you teach all that is taught by these institutions, of what possible use is this to the public? In what way can it tend to promote universal good, seeing you are bound by solemn oath and under the penalty of death, “ever to conceal and never to reveal any art or arts, part or parts,” never “to write, print, stamp, stain, hew, cut, carve, indent, paint, or engrave it on anything movable or immovable under the whole canopy of heaven,” &c., whereby any being in the known world shall obtain your knowledge, except it be in the “body of a just and lawfully constituted lodge”? Surely, all this can be of no public utility whatever. There is, therefore, no demand for such secret organizations. We are better without them than with them. We have other institutions, of a public character, better adapted to promote the public good, far beyond everything you have ever done or ever can do. Your pretensions are a mere mockery.

Furthermore, what are your secrets and your sublime mysteries, at the present day, into which you initiate those who are weak and simple enough to submit to the foolery and nonsense of being *hoodwinked and cable-towed* in a masonic lodge? What are they, and where are they? I answer, you have none, except your signs, grips and pass-words. These you have altered from what they were at the time masonry was revealed; so that a mere book mason cannot now get into the lodges: just as it was at the

time when a little book, called *Jachin and Boaz*, was published in England many years ago : that book then revealed masonry. To keep book masons out of the lodges, it became necessary to alter the signs, grips and pass-words. But masonry, as to the three degrees, remained substantially the same until revealed by Morgan : by him the veil is again lifted up, and all that constituted the secrets and sublime mysteries of masonry is fully and faithfully exposed to the uninitiated public. And any man who has a few shillings to spare, and will procure one of the books containing those revelations, may learn all what masonry is, and be more thoroughly instructed on the subject than hundreds are who pay ten, fifteen, or twenty dollars, more or less, and submit to the degradation of being led into the lodge by a rope called a "cable-tow" around the neck. He may know all, except the altered *signs, grips and pass-words*. "The ancient land-marks" have not been, and cannot be, removed ; and the principles of masonry, as we are assured by masonic authorities, "are the same in every age and nation." No mason with whom I have conversed has even pretended that there has been any alteration. And I am often assured that masonry is now just what it always was. So, if any one desires to know what wonderful freemasonry is, let him procure a book and read for himself. And if any of you, members of the order, shall pretend that your system is not now what it was as revealed by Morgan and others, but that you have made changes for the better, have made improvements, tell us what those changes and improvements are, and

wherein masonry now differs from masonry then. This you are bound to do, or remain silent.

Men of intelligence and of high repute, and some of them professed ministers of the Gospel, are in great business—are they not?—to get together under the cover of night, up chamber, and guarded by the tyler's sword, and spend two or three hours, once a week, or once in two or four weeks, when some of them, at least, ought to be at home with their families—get together, and for what purpose? Why, to act over the childish nonsense of masonic ceremonies, and administering blasphemous and murderous oaths. Great business, indeed!—business of which school-boys would need to be ashamed. What sense is there in all this flummery? what is to be learned? Just nothing. You have no secrets to conceal or reveal. The cat is out—the whole cat—neck and heels; and when you come together in your lodges, to “*work*,” as you term it, the very school children, girls and boys in the streets, may know what you are up to—how you proceed to make a mason, to initiate the “poor blind candidate,” and to bring him to light.

It is folly, and worse than folly, for you, gentlemen, to pretend that the people do not know what masonry is. You cannot say, as some used to say, in former days, you condemn something you know nothing about; for the fact is, that those who can read and who have any desire to know what the secret arts and mysteries of masonry are, or once were, may become as well informed on the subject (except the signs, grips and pass-words) as those are who frequent the lodges. I can put any man in the way of being a well-informed mason for twenty-five cents.

Now, is it not ridiculous in the extreme to see sensible men, sensible in most other things, employing themselves, spending their time and money, some of them traveling the country, visiting the lodges and lecturing to them, for the purpose of reviving these senseless, childish, and profane ceremonies? I have conversed with many persons who have read the revelations of masonry, and I have never seen one who felt entertained, instructed, or edified; but all, without a single exception, so far as I can recollect, have expressed themselves as being very much disgusted. What, then, is there in freemasonry that renders it so attractive, so bewitching to thousands? There certainly is no knowledge relating to any of the useful arts or sciences, or to morals or religion to be obtained there which cannot be more readily obtained, and to far greater perfection, from other sources. What, then, is there there? I can tell you, gentlemen: there is something aside from these purile ceremonies and childish sports acted over in the lodge-room. These things are only the shell. Beneath this outside, for which you care but very little—beneath this there lies something that operates as the charm. What this is, I will endeavor to point out in a subsequent letter.

LETTER III.

**FREEMASONRY CONFINES ITS SYMPATHIES AND
BENEFITS TO AN INSIGNIFICANT FEW
OF THE HUMAN RACE.**

In this we have further evidence of the direct antagonism between masonry and christianity.

The latter extends its sympathies and holds forth its favors to the whole family of man; the former confers its favors upon a few, to the exclusion of the many. These are the principles on which the institution is organized: to favor an insignificant few, to the exclusion of all the world beside. An institution of this character, every one knows, is antagonistic to the Gospel of Jesus Christ. That masonry is such, I shall proceed to show by arguments which, I am sure, no man can meet.

And, first, the entire fair sex—about one-half of the human family—is shut out from the lodges. The female connections of members of the lodges—their widows and orphans—if poor and penniless, are entitled to share in the pecuniary benefits of the society; but nothing further. Not one of *these* females can be admitted as a member, and to participate in the wisdom and knowledge and sublime teachings of a lodge-room: no, not one of the race can be allowed to enjoy this favor. No lady, however amiable, talented and worthy, can become a poor blind candidate for any one of the degrees. And do you wonder at this, in view of the ridiculous and disgusting ceremonies through which the candidate must pass to get into the *sanctum sanctorum*? What gentleman would not blush to see his amiable wife or daughter in the little preparation-room, neither naked nor clothed, neither barefoot nor shod, hoodwinked, and a rope called a cable-tow about her neck? This ceremony of initiation is a sufficient reason why females cannot become members of the lodges. But, does the Bible authorize such separation between the sexes?—does it

erect this barrier, that goes to exclude the entire female race from an institution that is said to be "the most perfect and sublime ever got up by man" for the good of community? But one answer can be given, and that is in the negative.

Look at christianity! listen to its heavenly teachings: "There is neither male nor female; but ye are all one in Christ Jesus"! Christianity makes the sexes one: "ye are all one in Christ Jesus." Females have an equal right with the other sex to membership in the kingdom, and to share with them in all its immunities. Now, are we to be told, and must it be trumpeted through the world, under the sanction of the highest masonic dignitaries, that an institution which excludes from its membership all the fair descendants of Mother Eve, not allowing one of them to be enrolled on its list of membership, and binding itself to extend pecuniary favor and chaste treatment to none but the few who may chance to be the widows, mothers, sisters, and daughters of poor penniless masons—are we to be taught that this is the most perfect and sublime institution? that its fundamental principles are *universal benevolence*? that it is the same in substance with christianity? A greater imposition was never palmed upon the world. Every master mason is made to promise and swear that he will never be at the "initiating of a woman," and that he will never "violate the chastity of a brother master mason's wife, mother, sister, or daughter, knowing them to be such." In case he does not know them to be such, what may he not do with masonic impunity? Do these principles of this most perfect and sublime institution

bind him to regard with christian purity all others of the fair sex? Is he not at liberty to let loose the reins of his unbridled lusts toward all but those named in his oath? And if he shall do this to any extent he pleases, can he be a subject of masonic discipline? He has violated no masonic oath or obligation. Grand masters, and grand chaplains, and grand high priests may write and publish what they please about the purity and benevolence of the order: the fact is, it throws a shield over some of the most licentious and worthless characters among us. Keeping themselves within the limits of masonic principles, what do they care for any others of the race, whether male or female, who are not connected with the fraternity? But I have not done with this antagonism.

Every master mason further promises and swears, that he "will not be at the initiating of an old man in dotage, or a young man in non-age." These two classes—old men and young men—are forever shut out of the lodges. Old men, however worthy, however wise and honorable, and however needy, cannot be admitted. And young men—our promising sons, who are in their minority, and who need to be instructed, trained and disciplined for future usefulness—cannot be admitted. These two classes—and they certainly constitute no inconsiderable portion of the great family of man—cannot be allowed to participate in what is called the sublime and useful knowledge that is said to be imparted in masonic lodges: nor can they share in the pecuniary advantages of the institution. Do such principles harmonize with the principles

of the Bible? Tell it not, for no sane man will believe it.

But there is another class, who, of all the race of man, are the most needy; and yet they have no share in the sympathies and boasted charities of the masonic institution: the poor, the sick, the lame, the blind, the deaf, the dumb, and those who are in any sense deformed in their physical constitution, or defective in their mental powers. The poor man, who is not able to pay his initiation fee and to support himself and family, or who by misfortune — the loss of property or health, or, perhaps, both, and is already thrown upon the world as an object of charity, or is likely to become such, however pious and honorable he may be—cannot be admitted as a member. Not an object of charity like this beneath the heavens can be received to the charities of this self-styled charitable institution. It is not designed to benefit such outside the lodges; and if they have such objects among themselves, as they sometimes have, they are those who have become such since their connection with freemasonry; they were not such when received. Now for the testimony. No man can become a member “unless he have an estate, office, trade, occupation, or some visible way of acquiring an honest livelihood, and of working in his craft, as becoming the members of this most ancient and honorable fraternity, who ought not only to earn what is sufficient for themselves and families, but likewise something to spare for works of charity. He must also be *upright in body, not deformed nor dismembered, at the time of making, but of hale and entire*

limbs, as a man ought to be." (Bradly, p. 152.) "Hardie's Monitor," a standard masonic work, speaking of the qualifications for membership, says: "Men in *low circumstances*, although possessed of some education and of good morals, *are not fit* to be members of the institution. They ought, previous to their application for admission, to consider their income and the situation of their families, and know that freemasonry requires not only knowledge, but attendance and decent external appearance, to maintain and support its *ancient respectability and grandeur.*" (Proceedings of United States Anti-Masonic Convention, p. 105.)

Should any one of that class of human sufferers which I have named make application for admittance and relief—should he knock at the door of a lodge, beg and plead to be received as a member—I ask you, gentlemen of the "ancient and honorable fraternity," would he be received? would you open your doors, your hearts and your treasury to relieve his necessities. No; you would treat him as the rich man in the parable did poor Lazarus. You would turn him away, and he might starve and die, as for anything freemasonry would do for him by admitting him to membership. You turn from him, and shut your doors against him, just because he is a poor sufferer—is already an object of charity. With such you have nothing to do outside of the lodge.

Should some poor virtuous widow, whose husband was not a mason, with her little fatherless ones, present herself as an object of charity, and, with many tears, beg for assistance, would

you be bound by your obligation to listen to her entreaties and to grant her petition? No; you would turn from her just as you would from the poor infirm applicant for membership. And yet you claim to be a charitable institution—to sail under the broad banner of universal benevolence! And there are many who, on reading your high pretensions, and yet not understanding the principles of your organization, really suppose that these things are so—that you are indeed charitable and benevolent to all mankind; but, by the false colors which you hold out, they are deceived. Here is a numerous class of sufferers—widows and orphans—real objects of charity, scattered over the land, among all nations throughout the world, to whom you are under no masonic obligation to extend the helping hand. You leave them to perish in the streets, highways and hedges, because they are not masons, or their wives and children. I do not say that as individuals you would not aid them from your own private resources; this, perhaps, many of you would do as cheerfully as any others: but I say, as masons, you are not bound by your oaths and obligations to respond to their calls. Hence, the oath of a master-mason: “Furthermore do I promise and swear, that I will be aiding and assisting all poor indigent master masons, their wives and orphans, wheresoever dispersed around the globe, as far as in my power, without injuring myself and family.”

Now, look at the perfect antagonism between this narrow, contracted, cold-hearted, selfish system, freemasonry, and christianity. The latter spreads out her great “feast of fat things, full

of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined," and bids all the ends of the earth to come and partake, "without money and without price." She sends forth her messengers to bring in "the poor, the lame, the halt, the blind," and all classes of human sufferers: her provisions are just adapted to their circumstances. On the other hand, not an object of charity under the whole canopy is ever received to membership in the masonic society—not an old man in dotage, nor a young man in non-age, nor a female. But the few who are admitted as members are, at the time of their initiation, "upright in body, not deformed nor dismembered, but of hale and entire limbs, as men ought to be." All are supposed to be perfectly healthy, and able to provide for themselves and families. Where is there room for charity or benevolence? Why, in case any of these members should become indigent, poor and penniless, you are bound, by the solemnities of the oath just repeated, to aid and assist; or, should they decease, and their families should be in want, you are bound, by the same oath, to assist them. Here, gentlemen, in the narrow limits of your society, is the sphere for the exercise of what you boastingly call *universal benevolence!!* It does not extend out of this circle. Your obligation does not bind you to aid and assist any others of the human race. If it do, why not say so? Why not say, "all poor indigent fellow-beings," instead of "all poor indigent master-masons"? Then you might talk about universal benevolence and charity to all mankind.

There is no truth in the representation, that

masonry is the most perfect and sublime institution ever formed by man for promoting the good of community; "that its fundamental principles are universal benevolence and brotherly love." Your fundamental principles are supreme selfishness: they have no direct reference to public good, or to universal benevolence, or to brotherly love, except it be to the secret brotherhood of masons. The pretension is like most others of your sublime order—a very great imposition—a piece of mockery.

LETTER IV.

THE MASONIC LEAGUE.

Freemasonry is a *league*, formed by a few for their exclusive benefit; this is the primary object of its organization. Wherever, therefore, lodges are located, the design is not to promote the good of the community around, but to aid and assist each other as members of the league.

You will ask me, perhaps, if you have not a right to organize a society, and raise a fund for the benefit of the poor of the society, just as a christian church raises a church fund for the benefit of the poor of the church? Let us look at this idea. The church raises a fund for the benefit of its poor. Who are these poor? They are of the household of faith; those to whom the church is bound to do good '*especially*,' and in preference to all others. Raising this fund for this special purpose, is scriptural. It is doing good in the way God directs in his word.

Is your organization founded on the same principles? Are your lodges the household of faith?

Is your fund originated for the special benefit of God's people? There is a mighty difference between these organizations. The poor members of a church are, by profession, of the household of faith: the poor of a mason's lodge may all be of satan's household—children of the wicked one. But suppose that a part of these poor of the lodge are God's people and belong to a christian church, and the others are of satan's household? you are under the same obligation to these children of satan, that you are to those who are God's children. But the gospel enjoins it upon you to do good *especially* to the latter. Hence your organization is a violation of christian obligations. It will not allow you to make any distinction between the children of God and the children of the devil. You are bound to regard the latter just as you do the former.

But if you mean that your institution is nothing more than a mutual aid society, this is another thing. Then of course, it is founded, or should be, on the same principles that a mutual fire insurance company is—bound according to the principles of the compact to assist those who have helped to originate the fund out of which the needy are to be supplied. On this fund they have in justice a mutual claim.

Now, if such be the nature of your institution, why those tremendous oaths of secrecy? Was it ever known that a mutual aid association—a fire or life insurance company, or any thing of the kind, was founded on oaths of secrecy, and every member placed under a death penalty? No, never. Away then with these terrible oaths, and do your business openly and like **honest men**,

who are not ashamed of what they do, if indeed you are such a society.

And further, why this high sounding religious profession? Why hold out the banner of universal benevolence—charity to all mankind? There is no more benevolence or charity in all you do to aid and assist your poor indigent members, their wives and orphans, than there is in paying an honest debt. It is what you have solemnly sworn on pain of death, that you will do. When members of an insurance company become unfortunate and suffer loss, and make application to the company and obtain relief, is that a deed of charity? They never pretend any such thing. And there is no more benevolence in the act of a masonic lodge, in handing over its funds to unfortunate sufferers. It is paying an honest demand; a demand which they all hold against the order, in case of necessity.

Perhaps you will say to me, in reference to secrecy, as it often has been said, that this is necessary in order to prevent being imposed upon—that were it not for your secret signs, tokens and pass-words you might be deceived, and bestow your charities on unworthy objects. How often have I heard the subject argued in this light? To prevent imposition. This implies that a person who cannot give the secret token of a mason and thus prove himself to belong to the craft, is not worthy of masonic charity. He may be a good man and true and in great affliction, yet not an object of masonic charity, because, forsooth, he cannot give the sign. But another man who can give the secret signs and tokens, and prove that he is a member of the

fraternity, may be one of the greatest villains in the world, yet he is an object of masonic charity, and is treated as such. This is one great benefit to be derived from being able to give the mysterious and secret token—it enables this villain to throw himself on his masonic friends for aid and assistance; while the good man who cannot give the sign, is turned away without receiving aid, for he is not worthy.

Let me ask, is this all that is intended by these secret signs and tokens—to prevent imposition? Is it necessary for churches to adopt this method to ascertain who are, and who are not worthy members of other churches? Why not just as necessary for them, as for masonic lodges? But they have no difficulty, in all ordinary cases, on this subject. So members of different lodges may carry their credentials wherever they travel, just as members of churches do theirs. It is a rare instance that a church is imposed upon.

But it is argued that great benefits are enjoyed many times in being able to give the secret tokens of a mason. This is no doubt true. And these advantages are sometimes enjoyed by the most worthless characters on earth. As an old lady related to me not long since, that a young man, a connection of hers, in the late troubles in Kansas, committed some crime, she did not seem to understand what, but he was apprehended and about to be executed, but he gave the masonic signal, and was soon set at liberty and sent off out of the country. It was a great advantage to him to be able to make himself known as a mason. No matter what crime he had perpetrated, murder or treason, if he could give the sign of a

Royal Arch mason, his brethren and companions of that degree were bound to "espouse his cause so far as to extricate him from his difficulty, right or wrong." How many such offenders have in this way escaped the retributions of law and justice, by the secret tokens of masonry, will be seen in the great day, when God shall bring every work into judgment together with every *secret* thing. Be a mason, it has been said, and in time of war you may escape being taken a prisoner, by giving the signal, or if taken, you may soon be released and sent home. This may be. And if you are a mason and a United States officer and sent with a band of soldiers to apprehend or destroy a gang of desperadoes, who have been committing their lawless depredations upon the innocent inhabitants on the frontier settlements, you may pursue and overtake them, and can easily capture the whole, if you please. But just as you are about to order your men to fire, the leader turns and gives you the secret token of a mason. You let him escape. You are bound to do so.

I have heard it said that Major Andre, the British spy, was a mason; and that Washington, who was also a mason, would not allow him to come into his presence, lest he should have been appealed to by the masonic signal of distress, which he had sworn to obey. It would have been of immense advantage to Andre, would it not? could he have made that sign in the presence of the commander-in-chief of the American armies? That secret token would have saved his life. Washington could not have signed the death warrant without violating his masonic oath.

Suppose the captors of Andre had been masons, and he had made to them the sign of distress? Would they have secured him and have delivered him over to death, according to the laws of nations? Indeed they would not. They could not without violating their masonic oath. They must have let him pass, and have done all in their power to aid and assist him to make his escape to the British army.* Then the plot might have succeeded, and the whole American army taken captives and the country ruined. All this might have been brought about by the mysterious token of a mason! British masons would, no doubt, have thought very much of masonry, and would have exclaimed, "See, what good masonry has accomplished for us in this war with the rebels!"

The greatest criminals find in this masonic league a hiding place. No matter what crime or crimes a mason may commit, he is sure of the

* Rev. Mr. Thatcher, of Massachusetts, in his remarks to the National Anti-masonic Convention, relates the following incident: "A masonic deputy sheriff pursued two villains to the cape, who had been breaking open stores in Providence. He was successful in apprehending them, and brought them part way back; but they made known to him that they were masons, and he put them in custody of some masonic brothers, and went away. He had scarcely turned his back before the men were missing; and it appeared that he had put them in possession of his brethren that they might be missing."

Mr. Morse, of New Jersey, in his remarks to the same Convention, related another incident of a like character: "On the 4th of July, 1827, I was introduced to Col. John Anderson, at Monroe, on the river Raisin, and on the next day he related to me in substance, the following:--When the last war was declared, I was a British subject trading at this place, and refused to obey the proclamation of a British commander, summoning his majesty's subjects to return to the territory, and thereby exposed myself to the penalty of treason. As soon as General Hull surrendered, a British Colonel was charged to arrest me. Fortunately for me, this Colonel was a mason. I will give the devil his due. He did as he was bound by masonic obligations to do, for we both belonged to the society; he sent on a messenger to apprise me of my danger, that I might escape." He did escape.

D

aid and protection of the whole fraternity, as far as he can make his case known. They are sworn to keep his secrets, to espouse his cause, so far as to extricate him from his difficulty, whether he be right or wrong. What a fine thing is masonry for all such characters! What villain would not become a member of such a league, and eulogize it, and defend it to the utmost? It is just the thing for him. And in some lodges, if not in most, you will find men of the lowest and most vulgar and irreligious character in community. And such are always the most zealous of the beloved brotherhood.

Mr. John R. Mulford, of New Jersey, in his renunciation of freemasonry, which was published some years ago, says: "*I have seen a grand jury selected by a masonic sheriff with an express view to prevent an indictment against a brother mason, and was told by the foreman of that jury, that had it not been the case of a brother that was to come before them, he should not have been there. I have also seen a mason brought up to be tried on an indictment, and observed him make the masonic signal of distress, and another sign to the jury, which latter sign two of the jurors answered; and these two jurors went out and refused to convict on a clear case of guilt. I have also seen signs exchanged between the bar and the bench.*" Here are "*Some of the BEAUTIES of masonry.*" And such worthless characters, violators of law, are the ones to reap the benefits of these secret masonic tokens. They are not, therefore, designed to prevent imposition, in bestowing charities, nor to *detect*, but to *protect*, criminals.

This masonic league is designed to be above every other association ever formed by men—its obligations to be above all others, human or divine. On this league, the Bible from beginning to end, sets the seal of condemnation, as something that is in direct antagonism to God's moral system. It is a flagrant violation of all the principles of the christian religion. Here men of the world, infidels, enemies to Jesus Christ and his cause, and professing christians, unite in a brotherhood, and bind themselves together under the most outlandish oaths, and horrible death penalties, that under all circumstances they will aid and assist each other *first*, and in *preference* to all others of the human race; and in some cases, whether right or wrong! Some professed ministers of Christ, who stand as guides to the people, teaching them from the pulpit to do good to all men—as they have opportunity, and especially to those who are of the household of faith, yet themselves are bound by these terrible oaths to do good to masons, though wicked men, in preference to their brethren in Christ Jesus who are not of the order.

A zealous member of the fraternity, with whom I had a conversation, argued that masonry was a very benevolent institution, and would even do what christianity would not in relieving the wants of sufferers. I said to him, "Brother, (he was a member of the church,) in joining that league—placing yourself under masonic obligations—you swear away your christian obligations. The latter are only secondary; the former are first and above all others. Let me convince you of this. Suppose that here in your village are

two men—your neighbors: one is a member with you in the church, and as worthy a brother in Christ as you have, but he is not a mason; the other is a wicked man of the world, and he is a mason, a member of the lodge with you. Both of them are in distress, and both apply to you for assistance; each solicits one dollar. You cannot respond to both, for you have but one dollar in the world which you can spare ‘without injuring yourself and family.’ Now, to which will you give that dollar?” He very readily replied, “*to the mason.*” “Do you not see,” said I, “that your masonic obligations are antagonistic to your christian obligations? The latter bind you to do good to your brother in Christ especially, but you pass by him, and reach out the hand of brotherly kindness to a wicked man. Christian obligations would lead you to do good to all men, as you have opportunity, without being placed under death penalties to do so. Whatever you do as a mason, in the character of a mason, and in accordance with masonic principles, is done under the fear of death. In case of a failure, you are liable to be executed according to the horrid imprecations of your own lips. Mark the difference: whatever a christian man does on christian principles, is done in love to God and to his fellow-men. Freemasonry, with all its boasted benevolence, is founded on the fear of death; christianity is founded on love.”

The professing christian who enters this league does, at the same time, swear the christian religion, with all its principles and obligations, into a merely secondary thing: henceforth

masonry is to be first, and its obligations are to be paramount to all others. This I have proved by quotations from masonic oaths. That I do not give a wrong interpretation to these oaths, I will now prove by quotations from standard masonic authors—Bradley, Town, and Preston. Mr. Bradley says, "Remember that around this altar you have promised to befriend and relieve every *brother* who may need your assistance." (p. 10.) Mr. Town says, "Although indigent members, their widows and orphans are *first* to be considered and *first* to be relieved." (p. 166.) Mr. Preston says, "However, you are never charged to do beyond your ability—only to *prefer* a poor mason, who is a good man and true, *before* any other person in the same circumstances." (p. 47.)

Therefore, when I say that the masonic league is designed to set aside everything else that may compete with it, I am sustained by authorities which are not to be impeached or denied. Freemasonry acknowledges no superior on the earth; hence, no provision is made in any of the oaths for the candidate to consider the claims of any other system as being superior to those of masonry, or even equal to them.

Here is the wonderful charm that operates with such a tremendous, bewitching influence on selfish, worldly-minded men, wherever masonry exists. This is the inducement held out to young men, especially, to enter the lodges. Become a mason, and you will always find friends who will feel bound to assist you, and to do all in their power to promote your interest under all circumstances. Go where you may—travel in

foreign countries—there you will find them. Should any misfortune befall you—should you be sick and in want—they will aid and assist you as far as it shall be in their power, and as they would not if you were not a mason. Hence, says Mr. Bradley, “In whatever nation you travel, when you meet a mason you will find a brother and a friend, who will do all in his power to serve you, and who will relieve you; should you be poor and in distress, to the utmost of his ability, and with ready cheerfulness.” (p. 108.) This is the bait by which thousands are ensnared. It is this that gives the institution its extensive popularity and its strong hold on hearts of selfish men who have no faith in God. Nothing can be better adapted to meet the feelings and views of such men. Take this from masonry and it would be shorn of its strength. How many there would be who would not care a fig for it, and would never visit the lodges again!

What else is it that induces any of the professed ministers of Christ to join this unhallowed league? Is it not the hope of this earthly gain, to have men of the world bound under death penalties to stand by them and befriend them, and assist them in every time of need? Is it not saying that it is better to trust in such an oath-bound brotherhood than to put confidence in God? As one with whom I am personally acquainted said, in justification of his course in becoming a mason, “I was in debt, and knew not what to do. The church would not assist me. I joined the lodge, and my masonic brethren took right hold and paid up my debts, and

helped me out of my difficulties." Was not this selling himself to the lodge, if not to the devil, for a few dollars and cents? What if the church did not do their duty? How this may have been I pretend not to know. But, suppose they did not, would this justify him in doing wrong? or, because masons befriended him in that time of need, did that prove that he had done right in uniting with them? What absurd course of conduct may we not justify in this way? A gang of counterfeitters would, no doubt, have shown this brother much friendship, and have helped him out of debt, had he joined them. The devil made our Saviour a very benevolent offer, when he promised Him all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them, if he would but fall down and worship him. A like inducement does freemasonry hold out to the ministers of Christ all over the land. Come and bow down and worship in our temple; come and strike hands with us; "cast in thy lot among us—let us all have one purse;" we will be your warm friends, will always stand by you, and do all in our power to aid and assist you. What other motive could induce any minister of Christ to join these sons of Belial? If they do not sell their Lord and Master, it looks too much like selling themselves for the friendship of the world, which is at enmity with God. It is trusting in an arm of flesh instead of leaning on Him who hath said, "Lo! I am with you always, even to the end of the world." Is not this enough? Or, is there something better, more safe, in the profane and bloody oaths of freemasonry than can be found in the immutable promises of Jesus?

If not, why fall back on those oaths? Why not take the Master at his word? The fact is, this course is practically saying to the world just what a member of a secret society (an Odd-Fellow) once said to me—that he found something better in the lodge than he ever found in the church; though he had been a member of the church many years.

Another thing connected with this league is, all the members are bound always to speak in its praise, and never to say anything that shall tend to bring it into disrepute. One says to me, "All the masons with whom I ever conversed affirm that masonry tends to promote the truths and principles of christianity." I say to him, in reply, no matter if you have conversed with all adhering masons "under the whole canopy," and no matter if they all affirm the same thing, their testimony in this case is not to be believed; for men who are under oath always to testify to one thing, cannot be considered as competent witnesses when called to give testimony which they know will conflict with that previous oath. Every mason in the world is under solemn oath always to testify on behalf of the ancient order, and never to say aught against it. In the first obligation he swears that he "will always *hail*, ever conceal and never reveal," &c. He is under the same tremendous oath, always to *hail* masonry; that is, always to salute it, bid it welcome, speak in its praise, that he is "ever to conceal and never to reveal." If he should cease to *hail* freemasonry—should say one word to bring it into disrepute—he would violate his oath just as much as if he were to *reveal* its

secrets. Will these men, who consider this oath binding, tell you the truth—that masonry is corrupt—even if they know it to be? No; they would as soon *reveal its secrets*. They must speak in its praise, if they say anything. This I ever felt in my own case, until I threw off the shackles. Every member of the fraternity may be brought into circumstances where he must violate his oath as a mason by telling the truth, or he must utter what he does not believe to be truth, or he must remain silent. Turn to the Appendix, and read the testimony on the trials of the Morgan kidnappers.

In the lecture on the first degree of masonry, second section, the candidate is asked, “Why were you hood-winked?” He answers, “That my heart might conceive, before my eyes beheld, the beauties of masonry.” He is asked for a second reason; the answer—“As I was in darkness at that time, it was to remind me that *I should keep the whole world so as it respects masonry.*” Are we to expect that men bound by such principles will be honest, and at all times tell us the truth about masonry? How can they do so when they feel bound to keep the whole world in darkness on the subject? If speaking the truth will enlighten people and bring masonry into disrepute, they will withhold the truth.

Men who are under the influence of such principles and obligations are not qualified to act as impartial witnesses or jurors in a case where masonry, or a brother mason, is concerned. This has been decided in a court of justice, at the trial of Elihu Mather for a conspiracy to

kidnap Wm. Morgan, at the Orleans county court, Nov. 11, 1829. On this trial several men were called as jurors who were masons; they were objected to on this account. Triers were appointed by the court. These triers, after hearing the nature of masonic oaths discussed, and the arguments on both sides, decided that such men were not impartial. Seven of those called were rejected on this account. (See Opinions on Freemasonry, pp. 270—280.) It was on this account that, in those days, the States of Vermont and Rhode Island enacted statutes prohibiting the administration of extra-judicial oaths. (See Adams' Letters, p. 215.)

LETTER V.

THE RESPONSIBILITIES RESTING ON ADHERING MASONS.

Every understanding and adhering mason is responsible to God for all the evils connected with the institution—its crimes of kidnapping and murder—its follies, absurdities, and profane pretensions. Is not every member of any society responsible for the character and principles of the society, so far as he knows what these are? And so, the society is responsible for the character and principles of each member, so far as these are known. If I connect myself with a gang of highway-men, knowing them to be such, I am responsible for their character, and a partaker, in the sight of God and man, of their guilt. If I, as a member of a church, am guilty of highway robbery, and this becomes known to the

church, and they do not call me to an account, but still retain me in good standing, they are responsible for my conduct. These are plain matters of fact.

An adhering mason said to me, in vindicating the character of the institution, "Our lodges will expel members for unmasonic conduct, just as churches will expel their members for unchristian conduct." "This may be," said I; "but what do you call *unmasonic* conduct?" "Why, anything that is immoral or ungentlemanly." "But," said I, "there are some things which are immoral and ungentlemanly, and are even a violation of God's laws and of the laws of the land, and an outrage upon the dearest and most sacred rights of men, which are, nevertheless, truly masonic. For these you will not, you cannot and you do not, expel members when proved to be guilty, and even confess that they are guilty. I refer you to the kidnappers of William Morgan. Some of those men I have known personally—have resided in the same neighborhood—have passed and repassed the old prison-house where they suffered the penalty of the law. They were convicted—three of them upon their own confession of guilt—and were sentenced by the court of Ontario county—one of them to two years, another to one year, and another to one month's imprisonment in the common jail of the county; and another, who was proved guilty upon trial, was sentenced to three month's imprisonment. Now, sir, more than thirty years have passed, and the public have not yet been informed that one of those men has ever been expelled from a masonic

lodge for this crime of kidnapping a free citizen. Is this conduct immoral and unmasonic? Why, then, not expel those men and publish them to the world? You say that for unmasonic conduct your lodges will expel members. This crime of kidnapping, which in this case stands connected with murder, is, to all intents and purposes, *masonic*; it is in accordance with the usages and customs of your ancient fraternity, and according to your murderous oaths. For this reason you have not, and you cannot expel them." The only reply he could make was, these were things of which he had no knowledge. Let this be as it may, where is there a masonic lodge, or an understanding mason, in the country that does not know that Morgan was kidnapped and murdered by members of the fraternity, and that, too, in strict accordance with their ancient usages, and that the men who have committed those crimes have not been expelled from the lodges? By sustaining them in honorable standing the institution does, to this day, sanction those crimes, and is verily guilty before God and all honest men; it is accessory to those deeds of wickedness after they are committed. In what other light can we view the subject? If the lodges do not intend to uphold those men, and to sanction what they have done, why do they not expel them and publish them?

If those men had been church members, and the churches to which they belonged had not dealt with them and forthwith expelled them, what would be said of their character? Those churches are guilty; they uphold kidnappers; if they do not intend to do so, why do they not

separate from them? And they would say, too, that all the members of those churches who continue their connection with them, knowing these things, are equally criminal. So of freemasonry. Its character, in the sight of God, is polluted with kidnapping and murder. This conclusion cannot be evaded. And so it is with all those who, knowing these things, either form a connection or maintain a connection with it; they are guilty in the same sense; God will hold them responsible.

Such men we have among us, in our churches—some of them occupying the pulpit every Lord's day. On their skirts is found the blood of murdered innocence! Can it be otherwise? It is a serious charge, I know, to prefer against professed ministers of Christ; but it is no less true than serious. I unhesitatingly say to all who have taken these profane and murderous oaths, and who cling to that profane and murderous institution, you are guilty of its murderous deeds; on your skirts is found the blood of the innocent. You justify these things as the Jews, in our Saviour's time, justified the deeds of their fathers in killing the prophets. He addressed them, saying, "Woe unto you! for ye build the sepulchres of the prophets, and your fathers killed them. Truly ye bear witness that ye allow the deeds of your fathers; for they indeed killed them, and ye build their sepulchres." The fathers of "ancient craft masonry" put to death masonic traitors, as I have shown in the "Inquiry into Masonry." Three degrees, at least, are said to be founded on the execution of these traitors. Those executions are nothing

less than cold-blooded murder. Modern free masons justify these murders by sustaining the bloody institution according to whose well known laws and usages they were committed. Those men who know what the character of freemasonry is, and, with their eyes open, identify themselves with the order and labor to revive and sustain it, must share the guilt not only of the abduction and murder of Wm. Morgan, but of all similar executions of masonic revenge. This is as true as it is that the wicked Jews, to whom Christ addressed the language we have just quoted, were partakers of the deeds of their fathers.

And you, gentlemen, who adhere to masonry approve of its bloody deeds; you approve of "the Morgan outrage." If you do not, you would separate from the institution. Or, do you say that such things never occurred? Turn to your own Free Mason's Monitor, and read the history of three degrees, at least, said to be founded on the execution of masonic traitors. Read about those "white aprons lined with black, *speckled with blood*; on the flap a *bloody arm with a poignard*; on the arch a *bloody arm holding by the hair a bloody head*." (Mon., pp. 12, 13.) What does this bloody emblem denote? Why, the assassination of a masonic traitor—Akirope by Joabert, who, it is said, "finding him asleep in the cavern with his poignard at his feet, seized it and stabbed him, first in his head, then in his heart, then severed his head from his body, and, taking it in one hand and the poignard in the other, returned to Jerusalem." This is the way that one of your

masonic murders was committed; this is your own version of the matter as published under the sanction of your highest authorities. And to this you subscribe; this deed of blood you approve. And as to the abduction and murder of one of our own citizens, by members of your own craft, you will not deny, for the matter stands on the criminal records of our civil courts, as acknowledged by some of them and proved against others. And yet, here you are holding them by the hand of masonic fellowship, hailing them as brothers in honorable standing. Your craft can be viewed in no other light than a murderous clan. You are deserving no confidence from an insulted and outraged community. You have laid violent hands on one of our worthy citizens—have torn him away from his beloved wife and hapless children—have hurried him, for aught we know, unprepared into eternity—making his wife a widow and his children orphans! This deed of murderous cruelty did, for awhile, break up your secret dens of wickedness; but as years have passed away, and the outrage is, in a measure, forgotten, and a new generation is coming upon the stage who know but little about these things, having read but little, you are now busily employing yourselves to resuscitate your blood-stained order. I tell you, in the name of my country, in the name of my God and Saviour, these things are too much to be endured quietly in the nineteenth century by intelligent people. All good men who are acquainted with these things will hold you responsible, and will never cease to be at war with your barbarous system until it shall be over-

thrown. You pretend a great deal of sympathy for widows and orphans, and boast of a great deal of charity for human sufferers, but how many widows and orphans have you made! how much human suffering have you occasioned! And you now mock at the tears which these sufferers have shed and at the outrages you have committed, by pressing to your bosoms and to your fellowship the ruffians who have executed your terrible death penalties. Your tears would most readily mingle, no doubt, with those shed by the crocodile.

Some thirty years ago freemasonry was summoned before the public tribunal, and its principles and practices were fully, fairly and candidly investigated, and exposed, and published throughout the land, and the verdict was *guilty*. This was public sentiment. The institution was publicly condemned; but very few were to be found to open their mouths in its defence; christian churches of all denominations denounced it as corrupt, and declared non-fellowship for all who would not forsake it; scarcely a church could be found, in those times, that would hold in fellowship a member who had anything to do with masonry. But now we have men among us who know these things—at least, they once knew them—for they passed through the investigations, read the public documents which then flooded the country, became convinced that the institution was corrupt and ought to be annihilated: some of them, to my personal knowledge, stood in the anti-masonic ranks; yet, with the knowledge of these things before them, have joined the lodges, and are exerting themselves

to the utmost to revive the institution and to induce others to join. I know of some professed ministers of Christ of this class—some who are now officiating as masonic chaplains! What confidence can we have in such men? Are they good men, and true to Jesus? Are they worthy of public confidence? I know not what confidence they can have to stand up before God and an intelligent community as public teachers of christianity, yet themselves being identified with all the abominations and blasphemies of ancient and modern freemasonry.

We should, however, make some exceptions. Young men who have come on the stage since the great anti-masonic battle was fought, some thirty years ago, are uninformed. The publications which exposed the true character of the institution have been carefully picked up and put out of the way. Pretty much all that these young men know about masonry they have learned from those who are under a death penalty always to *hail* it; that is, to salute it—to speak in its praise. They are, therefore, deceived as to the true character of the institution, and, figuratively speaking, they are *hoodwinked*, and led *hoodwinked* into the lodges. For these we can have larger charity than we can for those who know better—who know what masonry is.

But, gentlemen masons, there are other things for which you are responsible to God and to the public—your false, ridiculous, and, in some cases, your profane pretensions. These are numerous: to notice them all, to bring them out and expose them, would require more labor than I am disposed to bestow on the subject at present. I

R*

will notice some few of these pretensions as specimens of what others are.

And, first, the pretended divine origin of freemasonry. Almost all your standard authorities announce to the world, in substance, what Mr. Town does in these words: "It is no secret that masonry is of *divine origin*." This, I think, is indeed a secret—ever has been and ever will be—that masonry is of *divine origin*. And yet this announcement lies at the foundation, as the chief corner-stone of your stupendous Babel—"of *divine origin*." But where are the evidences which go to prove the proposition to be true? They are entirely wanting. We proclaim to the world that christianity is of divine origin—has God for its author. This is not a gratuitous assertion. We, at the same time, point to the evidences on which we found our belief—evidences which all the opposers of the christian system have never been able to meet. But not a particle of evidence has ever been presented by any of your masonic authors to prove that masonry is divine. It is a naked assertion, without even the shadow of proof to sustain it. Where is there a man of intelligence among you who will pretend to believe that masonry is of divine origin, or that Solomon was inspired of God to organize the system in its present form? And if this be not true, it is false—it is one of Satan's great lies, and the whole system founded on it is a great cheat, and thousands are deceived by it. Here you are, doing all you can to give currency to this great lie, and to make the world believe it; you are upholding and propagating the false system which is founded upon it. Do

you think me uncharitable—that this charge is unfounded? I ask you to produce the first argument to convict me—the first argument to prove that masonry is of *divine* origin, and that Solomon was inspired of God to organize the system. No such argument is at your command. You are, therefore, responsible for the evils originating from this great cheat: you, the professed ministers of Christ, who belong to the lodges, must bear your share of this responsibility! and this you will find to be no trifling matter.

The next thing I notice is, the incredulous and ridiculous story which you have published to the world concerning Enoch's subterraneous temple. This is to be found in your "Free Mason's Monitor," by Thomas S. Webb, edition 1802—a standard work, sanctioned by the highest masonic authorities. In this book (part 2, chap. 1st) you say:

"Enoch being inspired by the Most High, and in commemoration of this wonderful vision, (vision of a temple which he had seen,) built a temple under ground, in the same spot where it was shown to him, which, like that, consisted of nine arches, one above another, and dedicated the same to God." Then, "in imitation of what he had seen, caused a triangular plate of gold to be made," and on this plate of gold he "engraved the same ineffable characters which God had shown to him" in the vision, "and placed it on a triangular pedestal of white marble, which he deposited in the ninth or deepest arch." Then the Lord commanded him to "make a door of stone with an iron ring therein, by which it may

be occasionally raised, and let it be placed over the opening of the first arch, that the sacred matters inclosed therein may be preserved from the universal destruction now impending. And he did so. And none but Enoch knew of the precious treasure which the arches contained, nor knew the right pronounciation of the great and sacred name."

Now, gentlemen of the ancient and honorable craft, do you believe this foolish masonic legend? Where is there a man among you, who lays claim to be intelligent, who believes a word of it—that God inspired Enoch to build this mighty temple under ground, nine arches deep, and there to deposit freemasonry inscribed on that plate of gold in characters *ineffable*; that is, characters that could not be spoken—unspeakable characters!

As the story goes in the "Monitor," no one but Enoch "knew the right pronounciation of the great and sacred name"—the name which he had engraved on that plate of gold in some ineffable character. No one in that age—none of all the pious who called on God—could pronounce his name right. Enoch was the only mason on earth before the flood, and the only man who could pronounce God's name right; and the true pronounciation of that name was hid in the deepest, the ninth arch of that fabulous temple, on that fabulous plate of gold. And, then, from Enoch onward there was not another mason, nor another man, who had the true pronounciation of the sacred name until the Lord appeared on Mount Sinai and made Moses a mason, by giving him the true pronounciation of

His sacred name, with a solemn charge that no one else should pronounce His name. Read the "Monitor:" "To Moses God communicated His divine law, written on tables of stone, with many promises of a renewed alliance. He also gave him the true pronounciation of His sacred name, which He told him should be found by some of his descendants, engraved upon a plate of gold; and God gave a strict command unto Moses that no one should pronounce His sacred name; so that, in process of time, the true pronounciation was lost." Now, the "Monitor" teaches us that the "sacred book," meaning the Bible, gives us this information. I take the liberty to ask, in what part of the sacred book do we find this? We have an account of the giving of the law to Moses on Mount Sinai, but not a word of anything like what we have here quoted from the "Monitor"—not a word. If such a communication was made to Moses at that time, why was it not a matter of record? Gentlemen, can you tell? How could the Lord give Moses the true pronounciation of His sacred name when it was *ineffable* and could not be pronounced? And what need of commanding him that no one else should pronounce it, when it was unspeakable—tongue could not utter it?

But the promise of God to Moses was, as the story goes, that the true pronounciation of this name "should be found by some of his descendants, engraved on a plate of gold." Hence, from Enoch to Moses, and from Moses until that plate of gold was found in the deep arch of the subterraneous temple, none on earth knew the true pronounciation of God's name—none of the

patriarchs, none of the prophets, none of the holy men of old time, who used to call on God, ever knew how to pronounce His name right, save those two men! and they were masons. So says masonic tradition, and so publishes the "Free Mason's Monitor." And you, gentlemen of the sublime order, believe it, the whole story, do you? or do you not?

But when and by what means was that wonderful plate of gold found? Well, as the story goes in the "Monitor," Solomon was "inspired to believe that this could not be done," this plate of gold found, "until he had erected and consecrated a temple to the living God, in which he might deposit the precious treasure." Here we are informed that Solomon's object in building the temple was that he might find the lost name of God, which was engraved on that plate of gold. But Solomon gives a very different version of this matter: he says, "And behold, I purpose to build a house unto the name of the Lord my God. (1 Kings, 5: 5.) Solomon, therefore, had that name already, and purposed to erect a temple to that name, and not that he might find it.

To follow up the story: when Solomon was about to build the temple his workmen, in digging for a foundation, discovered the ruins of an ancient edifice, amongst which they found a very considerable quantity of treasure. Solomon finally declined to build on that spot. Some days after this, he sent three grand master architects to make further "search amongst the ancient ruins, where so much treasure had been found, in hopes of finding more. One of them,

in working with the pick-axe amongst the rubbish, came to the large iron ring; they found it fixed in a large stone perfectly square. With much difficulty they raised it, when the mouth of a deep and dismal cavern appeared." This proved to be the first arch of Enoch's temple; this was the identical square stone which, by inspiration, he had placed as a door to the arch; and here was the very iron ring which he was commanded to fix in the stone for the purpose of raising it—here it was, perfectly sound for aught that appears, though it had lain buried there some two thousand years. By its strength the big stone was raised and removed.

One of these men "descended into the ninth arch, and a parcel of stone and mortar fell in and extinguished his light, and he was immediately struck with the sight of a triangular plate of gold, richly adorned with precious stones, the brilliancy of which struck him with astonishment." Pause here a moment. Look at the miracle, or—what will you call it? His light was extinguished; then, in the darkness of that deep cavern, nine arches under ground, he was *immediately struck with the sight* of that plate of gold. Sight in the dark! This, reader, is masonry—ancient masonry. So it is said in the "Monitor."

This wonderful prize was taken up and presented to Solomon and Hiram, king of Tyre; and, as the story goes, "when the two kings beheld it they were struck with amazement. Being recovered, they then examined the sacred characters with attention, but would not explain them to the three grand master architects. Solo-

mon told them that God had bestowed upon them a particular favor, in having permitted them to discover the most precious *jewels of masonry*." This, gentlemen, is masonry. Deny it, will you? No, you cannot. You say, in your old standard text-book, that here are the most *precious jewels of masonry*! Yes, this foolish, ridiculous fable is freemasonry; to use grand master Scott's language, "ancient craft masonry." *Craft!* What kind of *craft*? Paul speaks of "cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive." Is not here something of that cunning craftiness? And how many are deceived by it?

We are then told that Solomon conferred upon these three "the most sublime and mysterious degree of royal arch masonry—(did royal arch masonry exist then? who believes it?)—and explained to them how the promise of God made to Noah, Moses, and his father David, was now accomplished: that promise which assured them that in fullness of time His name should be discovered, engraved upon a plate of gold; and they were bound to defend the sacred characters, and that they were not at liberty to pronounce the sacred name." No one, of course, could be benefited by all this wonderful discovery—by all that had come to light on this magic plate of gold; for they (Solomon and Hiram) were not at liberty to pronounce that name. Do you, gentlemen, believe that these two men—one of them a heathen—were the only two on earth who knew how to pronounce God's name?

But here is another masonic mystery for you to reconcile with truth. "The true name is said to have been visible *in the temple* at the time St.

Jerome flourished, written in the ancient Samaritan characters." Now, when did Jerome flourish? He was born in 331, and died in 420, which was three hundred and fifty years after the destruction of the temple by the Romans. This is a flat contradiction of plain historical matters of fact. And this, oh ye wise ones! is "Ancient Craft Masonry." More than three hundred and fifty years after the temple was destroyed and its foundations had become a plowed field, the name of God was visible there, in the ancient Samaritan characters!

One thing more. What became of the pretended subterraneous temple? It came to pass, as the fable goes, that "3568 ancient masters, who had wrought in the temple," requested that similar honors might be conferred on them which twenty-five others of their brethren enjoyed. This was denied them. They were disaffected. They therefore "determined, one and all, to go to the ancient ruins and search under ground, with a view of arrogating the merit so necessary for attaining their desires."

"Accordingly, they departed the next morning, and presently after their arrival discovered the iron ring, by means of which they raised the square stone, and found the entrance into the arches. They immediately prepared a ladder of ropes, and descended with lighted flambeaux; but no sooner had the last descended than the nine arches fell in upon them, and they were no more heard of." "Not one single person of all those who descended escaped the destruction."

Reader, if you are curious to read the "Moni-

tor" for yourself, procure the edition of 1802, as later editions may not give all the particulars.

Pause another moment over this last item—the destruction of this pretended under-ground temple. Without much difficulty, it seems, these disappointed ones found the entrance, the old square stone that covered the first arch, and the old iron ring which had been lying there in the earth some two thousand years, yet sound. They immediately prepare themselves to descend by means of a "ladder of ropes." And now look on, and see 3568 men descending these deep arches on a ladder of ropes! What if some of those ropes had broken? They would have found the bottom in a hurry. But they succeed. There they are, between three and four thousand men, away down in that subterraneous vault, nine arches deep! What a spacious room, to accommodate such a host! How long, think, was Enoch employed in building it? "*But no sooner had the last one descended*" than, behold! "*the nine arches fell in upon them, and they were no more heard of.*" Not one escaped! What a tremendous crash!

Now, gentlemen, will you wonder—will you censure me—if I pronounce this whole story, found, as it is, in your own text-book, a great masonic LIE! What else shall I call it? You do not, you cannot believe it. It is too incredulous: it is ridiculous.

But, who is responsible for this lie? Those, of course, who originated it. Who were they? No matter who. Responsibility rests somewhere else, too—on all who sanction it, and propagate it, and sustain the system of *lies* which is founded

upon it. You, gentlemen, every soul of you, who adhere to the institution, who receive the "Free Mason's Monitor" as a standard authority, as all of your lodges do, (for you cannot remove the "ancient land-marks,")—you are guilty of palming this lying imposter upon the world; and, rely upon it, you will be called to give an account.

LETTER VI.

THE SUBJECT CONTINUED.

Gentlemen, I have a few things more to present, showing the responsibilities of adhering free masons. The next thing to which I call attention is, the pretended origin of freemasonry at the building of Solomon's temple. In this all your masonic authors are agreed. This you trumpet in your monitors, charts, manuals, and orations. "We know from the traditions of our order, that it existed in its present form at the building of Solomon's temple." (Scott's Analogy, p. 152.) What evidence is there of this? "The traditions of our order." Not a particle of any other evidence (if it may be called evidence) can be produced—not a scrap of history, either sacred or profane, to show that such an organization existed at the building of the temple.* If it did exist then in its present form, is it not passing strange that no mention is made of it in either of the accounts handed down to us of the

*The first Grand Lodge of which there is any historical account was formed in "London on the 24th day of June, A. D. 1717." (Ward's Report to the U. S. Anti-Masonic Convention, p. 33.) Why pretend that there was a Grand Lodge at Jerusalem? It is gross imposture.

erection of that house of God—one in 1st Kings, the other in 2d Chron. : not a word about such an organization. And we do not believe that anything like speculative freemasonry was known at that time, any more than we believe that Enoch was inspired by God to build that great subterraneous temple which we have noticed briefly. Both are equally incredible and fabulous, resting their claims on “the traditions of the order.” And these traditions are deserving no more confidence than that of the old Indian, that when God made the world He placed it on the back of a great turtle.

Yet, in this enlightened age—the nineteenth century—this age of intellectual improvement, and after this silly imposition has been exposed again and again, thousands of the order—some of them men of intelligence in other things—cling to the idea that the institution is ancient and honorable, having originated at the building of Solomon’s temple.

By your traditions you teach us that not only did your institution originate at the building of the temple, but that then there were three grand masters—Solomon king of Israel, Hiram king of Tyre, and Hiram the widow’s son. Yes, three grand masters! What is the office of a grand master? To preside over a grand lodge; and a grand lodge is composed of a number of subordinate lodges. Were there three grand lodges at Jerusalem at the building of the temple? There must have been, or there could have been no employ for three grand masters. You teach us further, that these three grand masters had a secret vault under the temple, where they were

accustomed to retire and hold secret consultation. You would have us believe that, during the erection of that splendid house of worship, Hiram, king of Tyre, had his residence at Jerusalem the whole seven years, and that these three grand masters, so-called, were associated and equally interested in this great enterprise. But from the sacred history which has come down to us (and we prefer to credit this, rather than your traditions,) there is no evidence that the king of Tyre ever saw the temple, or Jerusalem, or the face of Solomon : no mention is made in all that record that he was ever at Jerusalem. Solomon and David, his father, were on friendly terms with Hiram, and had friendly correspondence with him ; but there is no history given of any personal interview. All the assistance the king of Tyre rendered in erecting the temple was to furnish workmen and materials ; we have no account of anything further.

By your traditions you teach us that no persons on earth but those three grand masters had the master's word—that *ineffable word* which was deposited in Enoch's subterraneous temple, on that wonderful plate of gold, and was discovered some two thousand years afterwards ; and they three had taken a solemn oath not to give that word to any one else, unless they were all present. Hiram Abiff being killed, the word was lost, for the other two would not give it. Yet, in the same chapter of traditions of the order, you teach us that beside the seventy thousand entered apprentices and eighty thousand fellow-crafts, there were three thousand six hundred masters employed as overseers. All

F*

these master masons must have had the master's word ; for without this they could not have been masters. How do these traditions harmonize ? None but those three grand masters had the word ; and yet there were thirty-six thousand master masons who must have had it at the same time. One tradition contradicts the other. The object of the three ruffians in extorting the master's word from Hiram was that they might pass themselves off as master masons ; this they could not do without the word.

The plea which the ruffian made who gave the death blow was, "that I may be able to get wages as a master mason in any country to which I may go for employ." Suppose he had succeeded in obtaining the word, of what possible use would it have been to them, seeing it was to all others an unknown word—unknown all over the world ? They could not, by that wonderful magic word, prove themselves to be master masons to any but master masons—those who had the word ; and if none but those three—Solomon and the two Hiram—had it, the ruffians could not prove themselves to any others. It would hence be of no use to them in traveling in foreign countries, where masonry did not exist.

If, as one part of the tradition goes, there were three thousand six hundred masters, and they had the word—which they must have had, or they could not have been masters—why did not the ruffians attack one of those masters instead of the grand master ? Would they not have been more likely to succeed ? That they should pass by all those thousands and assail the

grand master is, like all other masonic traditions, perfectly incredible.

Your tradition teaches us that those thirty-six thousand masters were, with the exception of twenty-five who had been raised to higher honors, all destroyed in an instant, as they descended Enoch's pretended subterraneous temple, as we have before noticed. "No sooner had the last descended than the nine arches fell in upon them, and they were never more heard of." So says "the traditions of the order." What a disaster this must have been! What a hindrance to the work about the temple! And if such an event did actually occur, such a host of overseers, all, except twenty-five or thirty, that Solomon had chosen for that purpose, were instantly buried deep in the earth, is it not a little unaccountable that no notice is taken of it in the sacred record?

And then, how was the temple finished? How did the seventy thousand entered apprentices and eighty thousand fellow-crafts proceed with their labors without their overseers—without these "ancient masters"? Do your traditions inform us, gentlemen, how this mighty breach was repaired—how all these vancancies (3,568) were filled? Whoever invented the foolish story should have thought of this.

Your traditions inform us that it was the custom of the "Grand Master Hiram Abiff to draw out his plans and designs on his trestle-board for the crafts to pursue their labors." But the inspired historian tells us that the plan of the whole house was given to David by the Spirit, and by David it was given to Solomon.

After making mention of this plan, and what it embraced, David said: "All this the Lord made me understand in writing by his hand upon me, even all the works of this pattern." (1 Chr. 28: 19.) Now, what had Hiram to do in drawing out the plans or pattern of the house on his trestle-board? Just nothing at all. His business was to *work*. He was a skillful worker in the materials of which the temple was composed. For this purpose he was employed, and not to draw plans for others, nor to take the oversight of them. (2 Chr., 2 ch.) Your tradition and the inspired word do not correspond.

You also teach us by your traditions that this skillful artist—grand master you call him—was killed in the midst of his labors, before the temple was finished; which circumstance threw the crafts into confusion, for there were no plans nor designs laid down on the trestle-board for them to pursue their labors. Hence you say, "that when Solomon came up to the temple at low six, as his custom was, he found the crafts all in confusion." Now, read the sacred history: "And he," Hiram the widow's son, "came to king Solomon and wrought all his work." "So Hiram made an end of doing all the work that he made king Solomon for the house of the Lord." (1 Kings vii: 14, 40.) Here is a flat contradiction. You say, in your address to the newly made master, that "masonic tradition informs us," just as we have related, that Hiram was killed in the temple while pursuing his labors, and before these labors were finished: God's Word assures us that he made an end of all the work for the house. This "masonic

tradition," on which pretty much all the ceremonies of the *sublime degree* of master mason are founded, is a palpable falsehood. And you, gentlemen, in all your lodges throughout the land, are guilty of repeating this falsehood every time you raise a "poor blind candidate" to the sublime degree of master mason: you make him pass through a mock representation of the whole affair: you knock him down for dead, lay him out and bury him, and then raise him up out of his grave and tell him, "You have this night (this is usually done in the night) represented one of the greatest men that ever lived, in the tragical catastrophe of his death, burial and resurrection. I mean Hiram Abiff, the widow's son, who was slain by three ruffians at the building of king Solomon's temple, and who, in his inflexibility, integrity and fortitude, was never surpassed by man." In your authorized publications, which were in circulation years before the Morgan disclosures, you allude to this in the following language: "This section (second section in the master's degree) recites the historical traditions of the order, and presents to view a finished picture of the utmost consequence to the fraternity." It is, indeed, of the utmost consequence to the fraternity; for, this being the sum and substance—the "*maha-bone*"—of the third degree, and being a base imposition, the whole system with which it is connected is of the same pernicious character. Well, what is this historical tradition? It is as follows: "It exemplifies an instance of virtue, fortitude and integrity seldom equalled, and never excelled, in the history of man." (Bradley, p. 92.) How unac-

countable it is that men of professed piety, and of literary accomplishments, should entertain such incredible stories—such contradictions of sacred history—and should employ themselves, spend time and property, in palming them off upon the world as the most solemn, sublime and interesting truths! Here is said to be an example which was “seldom equalled, and never excelled, in the history of man.” This is taught by the highest masonic dignitaries—yes, by all masonic dignitaries on the face of the earth. Yet, such a circumstance never transpired under these heavens. The masonic Hiram Abiff, the grand master, of whom it is gravely said that he used to draw out his plans and designs on his trestle-board, for the crafts to pursue their labors, and who died by the hands of ruffians, never had an existence, except in the childish and profane ceremonies acted over in all masonic lodges. Hiram of Tyre, the widow’s son, that skillful man, lived to finish all the work which Solomon had for him to do about the temple. We have no account of his death. For aught we know, he may have lived until a good old age.

There are other things connected with this masonic legend which are equally incredible and ridiculous. I will spend time with but one or two more. It is further related, on the authority of your traditions, that fifteen fellow-crafts entered into a conspiracy to extort the master’s word from their grand master, Hiram Abiff, or take his life. Twelve of the number recanted, and came to Solomon and confessed the thing, and at the same time expressed their fears that

the other three "had been base enough to carry their atrocious designs into execution." Solomon immediately ordered twelve fellow-crafts to be sent in search of the ruffians. They went, but were unsuccessful. "Solomon directed them to go again, and search until they found their grand master, Hiram Abiff, if possible; and if he was not found, the twelve who had confessed should be considered as the murderers, and suffer accordingly." Do you believe that Solomon, the wise and good king of Israel, would be guilty of threatening such an outrage upon all law, human and divine—to execute the innocent in place of the guilty, when the latter could not be found? Such an atrocious deed was never heard of. To attribute such a threat to Solomon is slandering his character. And it represents your grand master as being one of the most fiendish monarchs that ever lived. This falsehood, this slanderous imputation upon the character of the good king of Israel, you are guilty of teaching in all your lodges throughout the world. (I refer the reader to the third degree, as revealed by Morgan and others.)

The apprehension and execution of the three ruffians, who are said to have killed the grand master Hiram, are equally fabulous. Three of the twelve who were sent out on the search, it is said, "heard voices issuing from a cavern in the cleft of the rocks, on which they immediately repaired to the place, where they heard the voice of *Jubela* exclaim, "O! that my throat had been cut across," &c., repeating the penalty annexed to the oath of the first degree. Next, "they distinctly heard the voice of *Jubelo* exclaim,

“O! that my left breast had been torn open,” &c., repeating the penalty annexed to the oath of the fellow-craft’s degree. Then “they more distinctly heard the voice of *Jubelum* exclaim; “O! that my body had been severed in two in the midst,” &c., repeating the penalty of the master’s oath. And what did he know about that oath, or its penalty, being only a fellow-craft—having killed the grand master because he would not give him the master’s word, so that he might pass himself off for a master? This is incredible.

Then, as the tradition goes, these three fellow-crafts rushed forward, seized the ruffians, bound them and took them before Solomon, who ordered them to be executed according to the imprecations of their own mouths. *Jubela* had his throat cut across, his tongue torn out by the roots, and his body buried beneath the rough sands of the sea. *Jubelo* had his left breast torn open, his heart and vitals taken from thence and thrown over his left shoulder and carried into the valley of Jehosaphat, there to become a prey to the wild beasts of the field and vultures of the air. *Jubelum* had his body severed in two in the midst and divided to the north and south, and his bowels burned to ashes in the centre and the ashes scattered by the four winds of heaven. This is masonry—“ancient craft masonry;” and it is either true or false. Which is it? If true, then the institution is pledged to take the same course with all who violate their obligations—execute them according to these horrid imprecations. If not true, masonry is a wicked imposition. But, gentlemen, in every instance in

which you raise one to this sublime degree, as you call it, you teach him that these executions did actually occur. If they did not, I repeat it, masonry is a lying imposition. If they did, can you think of anything more brutal? Imagine yourself standing over the mangled carcasses of those three ruffians, after they were put to death. Does not your blood chill at the sight? "No butcher," says John Quincy Adams, "would so mutilate the carcass of a bullock or a swine, as the masonic candidate swears consent to the mutilation of his own." (Letters, p. 65.)

The raising of the dead body of the grand master, Hiram, from the grave will wind up this part of this masonic farce. Solomon ordered fifteen fellow-crafts to go and search for the body; they found it, as it is said, buried beneath a sprig of cassia, six feet deep. On opening the grave, they found their hands involuntarily raised in a certain position, to guard their nostrils against the offensive effluvia. The body had lain there fourteen days. Solomon ordered a lodge of entered apprentices to go and raise the body by the entered apprentice's grip—by pulling the fore-finger. This attempt failed, for the body was in such a state of decomposition that the skin cleaned from the bone. Then he ordered a lodge of fellow-crafts to make the attempt by pulling the second finger; this, also, failed in the same way. He then orders a lodge of master masons and says, I will go myself and try to raise the body by the master's grip, or lion's paw: this is done by placing your right hand in the right hand of another, as if to shake hands, and then by pressing the ends of your finger-

nails into the wrist joint. Thus did Solomon: he placed his living hand into the dead hand of dead Hiram, and stuck his finger nails into the wrist joint. By this strong grip, or lion's paw, as it is sometimes called, he succeeded in raising the body, though the grave is said to have been six feet deep. But by this strong grip Solomon brought him up square on his feet, according to what are denominated the five points of fellowship. These points are, "foot to foot, knee to knee, breast to breast, hand to back, mouth to ear." Here they stand; on the side of the grave, living Solomon and dead Hiram, the former pressing to his breast and hugging with his left hand the loathsome, offensive corpse of the latter—putting his mouth to its ear and whispering *ma-ha-bone*. This, gentlemen of the craft, is sublime masonry; and every word of it is true, or masonry is a lie. Do you say there is no truth in this? Then there is no truth in freemasonry; for the ceremonies connected with this disgusting affair are the principal ceremonies of the third degree; and every one who is exalted to this sublime degree, so-called, is made to pass through a mock representation of this very thing—"you have this night represented one of the greatest men that ever lived," &c. You would have him believe that Hiram was killed, taken away and buried, and, when found, raised out of his grave in the manner just related, and as he has been made to represent—the whole of which is a ridiculous farce. But who is responsible for this, and for the evils which originate from this great delusion? You, gentlemen, who adhere to the institution, God will call you to an ac-

count, not only for believing this lie, if you do believe it, but also for inducing others to believe it. I am sustained in my views, in part, at least, by one of your celebrated orators—Dr. Frederic Dalcho, of South Carolina, “Sovereign Grand Inspector General, Sublime Grand Master of the Degree of Perfection.” In reference to the traditions of the third degree, concerning the pretended death of Hiram, and especially alluding to his repeating these to candidates at their initiation, as he was often called to do, he says: “I candidly confess, my respectable brethren, that I feel a very great degree of embarrassment while I am relating to a minister of God’s holy word, or to any other gentleman of science, a story founded on the grossest errors of accumulated ages—errors which they can prove to me to be such from the sacred pages of holy writ, and from profane history, written by men of integrity and talent; and that, too, in a minute after I have solemnly pronounced them to be undeniable truths, even by that very Bible on which I have received their obligations.” And on the next page says: “As well might we believe that the sun travels round the earth, instead of the earth round the sun, as to believe in all the incongruities which have been taught to masons in the symbolic degrees (the lodges.)” (Dalcho’s Orations, pp. 43, 44.) Dr. Dalcho, the inspector general of freemasonry, was well aware that the foolish story concerning Hiram Abiff, and others connected with that, were founded on the grossest errors of accumulated ages; that there is no truth in them; that every man could, in one moment after his initiation, and after

being told that they were undeniable truths, prove them from the Bible to be falsehoods. No wonder he felt embarrassed; but it is wonder that he could say, right in connection with the above, "Masonry is a subject for which I feel the highest veneration." The highest veneration for a system founded on the grossest errors of accumulated ages! The ceremonies pertaining to the pretended tragical death of Hiram are held forth as the most sublime part of the sublime degree of master mason. These, being founded on the grossest errors, are false, and the whole system is a falsehood. Why not abandon it, like an honest man? But, what confidence can we have in a man who can deliberately assert as undeniable truth what he well knows is founded on the grossest errors of accumulated ages? He is not to be believed in anything he may teach concerning the craft, unless it shall be corroborated by other testimony.

LETTER VII.

FALSE AND PROFANE TRADITIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS OF FREEMASONRY.

The traditions of the order, gentlemen, are your oracle. To these, and not to well authenticated historical records, you appeal, as sustaining your high claims to antiquity and great veneration. But these traditions, for the most part, are utterly false—founded, as Dr. Dalsho says, "on the grossest errors of accumulated ages." False, not only, but profane. Some of these I purpose to notice in the present letter.

You teach us by your traditions that John the Baptist and John the Evangelist were free masons—patrons of the institution—and are now its patron saints. Grand master Scott, in his *Analogy*, says: “Our patron saint, John the Baptist, spoke of the ‘Lamb of God.’” (p. 40.) Again he says: “Masonic tradition, which is considered a pure channel of communication, informs us that this eminent and pious father was a member of the craft, or patron of the order. The fact, as transmitted from an unknown period, there seems to be no room to contradict, though many have doubted its verity. The principles which the Baptist preached, and the truths he taught, constitute the strong foundation on which the masonic edifice rests.” (p. 87.) “Masonic tradition, which is considered a pure channel of communication.” By whom is this considered a pure channel of communication? By members of the order, of course. Certainly not by others. As a general thing, it is considered by the uninitiated as the most corrupt channel of communication through which intelligence has ever pretended to reach us. The Jews of old made void the commands of God by their traditions. And shall we be considered unreasonable, if we hold and teach that masonic traditions are unreliable sources of information, deserving no credit? Through this channel we are taught the most extravagant, incredulous, and even ridiculous things of which the world ever heard—such as the building of Enoch’s subterranean temple, nine arches deep, in which were said to be deposited the precious jewels of masonry, where they were secreted and pre-

served until the time of Solomon; the manner in which it was found; the magic triangular plate of gold, with its ineffable characters; the instantaneous destruction of the temple and nearly four thousand masters, as they descended its deep arches on a ladder of ropes; the death of Hiram in the midst of his labors, and many other things equally fabulous and foolish. Is this "a pure channel of communication"? Has nothing corrupt ever floated down its stream? If not, then all these things are true. Yes, that temple was built, and found, and destroyed; Hiram was killed, buried and found, and raised in the manner described—Solomon, by the strong grip, pulled up his loathsome carcass out of its grave, hugged it breast to breast, hand to back, and mouth to ear. All these things are true, or masonic tradition is a corrupt channel of communication. All these fables, and a thousand others like them, have come down to us through this medium. But who of you, gentlemen, believe these things? Where is there a man among you who will hazard his reputation for intelligence and common-sense by saying, I believe them—I believe all about Enoch's temple, all about Hiram, his death and resurrection, as taught in the sublime third degree; that Jubela was executed by having his throat cut across, his tongue torn out by the roots, and his body buried in the rough sands of the sea, at low-water mark, where the tide ebbs and flows twice in twenty-four hours, when there is no such ebbing and flowing of tide in the land where his execution took place?

Now, it comes down to us through this

channel that John the Baptist and John the Evangelist were both eminent free masons. Shall we believe this? No; rather believe it to be a story "founded on the grossest errors of accumulated ages." We cannot do as grand master Scott further says: "It is taken for granted that they both were either members of the institution or patrons of it, mainly because we are so informed by tradition." No, sir, we cannot take this for granted. We ask for higher authority than your tradition; that is corrupt; it tells us a great many things which we know, and can prove, as Dr. Daleho admits, the next minute after we are taught them, that they are untrue. We would as soon believe that living Solomon embraced and pressed to his bosom dead Hiram, after he had lain in his grave fourteen days, and he had become so offensive that the fellow-crafts, while disinterring him, involuntarily raised their hands to defend their nostrils from the offensive effluvia, and the flesh was so decomposed that the skin cleaned from the bone—as soon believe all this as that the two Johns were free masons.

And, yet, says Master Scott: "Dr. Oliver says that Calmet positively asserts that the Evangelist was an Essenean free mason." (p. 89.) He adds, in a note, on the same page: "Our knowledge of their (the Essenean masons) belief and habits is chiefly derived from tradition." Calmet's *positive* assertion is therefore founded on tradition. Tradition will stand for what it is worth. Not a scrap of history, either sacred or profane, can be produced, going to show that those men were free masons. Your

traditions, gentlemen, are false—not only false, but slanderous. It is a base slander upon the character of those holy men of God to represent them as going into the secret chambers of masonry, or as patronizing the institution; and especially that tradition which represents the craft soliciting the Evangelist to “act the part of grand master,” and he returning for answer, “that although he was advanced in years, (being upwards of ninety,) yet, having been in the early part of his life initiated into the society, and always having it much at heart, he would cheerfully comply with their request.” (Scott, p. 91.) If these things were matters of well attested record, preserved and handed down to us from those times, there might be some propriety in treating them with respect; but as they are all, without exception, founded on tradition, and come to us through this corrupt channel, I unhesitatingly pronounce them a *libel*. It is a libel to represent the Evangelist as saying that in the early part of his life he was initiated into the society, and would then, in his old age, being upwards of ninety, consent to act as grand master!

Admitting that freemasonry existed in Jerusalem in the days of Christ and the St. Johns—that the latter were members and patrons of the order—is it not reasonable to suppose that the chief men among the Jews and Romans—Pilate and Herod, and the Jewish Sanhedrim—were members too? Then, I ask, by whom was John the Baptist beheaded? By a brother mason. By whom was the Saviour rejected, betrayed, condemned, and delivered over to the Roman

soldiers to be crucified? By masons!—by the Grand Lodge at Jerusalem! This is a fair conclusion.

Who that looks at these things in their true light does not feel a degree of righteous indignation, that the world should have been so long imposed upon by masonic tradition? Thousands have been made to believe that freemasonry originated at the building of Solomon's temple, and he was grand master; that the two St. Johns were free masons, and one of them, at least, grand master. Then, to see sensible men—sensible in other things, but extremely senseless and childish in these things—to see them gather from all quarters, and in crowds, to celebrate what they call St. John's Day—to see them parading the streets, making a pompous display of masonic regalia, all in memory of "holy St. John"—how ludicrous! If those holy men could be present on such an occasion, and be eye-witnesses of the flummery and nonsense of the day, how perfectly disgusted would they be, and how insulted, too, to be claimed as patrons of such a profane and murderous institution. These things, gentlemen, are an insult to those men and a dishonor to the christian religion. I feel called upon by the King of Zion to vindicate the character of His servants from this foul calumny, and to expose the imposition.

These pretensions to antiquity, and to the patronage of the honorable and the good of past ages, are for the purpose of giving character to the institution. Satan very well knows that he cannot succeed in any of his artful designs to

deceive men only as he transforms himself as an angel of light, as he did to our first parents. Were he to appear in his true character as Beelzebub, the prince of demons, and show his cloven foot, all the good and honorable would turn from him. All false systems of religion, therefore, put forth their high claims to sanctity and utility, pretending to be for the highest good of the race; otherwise they could not succeed. Were freemasonry to stand forth in its own regalia, just as it is and now revealed, divested of its borrowed plumes, not a good man on earth would ever submit to its cable-tow. All but the vicious and the vulgar would shun a lodge as they would a den of thieves and robbers. Therefore, a host of christian men—ministers and orators—have been employed by Satan, of late years, to cover up its deformity—to throw around it the robes of christianity—in order to make the institution appear respectable and honorable. How far this artifice of Satan has succeeded the history of the past and the present will testify.

Had the first oath of freemasonry—the oath administered to the poor blind candidate at his initiation—had this oath, to say nothing about others equally horrible, been before the public on the start—had the craft been as ready to announce that to be just what it is, as they have been to trumpet their traditions, in which there is no truth—where would have been the institution? Long ago it would have been numbered with the things which are not. And if you, gentlemen, members of the order, would now come out, like honest men, before God and your fellow-men, and acknowledge what you know to be the

truth—that the revelations of masonry now before the public are what they profess to be—your institution could not exist a day; not another honest man would ever join a lodge. This you well know. It is only by a downright dishonest course—by uttering things which you know are untrue and deceptive—that you have succeeded in reviving and sustaining freemasonry. You deny the truth of these revelations, when you know, every man among you who knows anything about them, that they are true and faithful. And you are busily employing yourselves in getting up and palming off higher religious pretensions than ever—pretensions which have no more connection with freemasonry than they have with Paganism or Mohamadanism; and but very few of those who compose your four thousand six hundred lodges in the United States will subscribe to them. They are not the principles of masonry. They are the glorious doctrines of the Bible, for which wicked men, whether in your lodges or out of them, have no relish; and had they been made to understand, before their initiation, that these were masonic principles, and they must acknowledge them as such, they never would have offered themselves as candidates. You are not honest men. If any one who has never been initiated into the order were to ask you, one by one, throughout all your lodges, if the revelations of masonry now made public are what they are said to be by all seceding masons, what answer would you give? Would you be honest, and tell just what you know to be the truth? If you gave any answer, it would be either a

direct or an indirect denial of the truth, and of what you know to be the truth. Therefore, I say you are not honest; and the principles and obligations of your ancient craft will not allow you to be honest. I repeat it—if you were to act the part of honest men your institution could not stand another day.*

Freemasonry, if I may use the figure, has two suits in which she clothes herself, as most people have—one which they wear every day, about their ordinary business, and another which they put on occasionally, when they go from home and appear in public. So, masonry has a garment of her own, which is her every-day attire; she wears it about all her ordinary masonic business, wears it in all her secret chambers, and never in public. If she were to be caught before the public, having on this, her native robe, she would feel very much as some house-keepers do when unexpectedly called upon by strangers, and found having on their every-day dress. Masonry has ever labored to shun this exposure—has guarded against it by the most tremendous oaths. She has never appeared before the public, voluntarily, in her own native habiliments. She has been compelled to this by the faithful exposure of others. She has another suit—her Sunday dress we may call it—in which she appears before the uninitiated. This is very pretty; in this she appears quite honorable; but, the mischief is, it is not her own—it is a borrowed, or, more properly, a stolen robe.

*Read the renunciation of Rev. Mr. Thacher, and of Dea. Wm. A. Bartlett, in the Appendix. See how masons deceived them, and even lied to them, to get them into the lodge.

Attired in this, she makes herself appear, verily, like religion itself; a superficial observer would hardly perceive the difference. Thousands are deceived and are led to believe that freemasonry is equal to christianity, if not even superior.

Not a book has ever been written and published under the sanction of the institution, setting forth its real sentiments, giving it its true character, clothing it in its every-day dress—not one. This would be fatal to its very existence. Let some grand high priest, or grand chaplain, or grand master, write and publish a book that should be commended by the highest masonic dignitaries, showing how excellent it is to belong to an institution whose members are all bound by solemn oath to keep each other's secrets—in some cases, murder and treason not excepted—and to espouse a brother's cause so far as to extricate him from his difficulty, right or wrong, and, as I have said, that would be the end of freemasonry. That book would dig its grave and chant its funeral dirge.

But, scores of books have been written and published, under the highest sanction of the institution, which are designed to maintain its high pretensions to morality and religion, and to everything else that can render it popular. These pretensions, so far as they pertain to the doctrines, precepts and institutions of the Bible, are not masonry: they are its borrowed trappings; and not four-fifths of the members of the lodges will acknowledge them as the teachings of masonry.

There are some few pious men, members of masonic lodges, who love these doctrines,

precepts and ceremonies, as connected with christianity, but will not allow that they are freemasonry, or that they have any legitimate connection with that institution. But there are scores on scores of members—Unitarians, Socinians, Arians, Christians, Deists, Universalists and Skeptics—who will not own these religious pretensions anywhere, whether in the Bible or out of it; they would scorn the idea of subscribing to them.

For illustration: Salem Town, in his "Speculative Freemasonry," a work which I have often quoted in the "Inquiry into Masonry," says: "With these views the sixth degree is conferred, where the riches of Divine grace are opened in boundless prospect." (p. 79.) Grand Master Scott, speaking of the types and remarkable events of ancient craft masonry, says they "showed forth, or mystically represented, the glorious plan of redemption. We believe that our ancient brethren read in them the most cherished assurances of a coming Messiah, in an age then far off, as distinctly as they did in the types and prophecies of the old dispensation." Again: "How beautiful, how grand, and how sublime must be that view of ancient craft masonry which connects it with all time, all ages, all generations, and with the redemption of the world!" (pp. 15, 245.) Now, who of all your thousands believe these things? Where is there a good man among your number who believes that in the ceremonies of the lodge-room the riches of Divine grace are unfolded in boundless prospect, or that the types and events of ancient masonry shadowed forth the plan of redemption,

or that the coming of Messiah was as clearly seen in these types and shadows as in those of the Jewish dispensation, or that freemasonry is connected with the redemption of the world? Where, I ask, is the man to be found who believes them? Sure I am that not one of all the classes of heretics, as we sometimes call them, which I have named will acknowledge them—not one. The fact is, they are not masonry; they are borrowed trappings.

Take other pretensions equally absurd and profane. Grand Master Scott says of the *lamb-skin*: “It is worn in remembrance of that pure and holy being who suffered and died for our transgressions. It undoubtedly has reference to the Lamb that was slain from the foundation of world.” “It speaks of One who bled and died.” (pp. 41, 42.) I ask the author of these extravagant pretensions to point us to an instance in any of the lectures or ceremonies of the degrees in which the candidate is taught that the lamb-skin represents the Lamb of God as having suffered, bled and died for our transgressions. He cannot do it. This is not masonry. And I ask you, gentlemen, Deists, Unitarians, Universalists and Skeptics, do you believe this is masonry? Not one of you. The language of the order is: “This is an emblem of innocence”—not of the Lamb of God.

On the Divinity of Christ our author says: “He was the perfect man and the perfect God, which two characters find an apt and sublime illustration in one of the emblems of our order.” What is that emblem? It is this: “A double equilateral triangle.” “The upper triangle,” he

says, "representing the perfect God, and the lower triangle the perfect man." (pp. 154, 155.) Gentlemen, Unitarians, and all others, I have named, do you believe this—that Jesus Christ is perfect God and perfect man? Were you ever taught this doctrine in a masonic lodge? No, never. And you, gentlemen, members of evangelical churches, who hold to the doctrine that Jesus is God manifest in the flesh, were never taught this glorious truth in a masonic lodge; neither do you believe that it is or can be represented by any masonic emblem. It is a false and profane saying of Master Scott, for which he and those masonic dignitaries who have sanctioned his book are responsible.

Next comes the doctrine of the atonement—the vicarious sufferings of Christ for sin. This fundamental doctrine of christianity is represented by Mr. Scott as being taught by freemasonry. He says: "Christ died for us, and through His merits only can we ever find that which was lost. His blood was shed for us. He died for all mankind." (Analogy, p. 366.) In connection with this, he presents the doctrine of the Trinity as being held forth in the lodges. He says: "There are three persons and one God. The Father, Son and Holy Ghost raised Jesus from the tomb." (p. 278.) Speaking of the number three, as frequently used in masonic ceremonies, he says: "Many believe that it refers to the doctrine of the adorable Trinity. Many enlightened craftsmen have stated that it is not only an emblem of the Trinity, but that it is so explained in our lectures." (p. 335.) Now, where is there a masonic lodge on earth that

ever taught the Divinity and vicarious sufferings of Christ, and the doctrine of the Trinity? Not one. For this very good reason: these doctrines are not masonry, and have no more connection with what is called Speculative Freemasonry than they have with laying brick and mortar. To convince you that what I say is the truth, let me recommend to you to take these treatises—Town's and Scott's, and others of the same stamp, which dress out the institution in borrowed robes—take these into your lodges, as you do your Monitors, and make them your text-books; enforce the sentiments herein taught upon every candidate, and require of him to assent to them, just as churches require of those who become members to assent to their articles of faith, and what would follow? An explosion that would shake your splendid Babel down upon your heads. Take the work of Town or Scott, either one, into any lodge where there are Unitarians, Deists and Universalists, (and you can find hardly a lodge where there are not some such;) make a move that the religion taught in that book shall be that of the lodge; take a vote to that effect. How would the matter stand? You would have contention and a division that would threaten to annihilate the lodge. You would soon learn, to your entire satisfaction, that such books, though published under the sanction of your highest authorities, do not teach masonry as it is taught in the lodge-room: it is masonry as taught for the uninitiated to look at; but it is not masonry in its native costume. And you could not intro-

H*

duce a work of that character as a text-book into any lodge in the United States.*

The types, shadows and ceremonies of the Jewish dispensation were sacred—were instituted by Jehovah for a sacred purpose. They have fulfilled their mission, and have passed away. What man, or body of men, are authorized to revive them? None. To do so is profane; it is perverting them from their original and sacred use to an improper and profane use. This freemasonry does by adopting them into its system and using them in a way and manner which the Divine Institutor never intended. Grand Master Scott says: "Then all the types, shadows, rites and ceremonies of the Jews, as contained in the Old Testament, have been adopted expressly or impliedly into our system, and form a part of its mysteries." (p. 221.) This, I say, is profane. God has given you no leave, gentlemen, to adopt these types, shadows, rites and ceremonies into your creed or system. You are guilty of sacrilege. If a man desires to know the true import of these things, as con-

*Avery Allyn, in his *Ritual of Freemasonry*, (page 14,) relates the following incident: "In the State of Connecticut, a memorial from a Clergyman was presented to the Grand Lodge of that State by one of its members, *praying* that the prayers used and authorized by that body in the initiations and in the opening and closing ceremonies of the first three degrees of Freemasonry should be so improved and revised, by inserting the name of the Saviour in such a way that all prayers addressed to the Deity should be offered through Jesus Christ, as the common Saviour and Mediator between God and man. The petition was laid before the Grand Lodge and its merits discussed. The question on granting the prayer of the memorialists was put and—rejected.' This, reader, was the result. "By an official act of the Grand Lodge, says Mr. Allyn, "the Saviour was voted from their society." And if the same question was put in every Grand Lodge in the United States, the result would, no doubt, be the same.

tained in the Old Testament, where shall he go? Into the dark chambers of masonry, or to the sanctuary, where these mysteries are expounded by God's ministers, and in the way he has appointed?

To introduce certain figures as a representation that "Jesus Christ is perfect God and perfect man," or to denote the doctrine of the Trinity, is profane. To teach the candidate that the lodge-room represents the holy of holies in Solomon's temple, and consequently Heaven itself, the holy place where God resides, is blasphemous. In the third degree, the candidate is taught by his conductor; "Brother we are now in a place representing the *sanctum sanctorum*, or *holy of holies*, of king Solomon's temple." In reference to this Scott says: "In the holy of holies of our temple is an ever-present Deity." (p. 88.) Does Jehovah dwell in a masonic lodge, as He did in the holy of holies in the temple? Does a lodge-room, where God's name is taken in vain in the oaths, ceremonies, and even prayers that are offered from profane lips—where the institutions of the Bible are perverted to profane uses—is that place a representation of heaven, or even of the holy of holies of Solomon's temple? No doubt there is a present Deity in that room, as in all other places: He is there to behold in those solemn mockeries things which He infinitely abhors and will bring into judgment.

In reference to the true meaning of the terms *Urim and Thummim*, as worn by the high priest, under the law, Scott says: "Masonic traditions, if we were permitted to make them

public, would probably throw some light upon the true meaning of these words." (p. 250.) This implies that christianity has never yet attained to the true import of those sacred terms, but freemasonry has; that this "*true meaning*" is yet concealed from the world and from the church of God, under masonic emblems which the order is not at liberty to make public. God forbids it. He has granted favor to freemasonry which he has withheld from christianity! It must, therefore, be a great privilege (must it not?) to be allowed to enter the secret chambers of freemasonry, and there to receive *light* in reference to the true import of Jewish types and shadows, which God has withheld from Zion—there to be taught the true pronounciation of the name of Jehovah, which is not known to any but members of the craft? Who does not feel a righteous indignation at such an outrage upon the christian faith, and that, too, by the professed friends of christianity?

Scott's Analogy abounds with such false, ridiculous, and profane pretensions. It is disgusting to see how the man labors to identify the two institutions—masonry and christianity. I have neither time nor patience to take further notice of the book. It carries its own condemnation on almost every page; and the candid christian needs only to turn over its pages and glance at their contents to be disgusted with its pretensions.

But, before closing this letter, I will notice, briefly, two or three other things which forcibly illustrate the profane character of the book. The author represents that Hiram, the widow's

son, built the temple. He says: "He was the builder; he drew the plan and superintended the work." Then, he asks, was he not "a type of Christ?" (p. 236.) Every attentive reader of the Bible knows that these things are not true. Hiram was not the builder of the temple, did not draw the plan, nor superintend the work; nor did he represent Jesus Christ.

The childish ceremony through which every candidate for the master's degree passes, in which he is said to represent dead Hiram when Solomon is said to have raised him out of his grave, is held forth as representing the resurrection of the dead. "The word *raised*," says Scott, "is a masonic term." "This term is used to designate the reception of a candidate into the third degree of masonry. It alludes to a portion of the ceremony which is fully understood by a master. The doctrine of the resurrection is a sublime doctrine, and is powerfully enforced in our masonic bodies." "This doctrine is elucidated in the third degree, and sublimely evolved in the ceremonies." (pp. 267-8.) The ceremonies alluded to are those in which the candidate is *raised*, in imitation of the resurrection of dead Hiram by Solomon. To hold forth that this is an illustration of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead by our Lord Jesus Christ is solemn mockery before God. Once more: when the poor blind candidate is on his knees in the lodge-room before the altar, on which are placed burning tapers, and a tight bandage over his eyes, so that he is in total darkness when he is brought to light, as it is termed, by the bandage being instantly pulled

from his eyes. This "masonic rite," Scott says, is "typical of a new-born soul," who is just brought from darkness into God's marvelous light; and also "typical of a Mediator" through whom this great change is wrought. (p. 170.) Now, if these things are not *mummery*, I beg to know what would be. This is the way, as our author remarks, on page 371, that "ancient craft masonry illustrates biblical truth." More properly, he might have said, the way in which ancient craft masonry profanes biblical truth.

But some one will, perhaps, say these are only the opinions of an individual who has written and published a book on his own responsibility; freemasonry is not answerable for it. To such I have only to say, turn to the book and read for yourself the "testimonials from distinguished masons," and "from lodges and chapters of the State of Mississippi." And as an evidence that the book is extensively patronized by the craft, it had passed through six editions in 1857. The first edition was published in 1848. Six editions in eleven years.

But the climax of all that is profane in masonic ceremonies is a mock celebration of the Lord's Supper in one of the "ineffable degrees." The *Free Mason's Monitor* prescribes the rule for this mockery: "The *Most Perfect* presents the candidate with bread and wine, saying, eat of this bread with me and drink of the same cup." (*Free Mason's Monitor*, edition 1802, p. 263.)

LETTER VIII.

HAS NOT FREEMASONRY BEEN CHANGED ?

I know not how often I have been interrogated, Has not masonry been changed? is it not a different thing from what it used to be? And some will add, Masons assure us that the institution is not what it was when disclosed by Morgan and others; there has been a great change made for the better. One young man said to me: "My father is a mason, and he tells me that masonry is a different institution from what it was formerly, and I believe him."

My usual reply is after this manner: No doubt masonry has been changed; it is not, in all respects, what it was when disclosed a few years since. That change is such that no mere "book mason" can now get into the lodges. Hence, masons feel themselves justified, to a certain extent, in saying that there has been a change. Still, their language implies, and they intend that it shall imply, what they know is not true. They mean to be understood that the principles of the institution have been changed, and the system is now a different thing; but no such change has taken place. The system of freemasonry, embracing all its fundamental principles, remains unchanged. You will, therefore, frequently meet with zealous members of the order who will tell you that masonry is now just what it ever was. They mean by this that the system has undergone no change. I have never met with an adhering mason, who knew me, who has ever intimated that masonry had been changed. I, not long ago, met with one to

whom I was a stranger, who undertook to make me believe that the horrid oaths published to the world were not masonic oaths. I replied, "Brother, you are unfortunate in attempting to play that game with me. I have been there. More than forty years ago those same oaths were administered to me in 'the body of a just and lawfully constituted lodge, dedicated to God and held forth to the holy order of St. John.'" He was silent, as well he might be. See, in this case, the mischievous influence of freemasonry in leading professedly good men to falsify the truth. This man was a member of a christian church.

The change, which I admit has taken place, is similar to that which was made many years ago, when "*Jachin and Boaz*" was published in England. That book revealed masonry at the time of its publication. It was a faithful disclosure of the secrets of the three degrees. And to prevent "book masons" from getting into the lodges the signs, grips and pass-words were altered. This was the change, and, I believe, all the change that was made in masonry at that time. A similar change was made at the more recent disclosures of masonry in 1826-7. The signs, grips and pass-words were altered; but the principles of masonry—the system itself—is just what it was—that has not been changed.

And, gentlemen of the order, when you tell people that masonry is not what it was, as disclosed by Morgan and others, you admit that those disclosures were correct. This every one can perceive. Masonry was then revealed, but you have changed it, you say, so that it is not

now what it was then. This is not all. You admit that masonry was then corrupt, else why change it? Yes, ancient freemasonry, as instituted by Solomon, as you pretend, at the building of the temple, and of which you have boasted for ages, is found to be corrupt; and it has become necessary to revise and improve it. Will you abide by this? If not, tell us no more about masonry being something different now from what it used to be. Have you dispensed with those horrid, blasphemous oaths and death penalties? Let us know. You tell us that you have made changes in the system. I argue that you are bound to let us know what those changes are, that we may judge for ourselves whether they are for the better or for the worse. We shall not take your word for it, but claim the privilege of looking at the matter, that we may be prepared to say whether you have improved the system or not. Come out with your pretended improvements, or forever remain silent.

And, furthermore, you admit, not only that masonry is revealed and is found to be corrupt, and that it is therefore necessary to revise it, but in getting up this revision, so far as it extends, you dispense with "ancient freemasonry." In so far as you have anything new, it is modern, not "ancient." If you have revised the whole system and made it all new, then it is no longer "ancient craft masonry:" it is modern masonry. And, if you say that it differs from ancient masonry, tell us wherein it differs. In the first degree the candidate, you know, is made to swear that he will not reveal the "secret arts and mysteries of *ancient* freemasonry:" he is at

liberty, so far as anything in this obligation is concerned, to reveal whatever may be of a modern character. If you have got up something new, some new fangled system of secrecy, why retain the old name? Why not give it a new name, if, indeed, it be a new thing? And, then, you must tell us what this new thing is. You have told so many falsehoods about "ancient freemasonry," that we shall be slow to believe anything you may say about something which you may call new and better. We must judge for ourselves.

Once more: the principles of masonry cannot be changed, in any of their essential features, without violating the solemn charge delivered in the third degree. It is as follows: "*The ancient land-marks of the order entrusted to your care you are carefully to preserve, and never suffer them to be infringed, or countenance a deviation from the established usages and customs of the fraternity.*" (Masonic Chart, by J. L. Cross, G. L., p. 42.) The same is found in Bradley and in many other standard works of the order. Masonry, therefore, cannot be changed so as to be anything materially different from what it has ever been without violating this charge to the candidate. We are, therefore, taught by masonic authority that "masonic principles are the same in every age and nation." (Bradley, p. 33.) These principles admit of no change in any age or nation. Grand Master Scott confirms my position beyond all controversy. He says: "Concerning the land-marks of our institution there can be but little room for disputation. Nothing can be added to, or

taken from, them, according to the constitutions of masonry. They are permanent." On another page, he says: "Of course, nothing can be engrafted upon the regular lectures, nor can the ancient land-marks be in any wise changed." Once more: "The system of masonry is so perfect, and its mode of transmitting facts orally so pure, that we may safely affirm that our traditions have been handed down to us without any material alteration. *They cannot be constitutionally altered.* They are guarded by the most solemn sanctions, and, as a proof that they have not been changed, they are now and ever have been the same the world over. The remarkable uniformity which exists in the masonic work and ceremonies throughout the earth, shows that the traditions or land-marks of the institution have been preserved inviolate." (See Scott's Analogy, pp. 252, 261, 393.) The book before me, from which I make these extracts, was published in 1857, about two years since. Up to that date the land-marks of the institution had been *preserved inviolate.* They are now, and ever have been, the same the world over. Wherever masonry now exists, the world over, it is, in all its essential features, just what it was when Morgan was kidnapped and murdered for revealing it to the world. And you, gentlemen of the order, when you tell the uninitiated that masonry has been changed, is not now what it used to be, you are verily guilty of willfully perverting the truth. They can, therefore, put no confidence in anything you may say in reference to this matter.

LETTER IX.

THE WARFARE.

There is a great controversy going on in this world. The parties engaged are Right and Wrong—sin and holiness. God's people are represented in the Scriptures as soldiers: their business is to maintain this warfare. They are, therefore, exhorted to put on the whole armor of God, and to "contend earnestly for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints."

This warfare is to be maintained against sin in all its forms, and of every name. Show us an exception. Point out a single sin against which the soldiers of Christ are not to make unceasing war.

There are what we sometimes call popular sins, because they prevail extensively, are committed in high places and by men of popular standing. Slavery, for instance, is of this character: it prevails throughout a great portion of these United States, is sustained by the national government, and by men of the highest religious, civil and political standing. Those, therefore, who venture to war with the system expose themselves to popular indignation; they draw down upon themselves the execrations of the whole host of slavery and pro-slavery men, and, in some instances, the maledictions of United States' laws, and are liable to their penalties. Therefore it is that thousands who acknowledge in private conversation that slavery is "the sum of all villainies," yet decline to take any active part in prosecuting measures to get rid of the evil. They fear the consequences.

Freemasonry is another popular sin. Its lodges, chapters, and encampments extend throughout the United States, and they are patronized and sustained by men of wealth, of talents, and of influence. Its popularity, though not what it was before the "Morgan affair," is rising; and thousands are beginning again to shrink from any warfare with the evil. They are well aware that to oppose the institution will call down upon them the secret revenge of the order. They take the position that others do in reference to slavery and other popular sins—let them alone, say nothing about them. They let masonry alone, and say nothing about it, and advise others to do the same.

There are some christian churches who are adopting this popular course. They acknowledge masonry to be an evil, a great evil, and once they opposed it, bore testimony against it. In those days, if any of their members belonged to the lodges and would not leave them, they expelled them forthwith; and, while they maintained this position, masonry was down. And had they stood firm and continued the warfare, the institution could never have been revived. But a great change has come over them. They have thrown down the armor, proclaimed peace with the enemy, opened wide their doors and bid him welcome to enter. Some of these churches are now receiving members of masonic lodges to their membership without asking any questions. If they are not preparing the way for another sore conflict hereafter, I am under a great mistake. They are making work for repentance. The Saviour will not allow His

bride to be associated with such an abomination as freemasonry is, though it may profess to be the bride's handmaid.

What is the mission of a gospel church? Not merely to augment its numbers, to display wealth, talent and influence. Not to court the popularity and friendship of the world. It is to be a reformatory body—the greatest of all reformatory agencies on earth—to reclaim men from sin—to reform the world—to make it better. It must, therefore, keep itself pure, unspotted, stand aloof from all wrong doings, and labor to expose every evil which men commit, and bear open testimony against it. Else how can she reform men, and reclaim them from sin. If the church shall indulge in any known sin, how can it reform others who commit the same. If it hold in its fellowship those who deal in human chattels, can it with any consistency, testify against the system, and take an active part in pursuing measures to get rid of the curse?—Surely not. Her influence is the other way. Hence, slaveholding churches are doing more than any other instrumentalities on earth to uphold slavery. Let all christians and churches and ministers of all denominations, come out from that sin, and proclaim war against it, and it could not exist. Exactly so in reference to freemasonry. Those churches that now receive members of that order to their fellowship, without requiring them to dissolve that unhallowed connection, not only cease to war with the abomination, but they are upholding it, and the whole weight of their influence goes to revive it. They are, therefore, responsible to God, to a very

great extent, for the existence of masonry at the present day. As I have said, had they stood fast on the ground which they once occupied, masonry could never have been revived in our land. Do they stop to think of these things? They may pass along smoothly for a while, shaking hands with satan, and co-operating with him in promoting one of his strong delusions, but trouble is ahead, the day of reckoning will come.

No class of men in the world are doing more in this unholy business than some professed ministers of Christ. They of all men ought to be the most pure and unspotted. "Be ye clean, that bear the vessels of the Lord," is the command. They are constituted, by Christ, leaders in this warfare against all sin. They should, therefore, stand forth in the front of the battle, and lead on the sanctified hosts of God against the enemy, against every popular sin. It is extremely painful to see the course some of them take—going over to the enemy, joining his standard, and warring against those who war with him. They are not ignorant that they grieve many of the dear ones for whom Christ died. And they are doing this needlessly. Like Sampson they are shorn of their locks. And their strength in the christian ministry is very much departed. They are blind guides, leading the blind. They are stumbling blocks to thousands of the impenitent; and there are thousands of the saints with whom they can have no influence. How they can pursue this course is a mystery which I must leave to be solved at a future day. Some of these men are leading officers, chaplains of the lodges; men who are employed to pray for the

prosperity of freemasonry, and in their orations to eulogize its character. I know one who sustains the high, (or rather low,) office of grand chaplain of the grand lodge of the State of New York, I blush to say it—a Baptist minister, and once an anti-mason. For what do these chaplains pray, in those secret chambers? For something good? No. They pray for an enterprise which God abhors. They pray indirectly, though not intentionally, for the prosperity of the devil's kingdom. And they labor to promote his cause. They are the most successful agents he has in his employ. They are doing more for him, in reviving masonry, than any other class of men can do. Must we have confidence in them as good men? Must we extend to them the hand of christian fellowship, and call them brethren, while they turn away from us and go into the lodges, and there associate with infidels and blasphemers, and the most worthless characters on earth, and call them brethren? This is asking too much. "By their fruits ye shall know them." It is an imposition for them to claim public confidence. They cannot plead as all who have renounced their allegiance to the institution, do plead, that they were deceived. I was deceived. And so says every seceding mason. We found masonry not to be what we supposed it was, and was told that it was. We therefore left it. But these men have gone into the lodges with their eyes open, knowing, or at least they might know, would they take pains to read, what masonry is. And it is too late in the day for them to say, that masonry is not as bad as it has been represented. We know better. Some of us have been there,

and we know for ourselves that the system has been faithfully developed, and that it is just what it is held forth to be, and that every man, woman and child who can read, and will read, may know what freemasonry is, except the altered signs, grips and pass words. If any of you, gentlemen, chaplains and grand chaplains, shall feel that these remarks are severe, that these arrows hurt, all I have to say is, then come out from the enemy's ranks.

There is another class of ministers who are almost as inconsistent with their high calling, though they do not enter the lodges with a cable-tow about their necks. In private circles they will freely denounce the whole concern as wicked. They lament the existence of the institution, and that the evil should again find its way into the churches. But they take this position—let it alone—say nothing about it. They urge us all to adopt this method. For, say they, it is useless to oppose the thing, we can effect nothing, shall only stir up strife, get enemies, and with many hurt our influence.

Is this a commendable course for the soldiers of Christ, especially for those who are leaders in his army? Is not this retreating before the enemy, giving up the ground, and acknowledging to him, that we are not able to cope with him; even in the name of the Lord of Hosts. To me, it does look somewhat cowardly. For I am confident, that putting on "the whole armor," and standing in the Master's strength, the gates of hell cannot prevail against us. We shall succeed. "One shall chase a thousand, and two shall put ten thousand to flight." No weapon that is

formed against us can prosper. For one, I had much rather die on the field, facing the enemy, covered with wounds, than to be seen turning my back, and to be heard crying, let the devil alone, it is useless to contend with him; you will get hurt. My brethren, did you enter the "holy war," anticipating a pleasant time; that a tide of popularity would fall to your lot through life? Is there not too much of a disposition to avoid a contest with this popular foe, for fear of losing a little popularity, or for the fear of getting hurt somehow.

A ministering brother was heard to say, "I am sorry brother Stearns has published a new edition of his "Inquiry into Masonry." Why?" said one. "Because he has hurt himself." I suppose he meant, that in republishing the book, I had raised up a new recruit of enemies, who would be likely to injure my influence. But did not the prophets of old hurt themselves in this way—by openly and fearlessly reprovng popular and prevailing sins? How was it with Elijah, who protested against the idolatry of the people, and was compelled to flee for his life. How was it with the good prophet Micaiah, of whom the king of Israel said, "I hate him, for he doth not prophesy good concerning me, but evil." So of all the prophets. And how was it with Christ and the apostles? Did they not hurt themselves, by reprovng the popular and prevailing wickedness of the world? The reason which Jesus assigned why the world hated him, was, because he "testified of it that the works thereof were evil." Every faithful minister of Christ hurts himself in a greater or less

degree, in this way. In reprovng the prevailing and popular sins of the world, he of course exposes himself to the hot displeasure of those who are in the love and practice of these sins. There can be no escape, but to cease the warfare. This some are disposed to do, rather than to get hurt—avoid the conflict—let the enemy alone.

But there is a “balm for every wound” received in this warfare; and no faithful soldier has ever been so badly wounded, but that he has recovered. His wounds will all be healed. And I know of no greater honor than to be covered with scars, which are the marks of wounds inflicted by the enemy. This is “bearing in our body the marks of the Lord Jesus,” as Paul said he did.

But victory is sure. This enemy, popular and powerful as it is, will be driven from the field. Speculative freemasonry will be overthrown. Our brethren need not tell us, that opposition to the institution is useless, and we may as well be still, and say nothing. We do not believe a word of this. We may as well adopt the same course in reference to all the wickedness of the world—let it all alone, and say nothing about it. Though these brethren shall prove like the thousands of Gideon’s army, who were afraid to go to the fight against the Midianites, yet the Lord will have his few faithful ones whom he will sustain, and by whom he will triumph over the enemy.

There is a spirit manifested by masons towards their opponents that is seldom to be met with anywhere else, unless it is in our warfare with the system of slavery. I know not by what

name to call it, unless to say that it is a kind of *infernal* spirit. Sure I am that it is not the spirit of Christ; for it ever seeks to injure those who labor to expose the character of the institution. And this, I suppose, is one reason why so many choose not to be identified with the opponents of secret societies. This spirit is peculiar to the whole family of secret societies. A few years since I took occasion to say something in public against Odd-Fellowship. Sometime in the week I was accosted by a member of the lodge after this manner: "Elder, you hurt yourself last Sabbath in what you said against Odd-Fellowship." "Well," said I, "this is not the first time, and I presume I shall recover; the wounds are not dangerous."

The course pursued by some brethren in the ministry, and some lay members, too, is grievous as well as inconsistent. Once they stood on good ground, and they maintained their standing for years; but within a few years, and since masonry is coming up again, and is becoming popular, and its vengeful spirit is being manifest, they have shifted their position, and now tell us let masonry alone, it is useless to oppose it.

There is another class of men who occupy a leading position among their fellow men, and in the churches of Christ, whose influence is extensive, and goes far toward forming and controlling public sentiment, whose course, I think, the Master does not approve. I allude to conductors of religious journals. Many of them will not allow an exposure of the evils of freemasonry in their respective journals. They will not sound the alarm in Zion, nor will they admit others to do

so through their columns. Are they discharging their duty to the cause of Christ? There are none who occupy a more responsible position before God, than they do. Most, if not all of them, are professed ministers of Christ; and some of them are called *Doctors of Divinity*. Ought they not to stand in defense of that divinity of which they are said to be doctors? Ought they not to urge an unflinching warfare with all the popular evils of the world, and especially those which have a tendency to corrupt the faith of God's people and lead souls to perdition? For what purpose should a christian editor send forth his weekly message to the hundreds and thousands who may read? By what motive should he be governed? By the same that he or any other man would be in preaching the gospel—to honor God, by defending his truth and exposing error, and leading men to Christ. But instead of this, it is manifest that in some instances, at least, the object is worldly gain—to please every body, and give offense to nobody, and thus obtain extensive patronage. Truth must, therefore, be compromised, and popular sins *let alone*. For if an editor shall come out fearlessly against these sins, and labor to expose them, he will most surely "*hurt himself*." Every now and then he may receive a notice through the post-office, like this: "*stop my paper*." But I do not know as any man, and especially a professed minister of Christ and a D. D., would be any more justifiable in conducting a weekly journal with a view of obtaining a livelihood than he would be to preach the Gospel for the same purpose. And who would not pass censure

against any man who should enter the christian ministry with this view—just to get a living?

The editor of a New York religious journal, in his editorial for February 17, 1859, puts forth some strange, and, in my apprehension, contradictory notions on the subject of "Religious Journalism." He first argues that the object of a religious newspaper should be to promote "the great idea of the identification of every human interest and relation with God and His service." This is sound logic and sound theology. But, then, how can this desirable end be brought about without a warfare against all those evils which tend to hinder this identification? If there be any other way, I should like well to be made acquainted with it. Then, we may no longer disturb the carnal peace of this slumbering world: we may let alone all popular sins and leave them to work their own cure, if such a thing can be. Our editor adds: "With this view of the province of a religious newspaper, we *deprecate controversy*, intolerance of opinion, inordinate sectarianism, all manner of discourtesy and unkindness, and the *agitation of topics which only make men angry, and disturb the serenity and peace of the church.*" We *deprecate controversy*. How, I should like to know, can the christian warfare be prosecuted where there is no controversy? This is an absurd contradiction. So long as sin and holiness exist here on Jehovah's footstool, there will be, there must be—yes, there ought to be—controversy. And God's displeasure will rest on those who refuse to take an active part in the great battle which is being fought against

the evils of the world. It is impossible to war against these evils—especially against the popular evils of the world—and not agitate them; and it is impossible to agitate them, to any great extent, to expose them, to testify against them, and labor to put them away, and yet not stir up the anger of wicked men, nor disturb the peace of corrupt churches. If our editor feels authorized to adopt and pursue this course—have no controversy with sin in its various forms, to agitate no subject that shall wake up the wrath of wicked men and devils and apostate churches—can he claim to be a soldier of Christ? He is not acting like one; he is not wielding the weapons of the holy war; he is crying “peace!” where God has determined there shall be no peace. This is his course in reference to the “question of slavery,” and also to freemasonry. To the interrogation, “Will you publish a well written article on the subject of masonry in your paper?” he replied, “The more you stir this subject the worse it will be—the greater numbers will rush into the lodges; therefore, let it alone.” I cannot call this sound logic, nor sound divinity. It is a kind of divinity that needs a pretty skillful D. D. to take care of it.

Is it true that a proper exposure of any sin will tend to make the matter worse, and to lead people into it? How, then, shall we reform the world? In no other way, according to this idea, than to just let it alone—let things take their course. Carry out this principle—where will it end? Evils abound everywhere, and the world groans under the accumulation of their guilt; but you must not say anything about

them, for this is the most direct way to multiply them and make them worse. Take the sin of intemperance—this prevails extensively the world over; but the way to promote a reformation, and to lead people to temperate habits and to reclaim inebriates, is to say nothing about it: if you agitate the subject you will only make it worse—you will incline others to thirst for the drunkard's drink who might not otherwise have thought of it. Now, we know that this is not the way the cause of temperance has been promoted and men, to some extent, have been reformed. There has been a great amount of agitation—a great deal of talking, writing, printing and public lecturing; and the more of these things the better. The cause has prospered in proportion to these efforts at agitation.

Take the "question of slavery"—the very thing to which that editor refers when he says, "we deprecate controversy and agitation." The way to bring about a reform on this subject, and to abolish the institution, is to let it alone! Let men do as they please; let ship-load after ship-load of those unhappy creatures be landed on our shores and sold into hopeless bondage—say nothing about it; for the more you stir, the worse it will be. This sentiment, coming from whomsoever it may—a D. D. or the Pope of Rome—is to be "*deprecating*." It is antagonistic to everything pertaining to moral purity. To think of reforming men by keeping them in ignorance as to the nature and tendency of sin, or of overthrowing the devil's strongholds by letting them alone, is a strange notion: it is rank popery: it is popery in a hot-bed: it is,

indeed, moral insanity. Such a thing never did and never will occur. Did the Saviour anticipate setting up His kingdom and overthrowing satan's in a kind of quiet, peaceable way? Hear Him on this subject: "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law; and a man's foes shall be they of his own household." "I am come to send fire on the earth; and what will I if it be already kindled?" The time-serving policy which I oppose, and which is manifested, not only by the editor to whom I refer, but by thousands of others, would never stir up these divisions and these contentions for the truth's sake, nor kindle these fires of persecution around the saints of the Most High. It could never reform the world on any great moral or political evil that might prevail.

A few years ago freemasonry was put down—the institution was overthrown—and it was thought by many that it never could be revived again and become popular in this part of the land; charters were given up and lodges abandoned; and I know not that a lodge could be found in operation in this State, and in some others. How was this revolution brought about? By this do-nothing and say-nothing policy? Every one knows better. We have not forgotten the tremendous agitation that convulsed the whole country. For several years it was the chief topic of discussion in families, in social gatherings, in town meetings, county conven-

tions, state conventions, and, in one instance, in a great national convention held in the city of Philadelphia; books, pamphlets and periodicals flooded the country; and the result was, as I have stated, the institution was put down. Then, as the enemy had retired from the field, the warfare ceased; as there was no longer a necessity for agitating and discussing the subject, agitation and discussion ceased. There was then a time when masonry was let alone; nothing was said or done about it, for all supposed that it was dead. Then what followed? We all know. Soon the institution began, secretly, to revive; and before we were aware of it, lodges were in operation all over the country. This is the fruit of saying nothing and doing nothing. It has been let alone too long. Had the agitation been kept up, masonry could never have been revived.

LETTER X.

PROFESSED MINISTERS OF CHRIST POOR BLIND CANDIDATES.

Some months ago I wrote an article for the *American Baptist* on the subject of masonry, and had occasion to say something about ministers becoming masons, and about some certain ones who had joined the lodge secretly and endeavored to keep it a secret. A correspondent of that paper, over the signature "Iowa," came out upon me with great severity. He represented that I had abused such ministers, and that my language was "*covert slander.*" The worst thing that I said of such men was, that they

ought to be *ashamed* and to *confess* their wrong. This I say now, and have no apologies to make for repeating the language. Ministers who go into masonic lodges, and submit to the degrading ceremonies and take upon them the profane oaths of the order, ought to be ashamed; and before they ever enter the pulpit again to preach Christ, they ought to confess their wrong. But if I misrepresented them—if plain matters of fact will not bear me out in what I have said and now repeat—then am I seriously in fault. To these matters of fact I appeal. They usually join the lodge secretly, unknown to their families, friends, and the community; and they keep it a secret perhaps for months, if not for years. To form this alliance they must go into a dark and secret chamber—a chamber with darkened windows and a closed door, which is guarded by a drawn sword. To say nothing more, is this a proper place for honest men, and especially for the professed ministers of Christ? He said of himself, “In secret have I said nothing.”

The committee appointed by the United States Anti-Masonic Convention, to inquire into the effect of freemasonry on the christian religion, say: “How, then, can that spirit (the spirit of christianity) delight in secrecy and wrap itself in darkness? Innocence seeks no cover; shame and crime cry, ‘Come, night, and shroud us in the *blanket of the dark!*’ Is there a christian clergyman between the poles who would pass the ceremonies, and take upon him the obligations of freemasonry in open conference, in presence of his church? How, then, dare he do it in presence of his God?” (See Report, p. 3.)

But, let us follow one of those reverend gentlemen to the lodge-room: first, to the little room adjoining the lodge-room, called the "preparation-room." Look on, and see him being "divested of all his clothing, shirt excepted, then furnished with a pair of drawers, his left foot bare, his right in a slipper, a bandage over his eyes, his left breast and arm naked, and a rope called a cable-tow around his neck." Here he stands, "neither naked nor clothed, neither bare-foot nor shod, hoodwinked, and with a cable-tow about his neck." Look at him, "a poor blind candidate!" Candidate for what? Why, for the sublime nonsense and awful blasphemies of freemasonry. Does he not make a most shameful appearance? But who is he? Why, he is a reverend gentleman! Now, take this "poor blind candidate" down stairs, out into the streets, under the light of a mid-day sun! I venture to say that you could not present an object in human shape that would make more fun for the rabble; they would shout at the top of their voices, and laugh, and make a world of sport. Yet, this is a professed minister of Christ!! If you were to behold such an object in the street, would you not call it "*shameful*?" would you not pronounce him a "*simpleton*?" But, what difference does it make whether he be in the public street or in the lodge-room to be gazed at? In either place he makes a ridiculous appearance.

Take him back into the "preparation-room;" then follow him, as his conductor leads him by the rope round his neck into the lodge, where, after passing round and round and round three

times, from west to east, searching for light; then see him kneel before the altar, on which are burning tapers, the Bible, square and compass—his left hand under the Bible and his right hand on it. Now hear him swear: "In the presence of Almighty God and this worshipful lodge, I promise and swear," &c., &c. I will only give the penalties of the oaths of the first three degrees: "Binding myself under no less penalty than to have my throat cut across, my tongue torn out by the roots, and my body buried in the rough sands of the sea at low water-mark, where the tide ebbs and flows twice in twenty-four hours: so help me God, and keep me steadfast in the performance of the same." Second oath: "Binding myself under no less penalty than to have my left breast torn open, my heart and vitals taken from thence and thrown over my left shoulder and carried into the valley of Jehosaphat, there to become a prey to the wild beasts of the field and vultures of the air, if ever I should prove willfully guilty of violating any part of this my solemn oath of a fellow-craft mason: so help me God," &c. Third penalty: "Binding myself under no less penalty than to have my body severed in two in the midst and divided to the north and south—my bowels burnt to ashes in the centre, and the ashes scattered before the four winds of heaven—that there might not the least track or trace of remembrance remain among men or masons of so vile and perjured a wretch as I should be were I ever to prove willfully guilty of violating any part of this my solemn oath or obligation of a master mason: so help me God," &c. But

who is this that swears in this horrible manner, and binds himself under these bloody, these barbarous penalties, and then calls on God to keep him steadfast? Who is he? Why, he is the *Rev. Mr.* ———.

Have I ever written anything concerning these men that is too severe—which these plain matters of fact will not authorize? Let every person of common sense judge. If these oaths are not anti-christian, profane and murderous, I confess that I am no judge.* And the men who shall say that they are not, but that they tend to promote the truths and principles of christianity, are entirely beyond the reach of my confidence as men of God. "By their fruits ye shall know them." This is an infallible test. The prince of demons could not invent a system more at variance with christianity than freemasonry is in all its essential features.

And yet, "Iowa" says, "Masonry is not dead here in the west, but alive and at work." The thought occurred to me, whose work are masons doing in the west—the work of Christ or of

*If the reader is not satisfied, let him follow these professedly holy men as they ascend higher. Follow them up to the Royal Arch, and hear them swear to keep a brother's secrets, "murder and treason not excepted," and to espouse his cause so far as to extricate him from his difficulty. "whether he is right or wrong." Follow on up to the degree of Knights Templars, and hear them swear "to wield the sword in defense of innocent maidens, destitute widows, helpless orphans, and *the Christian religion.*" And, in the "fifth libation," behold them drinking wine from a human skull, imprecating, at the same time, eternal and double damnation on themselves in the following language: "As the sins of the whole world were laid upon the head of our Saviour, so may the sins of the person whose skull this was be heaped upon my head, in addition to my own; and may they appear in judgment against me, both here and hereafter, should I violate or transgress any obligation in masonry, or the orders of knighthood, which I have heretofore taken, take at this time, or may hereafter be instructed in: so help me God." (See Allyn's Ritual.)

diabolus? Sure I am that they are not working for the former. He needs no such helpers as masonic lodges. His work of mercy is promoted in the earth by means of His churches. These, and not oath-bound secret societies, are His chosen instrumentalities. "*At work?*" Yes, doing a most pernicious work, too—a work of which they will find much reason to repent hereafter—leading "poor blind candidates" into the dark halls of masonic blasphemy, where they are taught some of the most demoralizing principles that ever disgraced fallen humanity—principles which are utterly at variance with the teachings of the Bible and of common honesty.

"Iowa" adds: "Hundreds and thousands of church members in the west are masons, and ministers not a few have worn the *cable-tow*." On reading this I instinctively exclaimed, What is the character of the churches and of the christian ministry in the west? Are the former being metamorphosed in masonic lodges, and is the latter becoming a tool in satan's hand to promote the interests of that wicked institution? To revive freemasonry again in this day, and to render it at all popular, would be up-hill business entirely were it not for the influence of ministers. They are much like the little bird called the "stool-pigeon," which is the means in the hands of its employer of inducing hundreds of its harmless mates into the net which is spread for their destruction. These masonic ministers, by their example, lead hundreds and hundreds of our young men into the lodges; they feel that it is safe, and even honorable, to follow christian ministers. But, if I am not under a great mis-

take, these men will have a fearful account to render.

I do not hope that "Iowa" has intentionally misrepresented things; but I do hope that he is under a mistake—that there are not as many church members and ministers (who have worn the *cable-tow*) employed by the arch deceiver in this iniquitous business of reviving the "unfruitful works of darkness," practiced in masonic lodges, as he represents. If his statements are correct, it is high time for churches of all orders to awake.

I may safely say to all who are bent on reviving that relic of barbarism, You will find a hard battle to fight. The opponents of secret societies are not all dead; and though they have been slumbering for awhile, yet they are waking up, refreshed, and are rallying for the conflict. They will say, in the language of a revolutionary patriot, "If we must have war, let it come."

APPENDIX.

A CONDENSED HISTORY of the *Abduction and Murder of WILLIAM MORGAN, by Free Masons, for Revealing the Secrets of the Order, showing that they are responsible for the outrage.*

This is one of the most lawless and high-handed offenses ever committed in a civilized community against the rights, liberty and life of a free citizen. William Morgan had not violated the laws of his country; he had stood on the battle-field and fought in defense of her free institutions, and was entitled to her protection; yet, under false pretences, was he violently seized by free masons and torn from his wife and children, friends and home, and secretly and forcibly conveyed through a densely populated region of country, and lodged in a strong fortress of the United States. There, in that lonely cell, in that bulwark of our nation's independence, he was confined several days and nights, and then secretly taken from thence in the dead hour of night, pinioned, hoodwinked and gagged, and inhumanly put to death by being sunk in the waters of Niagara. And for what, I ask, in the name of my country, and in the name of all that is sacred, for what? Why, for violating the laws of a secret, self-created, oath-bound and powerful organization, which had spread itself over these United States, and over a great portion of the civilized world.

This deed of violence was not perpetrated by men of low breeding, the off-scourings of crea-

tion, bar-room loafers and midnight desperadoes. No; they were, for the most part, men of high standing and of the first respectability in community—some of them filling high places of trust in the gift of the people, and were the sworn conservators of the public peace—civil and military officers, to whom every citizen is privileged to look, when his rights are invaded, for protection and redress. These are the men who were the leaders in these scandalous scenes.

When this thing became notorious, and the people were alarmed, and steps were being taken to ferret out the deed and to bring its perpetrators to justice, members of this secret, self-created, oath-bound order rallied from all quarters to defend their implicated brethren. Measures, the most unjustifiable and unlawful ever heard of in civil prosecutions, were resorted to, and, apparently, without remorse, to defeat the ends of justice and screen the guilty from deserved punishment; and, as is well known, these measures were, to a very great extent, successful. But few of the guilty ever suffered the penalty of the law. The most notorious escaped, and some of them, I believe, have never been heard of to this day.

I purpose to lay before the reader a succinct account of the abduction and murder of William Morgan, so far as to show that the institution of freemasonry is, to this day, responsible for the deed. My statements will be founded on well authenticated documents, which have been before the public some thirty years, and have never, to my knowledge, been impeached. Some of the principles ones to which I shall have recourse

are—"A narrative of facts and circumstances relating to the kidnapping and presumed murder of William Morgan, &c., prepared under the direction of the several committees appointed by citizens of the counties of Genesee, Livingston, Ontario, Monroe and Niagara, in the State of N. Y.;" the doings and reports of anti-masonic conventions; "the proceedings of the United States anti-masonic convention, held at Philadelphia, September 11, 1830;" and "Opinions on Speculative Freemasonry," compiled by James C. Odiorne, and recommended by the State anti-masonic committee of Massachusetts.

The conspiracy entered into by members of the fraternity against Morgan, to suppress the publication of his book revealing the secrets of the order, was extensive. In the *Narrative* referred to, the committees state "that the transactions detailed extended over a distance of 170 miles." It was known throughout the lodges and chapters generally in Western New York, if not in the entire State, and in some other States, and in Canada, that preparations were being made at Batavia to disclose their secrets. A knowledge of this conspiracy came to me, some 150 miles east of Batavia, before any move was made, except secretly. A few weeks after the publication of the first edition of my "*Inquiry into Masonry*," a royal arch mason, with whom I was intimate, who was a confidential counselor, and yet kept his place in the chapter and attended all their meetings, said to me, in confidence, "they are publishing the secrets of masonry at Batavia; and depend upon it," he added, "*they will sacrifice the man*. I have learned this," said he, "in the chapter."

The committees, in their "*Narrative*," say, "that numerous individuals, in different and distant parts of our country, took a deep interest in the suppression of the book, we are not at liberty to doubt in the slightest degree; and the intenseness of their anxiety betrayed them, in very many instances, into the avowal of intentions and feelings which manifested how little they were disposed to regard the laws of the land and the lives of their fellow-citizens, if the violation of the first and the destruction of the second should become necessary to effect that object."

Bates Cook, a member of the Lewiston committee, and who resided not far from Fort Niagara, and as intimately acquainted as almost any other man with the whole affair, in his remarks to the "United States Anti-Masonic Convention," says: "It was mentioned by high masons in the neighborhood of the outrage—men of first respectability—that the book should be suppressed and should never meet the public eye, if it cost their lives; that the lives of half a dozen such men as Miller and Morgan, when put in comparison with the appearance of that book, were of but little moment." This discloses the state of feeling among masons of "the first respectability" in reference to this matter, and also the object of their conspiracy against Morgan—and that was, to suppress the publication of his book at all hazards, though property and lives should be sacrificed.

"At Buffalo, a man high in office declared that if Morgan should come there, there were twenty men who would take his life in less than half an hour."

“In Le Roy, a physician, formerly sheriff of the county, declared, at a public table, that the book should be suppressed, if it cost every one of them their lives.”

“In Batavia, a person holding a respectable office declared to another officer that Miller’s office should not stand there long.”

“A judge of the county court of Genesee said, that whatever Morgan’s fate might have been, he deserved it; he had forfeited his life.”

“A high priest of the order, at Le Roy, said that Morgan deserved death; he hoped he had received it; a common death was too good for him.”

“A justice of the peace in Middlebury, a sober, respectable man, said, publicly, that a man had a right to pledge his life; and then observed, ‘what can you do? what can a rat do with a lion? who are your judges? who are your sheriffs? and who will be your jurymen?’” (*Light on Masonry, Appendix, p. 26.*)

We are now prepared to judge, without any mistake, with what views and feelings these men entered on the business of suppressing the publication of the book.

The first move was on the 19th of August, 1826. Three or four masons, with a constable, who was also a mason, rushed into Morgan’s room and seized his person and all the papers which he was then engaged in arranging for the press, and hurried him to jail. While he was confined in jail, search was made at his lodgings, by virtue of some pretended process, for the papers which he had been engaged in preparing, but without success.

L*

The next move was on the night of the 8th of September, 1826. Members of the masonic fraternity from different and distant parts—Buffalo, Lockport, Canandaigua and Rochester—assembled at Batavia; and it was expected that a party would join them from Canada. None of them arrived at Batavia until in the night. They numbered between fifty and a hundred. “The object of this party was to suppress the publication of the work, by procuring the manuscript papers and the printed sheets. For this purpose an attack on the printing office of Miller was contemplated, and, it would seem, also, the forcible removal of Morgan from Batavia, to effect a separation between him and Miller. Eli Bruce, the sheriff of Niagara county, (who figured largely in this outrage,) had been requested to prepare and did actually prepare, a cell in the jail of that county for the reception of Morgan, whose forcible abduction by this band of midnight conspirators was confidently expected. Colonel Edward Sawyer, of Canandaigua, headed this party; but they failed, and dispersed a little before daylight the next morning. They were informed that Miller was aware of their intentions, and had prepared fire-arms and other means of defense. Many of the persons composing this party are known to have been selected and delegated for the express purpose of going to Batavia to assist in suppressing the publication of Morgan’s book; and, perhaps, the members composing this party, and the different and distant places from which they came, illustrate more forcibly than any other single fact the extent of the combination to suppress the publication of the book.”

On the night of the 10th of September (Sunday night) an attempt was made by one Richard Howard, of Buffalo, and others to set fire to Miller's printing office. This also failed. The fire was providentially discovered in season to be extinguished before any damage was done. The lives of ten or a dozen persons, who were asleep in the building at the time, were exposed, together with a considerable portion of the village. This Howard subsequently acknowledged to John Mann, of Buffalo, a mason, "that he, with others, attempted to burn said office; that he spread on the turpentine, and with his dark lanthorn set fire to it."

On Sunday morning, the 10th, Nicholas G. Chesebro, of Canandaigua, master of the lodge at that place, applied to Jeffrey Chipman, a magistrate of Canandaigua, for a warrant. Chesebro came to the office with E. C. Kingsley, who made a complaint against William Morgan for having taken away a shirt and a cravat which he had borrowed of Kingsley. The magistrate issued the warrant on the oath of Kingsley, which was directed to Chesebro, as one of the coroners of Ontario county, and handed to him. Chesebro, with five others, all masons, of Canandaigua, left that place for Batavia at about 10 o'clock the same morning in an extra stage hired by Chesebro." This was great business, was it not, for the Lord's day?—and all for the avowed purpose of recovering a borrowed shirt and cravat.

The party were joined by four others, all free masons, before they reached Batavia. A mile and a half or two miles east of Batavia, the stage turned about, the party from Canandaigua went

into Batavia on foot, and the others returned. The next morning early Morgan was arrested; an extra coach was procured, and the party left Batavia for Canandaigua with Morgan in their custody. Miller attempted to procure the release of Morgan just as the carriage was starting, but was pushed aside, and the coach was driven off very fast—Chesebro being on the outside with the driver, and urged him to drive fast until they should get out of the county. Chesebro repeatedly looked back, and said they should not take Morgan alive. They arrived at Canandaigua the same day with Morgan, and in the evening took him before the magistrate who issued the warrant, by whom he was examined and discharged. Chesebro then immediately applied to the same magistrate for a warrant against Morgan for a debt of about two dollars, claimed to be due from him to Aaron Ackley, a tavern keeper; which debt, Chesebro alleged, was assigned to him. Judgment was entered against Morgan for two dollars and sixty-nine cents, debt and cost; and an execution immediately issued, which was put into the hands of the constable, then present. Morgan took off his coat and offered it to the constable to levy upon for the debt. The constable declined receiving it, and arrested Morgan and committed him to the jail of Canandaigua the same evening, on the execution. He remained in custody in Canandaigua jail until the evening of the next day.

On Tuesday, the 12th, the day after Morgan was seized and carried to Canandaigua and lodged in jail, about noon, a crowd of men sud-

denly appeared in Batavia, nearly all of whom carried with them clubs, newly cut, and, to all appearance, provided for the occasion. The crowd assembled themselves at the house of Danolds, an inn keeper. To the oldest inhabitants of the village almost all of them were strangers; and to this day the names of very few have been distinctly ascertained, although the whole number thus equipped was sixty or seventy. They were manifestly selected for the occasion. No motive for their sudden appearance was assigned. Immediately after this assemblage, *Jesse French*, one of the constables of the county, repaired to Miller's printing office, and in a rude and violent manner arrested him, alleging that he had a criminal process, or a process in behalf of the people. They put him into an open wagon, and seven men, exclusive of the driver, all armed with clubs, took their seats in the wagon, all unknown to him. The whole mob proceeded to Stafford, a small village about six miles east of Batavia. On arriving there, Miller was seized by two men and conducted to a room in the third story of a stone building, ordinarily used as a masonic lodge-room. In this room he was guarded by five men, who said they were acting as assistants to French, the constable. Soon, his counsel and four or five of his friends arrived from Batavia, and by their exertions Miller was released. Several attempts were made to retake him, but they were unsuccessful. He made his escape, and returned to Batavia late at night, to the great joy of his family. Three of the men engaged in this riot were indicted, tried and found guilty, and sen-

tenced to close confinement in the county jail—one for one year, another for six months, and the other for three months.

What was the object of this mob, in a peaceful and quiet village, at mid-day? It was too obvious to be mistaken. They intended, in open defiance of law and order, to suppress the publication of that book; and had it not been for the timely interference of Miller's friends, he probably would have shared the fate of Morgan.

On the evening of the 12th, Morgan was induced, by false promises, to consent to leave the jail. Just before leaving, he observed to a fellow-prisoner, "if that man," meaning Lawson, who was busily employed in procuring his release, "if that man should betray me, I would not give much for my life." That man did betray him, and his life was the sacrifice. No sooner did he set his foot on the steps at the door than he was violently seized by those who were in readiness, like a lion, to pounce upon his prey; and, in spite of his struggles to free himself from their clutches, and his cries of murder, he was gagged and forced into a carriage, which was on hand for the purpose. He and his masonic captors, who got into the carriage with him, were driven off out of the place. According to the testimony which has been given in court, on the trial of several of the conspirators, this carriage took Morgan and that party through Victor, and on through Rochester, and about three miles beyond, on to the ridge road, and at a distance from any house, and near a piece of wood, set the party down in the road, and then returned. Another carriage had been procured in Roches-

ter of a royal arch mason—E. Platt — which drove on after the Morgan carriage from Canandaigua, and took up that party which had been left with Morgan in the road, and drove on to Lewiston. Though it was a warm day, the carriage was driven with the curtains down and windows closed. Several stops were made to exchange horses. As they passed near Lockport, Eli Bruce, sheriff of the county, and a mason, was called up, and joined the party; he, with another man, got into the carriage and rode to Lewiston, where they arrived about midnight. The carriage was driven to a back street and unharnessed. Samuel Barton, one of the proprietors of the stage line, and a mason, was called upon to help. He called up C. Fox, one of his drivers, and directed him to harness one of his carriages; he did so, and drove up to the tavern. Bruce got on to the box with him, and by his direction they drove around to where the other carriage was unharnessed, when Morgan was taken out and put into the carriage driven by Fox. Bruce and Hague got in with him, and Fox, by Bruce's direction, drove to Youngstown. They called at the house of Col. William King, a royal arch mason and high priest; Bruce called up King, and they both got into the carriage. Fox, by Bruce's direction, drove on towards the fort, which was about a mile from Youngstown, and, when arrived at the burying ground near the fort, he was told to stop; he did so, and the persons having Morgan in charge got out, together with Morgan, and all four walked off, arm in arm, toward the fort, and Fox was told

he might return.* Morgan was hoodwinked and bound. It was supposed that arrangements had been made for the reception of Morgan on the Canada side of the river by masons residing there. After the party left the carriage they went to the ferry house and called on Edward Giddins, who kept the ferry. All of them crossed the river with Giddins, and landed at some distance from any dwelling. King and Bruce went into the village of Niagara to see the masons, who, they supposed, would receive their victim; while Giddins and Hague remained at the boat with Morgan. They returned, with two other men with them, one of whom was Edward McBride, a member of parliament in Upper Canada. After some conversation, it was resolved to bring Morgan back, as arrangements for his reception in Canada were not completed. This had probably been anticipated, as Giddins and the keeper of the fort were requested, a few days previously, to prepare the magazine for the reception of Morgan, which they had accordingly done. The same persons who took Morgan across the river brought him back and placed him in the magazine. This was some time before daylight on the morning of the 14th of September, 1826. Morgan was left in charge of Mr. Giddins. The fort was entirely deserted, except by Giddins and the keeper and their families.

On the 14th, a royal arch chapter was installed

*This man, Fox, was the only person employed in the crusade against Morgan who was not a mason; and this was through mistake. Bruce told the stage proprietor, Barton, to send a mason to drive, but he made a mistake. Soon after this was found out, a special meeting of the lodge was called, and Fox was initiated and placed under death penalties to keep secrets.

at Lewiston, which event called together a great number of masons of that degree from Buffalo, Rochester, Lockport, and other places in that vicinity. It appears from the testimony of several witnesses, that scarce a mason attending that installation could have been ignorant of the fact that Morgan was at that time confined in the magazine of Fort Niagara; it was a subject of conversation among them, and several were then informed that such was the fact. On that day Giddins remained at the fort, to see that all was kept safe. He and John Jackson went to the fort to carry him food; he refused to admit them, and said he would rather starve than fall into their hands; and he made so great an outcry as to render it necessary to send Jackson to Lewiston to procure some one to silence him. David Hague came down in haste, a distance of seven miles, but did not succeed in quieting Morgan. Two others were then sent from Lewiston, and one of them, Lawson, the man who betrayed him in the jail at Canandaigua and helped to thrust him into the carriage; he succeeded. In the evening, some twenty or thirty persons, beside those belonging to the fort, came from Lewiston and were at the fort. About midnight, seven persons, all royal arch masons, held a consultation, some rods from the fort, as to the manner in which Morgan should be disposed of. There was but one opinion among them all—that Morgan had forfeited his life by violating his masonic obligations, and that it was their duty as masons to see that the penalty was executed. They came to the determination to proceed in a body and seize him, and perform their duty by

casting him into the river. After they had started to execute their purpose, one of the company discovered a reluctance to go to such lengths, which encouraged others to remonstrate, and the project was abandoned for that time. On the next night a similar consultation was held, but nothing was decided upon. At this time King, the high priest, became offended with Giddins for expressing a desire that Morgan should be released; and Giddins surrendered to him the key of the magazine, which was afterwards entrusted to the care of Elisha Adams. It is known that Morgan was confined in the magazine during the 16th and 17th, and it is believed that he remained there until the 19th. On that night, we have strong reasons to believe that he was put to death by being sunk in Niagara river. (See Narrative.)

Those men who took Morgan from the carriage led him off, arm in arm, to the ferry, put him into a boat, took him across the river and brought him back, and then shut him up in the magazine of the fort, could have told, had they been so inclined, what disposition was made of him. This is a plain matter of common sense. They knew, and therefore could have told; but they have ever maintained masonic secrecy on the subject from that day to this, except Edward Giddins.

And what, we now ask, what was done with the man? The only rational answer that can be given is, he was put to death. If he had been preserved alive, would they not have said so and have produced him? Lawson was at Fort Niagara on the 14th, and was the man who went into the magazine and quieted Morgan when he

made such an outcry. He, no doubt, knew what disposition was made of him ; yet, when on trial at Canandaigua, with three others—Chesebro, Sawyer and Sheldon—all three of whom gave their depositions, stating how far they had acted in this matter, Lawson declined doing so. As the committee state, in their *Narrative*, “he gave them not even his naked assertions, to show that Morgan had not been immolated as a victim to their rage, or was then in the land of the living. If Morgan was then alive, could not Lawson have given a clue by which to trace him ? If no motive whatever could induce him to venture, on a declaration under oath, that Morgan was then alive, or might be, for aught he knew, who can doubt that he knew that he was dead ?”

In addition to all this, the several proclamations of the governor of Canada and of the governor of this State, offering large rewards for the restoration of Morgan, if alive, failed to elicit any, the least information on the subject. Governor Clinton, in his last proclamation, offered a reward of “one thousand dollars for the discovery of Morgan, if alive ; and if murdered, a reward of two thousand dollars for the discovery of the offender or offenders ; and also the promise of a free pardon to any accomplice or co-operator who should make a full discovery of the offender or offenders.” All this failed to elicit one word as to what they had done with the man. Then, look at the intense excitement against the institution daily spreading all over the land ; the self-styled ancient and honorable fraternity sinking into disrepute under the odium of kidnap-

ping and murder; great numbers of lodges and chapters constrained, in consequence of these things, to surrender their charters and disband. Had it been in their power to have produced Morgan alive, would they not have done it? Most surely they would. They would have lost no time in doing so; for the very day the fact should have been known, the storm of indignation against the order would have ceased. The only conclusion, therefore, is, it was not in their power, for they had put him to death.

Now for further, and to every unprejudiced mind, perfectly satisfactory testimony that such was the fact. This was the object of the conspiracy against Morgan. They intended to take his life. Hence one of the conspirators was heard to remark to Morgan, as they were forcing him from the steps of Canandaigua jail to the carriage: "You have forfeited your life."

Mr. Giddins was one of the seven who held a consultation on the night of the 14th what disposition should be made of Morgan, and the result was, that he must die, and that it was their duty to execute him; and he was also present in a similar council the next night, and who assisted Adams in taking care of the man, (though opposed to his execution,) until the evening of the 17th, when having business across the lake, he took a steamboat and left; and did not return until the 21st. On his way back, he asked the captain of the boat, if the prisoner was still there? He replied, "No, he has gone where he will write no more books." When he arrived at Niagara, he fell in with Adams, who said, "they have murdered the man." "Sever-

al persons have been informed by those who were understood to be cognizant of the guilty secret, that such was the fact; and Hiram B. Hopkins, a royal arch mason, and deputy, under Bruce, has testified that he, as a mason, was informed in January, 1827, that Morgan had been murdered. Wm. P. Daniels, who was called as a witness, at the trials at Lockport, refused to answer a question on the ground that he might criminate himself, as an accessory to the crime of murder, although he was told expressly by the judge, that he must have better evidence that murder had been committed than the public possessed, before he could decline answering on such ground." That is, he must have known that murder had been committed; and he must have had a hand in it; else he was guilty of perjury.

Avery Allyn, a renouncing mason, and author of a "Ritual of freemasonry," states in the *introduction* to his book, and has made oath to the same, "that Libeas Chapman; a knight templar, told him in an encampment of knight templars, assembled at St. John's Hall, in the city of N. Y., 'that he knew that Morgan had had justice done him, and that a man had in that hall, confessed the murder to the masons there, and was by them protected, secreted, and furnished with the necessary means of escape.'" This murderer was Richard Howard, of Buffalo, who attempted to set Miller's printing office on fire. He fled to the city of New York, where he confessed in a masonic lodge, or encampment of knight templars, that with his own hands he helped execute

M*

the traitor. He was assisted by them to escape to Europe.

John Mann; of Buffalo, testified on the 21st day of Feb., 1827, before Judge Tinsdale, of Genesee county, that he had conversation with this Richard Howard, who informed him, that several of them had drawn lots to see who should execute the laws of masonry on Morgan; and the lot fell on him, and that Morgan had been executed. (See his deposition in *Light on Masonry*.) This Howard, the midnight incendiary, and murderer of Wm. Morgan, was helped by the lodges of New York, according to the testimony of Mr. Allyn, to make his escape to Europe; and I suppose he has not been heard from since.

Another of these murderers, (Henry L. Valarne,) who has gone to his reward, has made a like confession. He could not die in peace until he did. His confession was written down by his physician, and after his death published in a pamphlet. Extracts from this pamphlet may be seen in the *Inquiry into Masonry*. He acknowledges himself to be one of the three, (Howard of course was another,) who took Morgan from the magazine, put him into a boat, rowed him out on the Niagara river, in the dead of night, fastened weights to his body with strong cords, then Valarne with his own hands pushed him out of the boat into the river. This was the end of Wm. Morgan on earth. In view of all the testimony before us, no sane man can have a doubt but that Morgan was put to death in the manner above related.

We now ask, is the institution of freemasonry

responsible for this outrage? Of this we have no more reason to doubt than we have that the man was kidnapped and put to death. I know that it is many times said by the friends of the institution, that the deed was perpetrated by a few individuals—“*deluded fanatics*,” and on their own responsibility, that freemasonry had nothing to do with it, and does not justify it. But who were these deluded, ignorant fanatics, who did not understand the nature of masonic laws and obligations? Who were they, I ask? They were men of the first respectability and of high and honorable standing—men of intelligence, who would be as likely to understand the nature of their obligations as any other persons belonging to the order. Worshipful masters and high priests, civil and military officers, ought certainly to know what they were about. Look over the names of those men. Point out the ignorant fanatics. Who were they? This plea weighs not a straw with men who judge candidly.

The fact is the institution justifies the conduct of those men and approves of the outrage. If not, why have they not said so? If in their honest view those men acted without authority and in violation of the principles of the order, and have thereby brought unmerited disgrace upon freemasonry, that they therefore deserve to be cast out and disowned as unworthy and unprincipled members, why have not the lodges, grand lodges, chapters, grand chapters, encampments and grand encampments said so? Why have they not come out and made this announcement publicly? And why have they not ex-

pelled those fanatics, and published them to the world as being guilty of unmasonic conduct, and as being unworthy of any further connection with the ancient and honorable fraternity? And farther, why have they not aided and assisted in bringing them to justice? Have they done these things? They have not one of them, to my knowledge. Numbers of those men have been tried in civil courts and have been found guilty, and have suffered as violators of the laws of their country, yet not one of them has been expelled from a lodge or chapter or encampment for unmasonic conduct. Not one as I have ever heard of. Even the sheriff of Niagara county, who was removed from his office, by the Governor of the State, for participating in the Morgan outrage, and was subsequently tried in a civil court and proved guilty, and sentenced to two years and four months imprisonment in the county jail, yet the public have never been informed that he has been turned out of any lodge or chapter for unmasonic conduct; but was still retained in honorable standing. What do all these things mean? Why, that the conduct of those men was in accordance with the usages and customs, obligations and principles of freemasonry, and is therefore approved by the highest masonic authorities. No other rational construction can possibly be put upon the case.

When the royal arch chapter was installed at Lewiston, on the 14th of Sept., 1826, and it was known to most if not to all the members of that chapter, that Morgan had been carried through the place the night before, and was then incarcerated in the magazine of Fort Niagara, was it

not in their power to have brought the whole thing to light, had they been so disposed? Most surely they could. In the evening of that day, some twenty or thirty of them are said to have visited the fort, and about midnight some of the number held a consultation as to the manner in which Morgan should be disposed of. Had that royal arch chapter disapproved of the outrage, had they considered those kidnappers as violating the laws of masonry as well as the laws of the land, they would have arrested all further proceedings at once. They would have freed Morgan from his confinement, and have seized those guilty men and have handed them over to the civil authorities to be dealt with. Why did they not do this? Any other men but masons would have done it. Why did not they do it? Plainly, the thing was not unmasonic. It was just what they approved, and they were ready to help it forward, and to have Morgan put out of the way.

This has been the uniform course of lodges, chapters and encampments throughout the State. Instead of exposing the outrage, so far as it came to their knowledge, they have done all in their power to conceal it. Instead of aiding to ferret out the guilty perpetrators, they have done all they could to sustain them, and to help them out of their difficulties, "right or wrong." Mr. Ward, in his *Anti-Masonic Review*, says:—"Freemasons have called for the facts, while they themselves have concealed them! The grand chapter of New York, in Feb., 1827, solemnly affirmed individually and collectively, that they knew naught of Morgan's abduction,

while some of the active conspirators were sitting in that body, and the body itself voted money, it is affirmed, to defray in part the charges attendant upon that act of violence." "Henry F. Yates has publicly, and in a solemn manner, declared that the grand lodge of New York, at their session in June, 1827, did vote and pay the sum of \$250 to Eli Bruce, late sheriff of Niagara county, to remunerate him, in part, for the loss of his office, owing to his concern in the abduction of Wm. Morgan. This weighty charge, Mr. Yates accompanied with a defiance to any honest and conscientious member of that grand lodge, *to deny it on his corporal oath*, if he dare. Thus putting it to any honest member of the grand lodge to silence him, if with truth he could. Mr. Yates went further, and pledged himself to the public to prove it, to the satisfaction of a court and jury."

"Parson G. Shipman, of Onondaga, a renouncing mason, published, in May, 1827, on the authority of three members of that grand lodge, the same fact stated by Mr. Yates, with a variation only as to the sum. We hazard nothing in saying, says Mr. Ward, that either of these gentlemen has sufficient respectability of character to call out, not one only, but every one of the grand lodge. But they make no reply."

"Jarvis F. Hawks, editor of the Investigator, an anti-masonic paper in this city, (New York,) late high priest of Webb chapter, Cleveland, Ohio, a renouncing mason, has solemnly declared under his own hand, and published in the newspaper, that while visiting in Jerusalem chapter,

in this city, (New York,) in the autumn of 1827, a resolution was introduced to appropriate \$500 for the use of the Western sufferers, (the Morgan conspirators,) to be forwarded to Rochester by a gentleman then present, who would also carry contributions from several other masonic fraternities in the city, for the same object."—*Anti-Masonic Review*, Vol. I. No. 12.

In view of such astounding facts, what must be the conclusion of every honest citizen in the land? Can he exculpate the fraternity from the charge of guilt?

Well has John Quincy Adams said, in his letter to the Governor of Massachusetts, that the names of Morgan's murderers, "were known probably to every lodge in the State of New York, but they cannot be convicted, for none will testify; and the grand chapter at New York, which has the power of expulsions throughout the State, so far from expelling any one of the kidnapers or murderers of Morgan, has aided them with money to support them in prison and to pay their fines." (Adams' Letters, p. 45.)

In another letter, which he addressed to Col. William L. Stone, of New York, a knight templar, who wrote and published in the paper which he edited, several letters on "masonry and anti-masonry," he inquires, "How will they (the fraternity) endure your confirmation of the essential facts in Avery Allyn's affidavit, that Richard Howard had confessed himself the murderer of Morgan? That he made this confession in an encampment of knights templars, at St. John's hall, in the city of New York, under the sealed obligation, and had then been furnished with

money and means to abscond and go to Europe, as related in your 22d letter." (Letters p. 54.) The Colonel it seems had confirmed Mr. Allyn's statements.

In another letter addressed to Richard Rush, Esq., York, Pa., he says: "Mr. Stone is against the institution, the best of witnesses. He is in masonic language a worthy sir knight templar. He has never renounced nor ever formally seceded from the institution." "But after an ineffectual struggle to save the grand lodge from the terpitude of an appropriation of money for the benefit of the Western sufferers, he withdrew, and says, that he has never set his foot in a lodge room from that day. Col. Stone, I have said, is the best of witnesses against masonry, for he is an upright, intelligent, and most *unwilling* witness. His testimony confirms, far beyond any anticipation that I had formed, the extent to which the lodges, chapters and encampments of the State of New York are implicated in the Morgan murder crimes. It demonstrates beyond all possibility of reply, not only that the nine crimes specified in my letters to Edward Ingersoll, have been committed, but that lodges, chapters and encampments have been accessory to every one of them before or after the fact." (Letters p. 104.)

In the State of Rhode Island, a memorial emanating from an anti-masonic convention, held in Dec., 1830, charging the grand lodge and other masonic bodies, with violations of the constitution and the laws of the land, was formally presented to the legislature of the State. A committee was appointed to investigate these charges.

The following is a part of their report: "It cannot be doubted that the lodges and chapters in that part of the State of New York, had it fully in their power to have detected and brought to justice many of the criminals concerned in the abduction of Morgan, if not those concerned in his murder. And yet we do not find that they have expelled a single member, or made any inquiry about them. Can it be denied that by such conduct those lodges and chapters have implicated themselves in *the guilt of these transactions*, and made themselves responsible for them? And not they alone are implicated. *The higher masonic authorities, to whom they are subordinate and accountable, are equally implicated and responsible.*" (Letters, p. 191.) The reader will see that the report of this investigating committee charges the grand chapter of the State of New York, and the general grand chapter of the United States, (the highest masonic authorities,) with being implicated in, and responsible for, the kidnapping and murder of Morgan.

The letter of Mr. Adams, from which I copy the above extract, was addressed to Edward Livingston, grand high priest of the general grand royal arch chapter of the United States. Towards the close of the letter, he says to this grand masonic dignitary: "With that infamy (the infamy of lawless oaths, of barbarous obligations, of brutal penalties) your institution is now polluted, *as it is with the blood of William Morgan; nor can the 'labor' or 'refreshment' of all the royal arch chapters on the globe wash it out.*" These were the impressions and opinions of a no

less personage than John Quincy Adams, the venerable ex-president of the United States.

If further testimony is necessary to convince any one that the fraternity, generally, were implicated in that dark deed—the Morgan outrage—we have plenty of it.

As soon as the people became alarmed, and began to inaugurate measures to hunt out the conspirators and award justice to them, members of the lodges in all quarters began to rally—not, however, for the purpose of aiding and assisting to maintain the majesty of law, but to embarrass, to throw every possible obstruction in the way of all such proceedings.

They commenced by abusing the committees, which were appointed by the citizens of different counties to prosecute investigations. Bates Cook, Esq., one of the Lewiston committee, and who, at the time, resided in that village, says, that, after they had been into Canada to obtain what information they could in reference to the affair, and were defeated by masonic influence on the grand jury, they returned. “On returning from that place,” he says, “we met again at Lewiston, and gave an invitation to many in the surrounding country, informing them that the committee had assembled there merely to ascertain the facts in relation to Morgan’s being carried through the place to Niagara. No sooner was this notice given than a vast concourse of masons was assembled, not to give information or facts which would enable the committee to proceed, but to insult, browbeat, and drive from the spot the gentlemen who had convened. It was among the first inhabitants of the village that we found

the most inveterate and insolent opposers. Not only did they molest and hinder individuals who were inquiring after simple facts, but one man came into the room and extinguished the light. It was thought that something violent would ensue, but it turned out otherwise; we separated without being attacked. No information was obtained. No mason came forward, though more than twenty of them were well acquainted with all the ramifications and final termination of this tragedy. More than twenty were in the committee room; yet not one fact did they communicate. The next thing was for the heralds of the press to proclaim that a self-styled convention had assembled from different counties, to disturb the innocent repose of the good citizens of the county of Niagara. This they did with the most abusive language. And a mason who had sworn to prosecute offenders against the laws, came forward and publicly insulted this body of men." As they began to make inquiry about the abduction of Morgan, he says: "there was but a single countenance among the masons of that vicinity, and that was expressive of contempt. Those who embarked in it were cautioned thus, 'as you value your business, and all that is dear to your high standing, take care not to meddle with that Morgan affair.' More than once have our committees been approached in that way."

Nothing can be plainer than that these masons not only approved of the outrage upon Morgan, but they were determined, if in their power to prevent any investigation that should bring to light the guilty actors; else would they not have

come forward, with the facts in their possession, like honest men and good citizens, and have laid them before the committee, and have aided them in maintaining law and order? Most surely they would. But how common was the remark in those days, among masons, every where, "that if Morgan had been put to death it was no more than he deserved, he had forfeited his life."

Not only did they abuse committees of investigation, but conductors of public journals who ventured to publish any thing unfavorable to the fraternity. The following instance will illustrate the subject: "E. F. Marshall, the conductor of a paper called 'The Album,' published in Rochester, ventured to say, in an editorial, that the abduction of Morgan ought to be investigated. The paper with an article of this import had no sooner appeared, than Edward Doyle, a knight templar, and treasurer of the Monroe encampment, rushed into the office of the Album in a storm of rage, ordered his paper to be discontinued, and his advertisements stopped, and told Marshall if he did not cease publishing articles against the masonic fraternity, many others would take the same course, but that if he retracted the next week all might be well. Doyle then went to the printing office of a royal arch mason and boasted that he had shut the Quaker's head." All this to prevent any investigation. This Doyle was one who figured among the conspirators, in getting Morgan from Rochester to Lewiston.

The next thing we notice as an embarrassment to legal proceedings, was the packing of grand juries. These juries were known in many in-

stances to be composed of a majority of masons and those friendly to the order, for the avowed purpose of preventing indictments, and of defeating the ends of justice.

“At the time of Morgan’s abduction, the sheriffs of the different counties had the sole power of selecting and summoning the grand juries for the several courts; and such selection was made a short time previous to the sessions of the court. At the same time the sheriffs of the counties of Erie, Niagara, Genesee, Orleans, Livingston, Monroe and Ontario, which were the theatre of the outrage, were all masons. A grand jury which met in Genesee county, after the abduction, was convened in February, 1826. Doctor Samuel S. Butler was appointed foreman. He was a knight templar, and a large portion of the jury were masons. He said to one of the jury, also a knight templar, ‘a majority of the jurors are masons; we have got the staff in our own hands, and our friends must not be indicted.’”

The first grand jury which was summoned in Niagara county, (of which Eli Bruce was sheriff,) after the subject began to be agitated, met in January, 1827. Sixteen masons were summoned on that jury, and several who were friendly to the institution. At the court of oyer and terminer, held in that county in April following, the same sheriff again summoned the grand jurors. There were twenty-one present, thirteen of whom were masons, and six friendly to them. Paul Haws who has since been found to be an important witness, and Norman Shephard, since indicted for the Morgan conspiracy, were two of those grand jurors. At the May

N*

sessions, a majority of masons were summoned on the jury; and at the September sessions, about half the jurors were masons, and a number who were warmly in favor of the institution.

Complaint was made against Eli Bruce, sheriff of the county, before the April grand jury, for being concerned in the abduction of Morgan. The foreman, a freemason, examined the witnesses. One of the other jurors ventured to ask a witness some questions. The foreman called this juror aside, and privately solicited him to refrain from asking questions. One witness stated that he knew nothing which would go to convict any person. Being called to state what he did know, he asked to be excused, because he was poor, and his testimony might prove his ruin. A large majority of the jury voted to excuse him. One witness did testify to Bruce's acknowledgement of his agency in carrying Morgan to Niagara. Several witnesses were afterwards called to impeach the testimony of this witness, and one or two did answer that he was not to be believed on his oath. One witness testified, that he had been informed by a respectable individual in Canada, in whom he had full confidence, that Morgan had been put to death, and that his body was in the bottom of Niagara river, and might be found if searched for immediately. The witness stated that he received this information from a mason, who enjoined the witness to keep his name a secret, as if known, his life would be the forfeit. One juror insisted that the witness should give the name of the person who gave him this information, but he refused, and nearly all the other jurors sustained

the witness in his refusal, and he was allowed to retire without answering the question. This grand jury drew up a presentment to the court, that they had discovered nothing which would authorize them to find a bill against any person; and also framed and sent a memorial to the Governor, in which they stated that there was not the shadow of testimony implicating Bruce in the abduction of Morgan, with the exception of one witness, who was so contradicted, and whose general reputation was so bad, that they did not place any reliance upon it.

It is very certain that a series of questions to be propounded to the witnesses, had been so framed, that the witnesses could answer without eliciting any dangerous information. This must have been the case, or real perjury must have been repeatedly committed. All the important witnesses tracing the abduction from Rochester to Fort Niagara, were examined before this grand jury; and the same witnesses upon whose testimony bills had been found in other cases, yet no bills found here. And thirteen of these same witnesses have since been indicted, and three of them on the testimony of Bruce himself. Edward Giddins, in his "Statement of Facts," says, he was subpoenaed before this grand jury, which much alarmed those who were implicated. One of them informed Giddins, that he would go and see the foreman and state to him Giddins' situation, that he might know how to question him, so that his answers might not injure others. He subsequently informed Giddins that he had told the foreman what Giddins knew of the affair, and that he would put no

question but what Giddins might safely answer.

Eli Bruce was subsequently arraigned before another grand jury, in another county, (Ontario,) and indicted, and was tried and found guilty, and sentenced to two years and four months imprisonment in the county jail. Why was he not indicted in Niagara county? Was it not because that a masonic jury and masonic witnesses were determined to "extricate him from his difficulty."

Hiram B. Hopkins, a royal arch mason, a deputy under Bruce, and personally knowing to the abduction of Morgan at the time, says, in a published letter, dated Feb. 28, 1830: "After the abduction of Capt. Morgan, I used frequently to ask the masons, how they expected to escape punishment for that outrage, adding that if found out, the perpetrators of the deed would have to suffer the reward due to their crimes. They have told me time and again, that they would never be brought to punishment, because all were masons with whom they had to deal, and particularly the sheriffs of those counties in which the offence was committed were all masons, who had the selecting of the grand juries; that no grand jury would be summoned without being two-thirds masons. And when the time came for summoning the grand jury for this county, (Niagara,) I had my orders not to summon any but such as were particularly friendly to the masonic institution. Says Bruce, we must have at least two-thirds of them masons, and the others friendly to the order. If we have all masons they will suspect us. The jury was accordingly summoned. The subject of the ab-

duction was brought before them. The district attorney was a royal arch mason, who knew all about the Morgan affair, in my opinion, and the foreman of the jury was one of the warmest zealots of the order in the county. If I mistake not more than two-thirds of the jury were masons. The district attorney and foreman so framed the questions propounded to the witnesses, that after thus examining them, they drew up an instrument signed by all the jury, the substance of which was, that they had no reason to believe, that Morgan had ever passed through this county."

This is the grand jury—the April grand jury, just spoken of, before which a complaint was brought against Bruce, sheriff of the county, and after a mock examination, "framed and sent a memorial to the Governor, stating that there was not a shadow of testimony implicating Bruce." You will not wonder at this when you learn in what way the testimony before that jury was suppressed. Bates Cook, in his remarks before the national anti-masonic convention informs us how. "These witnesses, (the witnesses before that grand jury,) before they went before the jury, met and held a consultation as to what answers should be given to questions that should be put; and the resolution—I know not what else to call it—but the horrible resolution was: *We will say, we know nothing about Wm. Morgan or his abduction.* When these men retired from the jury chamber, one remarked, I told them I knew nothing about it, and there it ended. The most extraordinary measures, says Mr. Cook, ever heard of before any grand jury in

this country, were there taken." The reader will bear in mind, that thirteen of these witnesses before this jury, were subsequently indicted as having participated in this affair, and three of them on the testimony of Bruce himself.

Comment is needless. If these things do not prove that the outrage upon Morgan was in accordance with the obligations, usages and customs of freemasonry, and that the institution is responsible for it, they prove nothing.

Another thing we notice of the same character is, the absconding and concealment of masonic witnesses. The committee say, "one great difficulty that has been met with in the prosecution of the conspirators, is that of procuring the attendance of masonic witnesses. They frequently refused to obey the ordinary process of subpœnas, or evaded its service. It was frequently necessary to procure their arrest long before the courts, at which their attendance was wanted should sit, and place them under heavy bonds, to insure their attendance. Difficulties never encountered in any other prosecution, were here met with at every court and at every step. Witnesses have been secreted and sent off without the jurisdiction of the courts, and remained concealed for many months. Elisha Adams, the man to whom Giddins transferred the keys of the magazine, was served with a subpœna to attend a court at Canandaigua. He started and came as far as Rochester. From this place all trace of him was lost. He disappeared and nothing was heard of him for months. In the spring of 1828, it was ascertained that he was residing in Vermont. He was arrested, and on

his way back avowed his determination "to make a clean breast of it," when called upon as a witness, by telling the truth. But when he arrived at Rochester, he was once more surrounded by the counsel for the conspirators and the guilty royal arch companions of that place. And after his interview with these men, he manifested a determination not to testify, and from his declaration to an old friend, we are led to believe that he was deterred from telling the truth, by threats of a fate as horrible as was that of Morgan."

Adams was one of the most important witnesses in this whole affair. He had charge of Morgan when he was taken from the magazine and sunk in Niagara river. Had he been allowed to give his testimony, to use his own language, "to make a clean breast of it," by telling the truth, he would have developed that dark, midnight, murderous tragedy. No wonder the fraternity were determined to keep him out of the reach of the courts.

Several other important witnesses absconded, and fled from place to place, and were secreted and kept out of the way by the fraternity, much as Adams was; and their testimony could never be procured. One of them, after having been before a grand jury, and had given bonds to appear and testify on trial, forfeited his bonds and disappeared. The committee say, "There are circumstances existing in relation to some of them, (the witnesses,) which leave the irresistible presumption upon the mind that they were hired, at a heavy expense, to leave their homes and their business, in order that their testimony

might not place the reputation, the liberty, and the lives of some members of the fraternity at hazard. Edward Giddins was told, if he would leave the country to save his friends, any amount of money he should demand was ready for him, and had been furnished for the express purpose. An extravagant sum was also offered for his property, if he would go, by a mason, who said he was authorized to make the purchase, and that the money had been furnished by the grand lodge for the purpose."

"The conduct of masonic witnesses, even after they appeared on the stand, goes to show how determined the fraternity were to suppress their testimony. Some of them seem to have argued themselves into the belief that there could be no greater sin than to break a masonic oath; that if they told the truth in relation to the outrage, they would divulge a secret which they were masonically bound to keep, which would criminate themselves; and that therefore their only course was to testify that they knew nothing about the affair. A counselor of the supreme court advised them to this course. Many witnesses to whom circumstances almost unerringly pointed, as having a knowledge of, or being implicated in, some portion of the transaction, did solemnly make oath, that they knew nothing about it. Some testified in such a way as to leave the impression upon every mind that they had not told *the whole* truth. The evidence that was extorted from such witnesses was absolutely wrung from them. In several instances they came into court with their own counsel, to advise with them what questions they were legally

bound to answer ; a circumstance before unheard of in courts of justice. Some of the witnesses utterly refused to answer at all, and suffered the penalty of the law — imprisonment and fine. Orasmus Turner was called as a witness on the trial of Ezekiel Jewett, at Lockport. Several questions were put to him, all of which he refused to answer. He was sentenced for the first contempt, to thirty days imprisonment, and \$250 fine ; and for the two last, to thirty days imprisonment for each contempt. On the same trial Eli Bruce and John Whitney were called as witnesses, and both refused to be sworn. Bruce was sentenced to thirty days imprisonment, and Whitney to the like imprisonment, and also to pay a fine of \$250. These individuals were liable, under the laws of the State to further punishment for their contempts, by imprisonment for one year each, and by a fine of \$250. It is evident that no slight cause could have induced them to take this course, and to subject themselves to such punishment." Were not these men determined that the truth should not come to light ?

The committee add, "It would seem as if the fraternity had set down and coolly counted the cost, and had come to the determination, that it was wise to shut the door completely against the bare chance of establishing the murder of Morgan, by any facts or inferences to be derived from their testimony, even though it should be done at the expense of the liberty and property of some of its members. In these instances the power of the fraternity came in collision with the laws of the land, and set them and their

penal requirements at defiance, and prevailed in the conflict. The laws were seen to be impotent against a power so secret, so murderous, and so overwhelming." And I may add, that with such witnesses, bound together by such oaths, under such penalties, it would be impossible to convict any man of any crime, no matter what, "murder and treason not excepted." Civil government becomes a nullity, and civil laws a solemn mockery.

As a further evidence that the kidnappers and murderers of Morgan were highly approved by the fraternity, and those who were convicted and punished, were looked upon as martyrs suffering in a righteous cause, the committee further say, "Individual masons, not particularly implicated in the transaction, have interposed every obstacle in their power, to prevent the development of truth. Purses have been liberally opened, exertions have been freely given, to prevent convictions, to enable offenders to elude justice, and to aid in the removal and concealment of important witnesses. Though several of the conspirators have been convicted by an impartial jury of their country, and some of them have even confessed their guilt, yet not a single one has been subjected to even a masonic censure. On the contrary, most of the conspirators have received the marked countenance and support of the order, have been protected by its funds, shared largely in its sympathies and in its patronage; and even some of them, after their agency in the conspiracy had been generally known, and publicly proved, have been raised to a still higher rank in the honors of the

institution, as a reward, as avowed in the case of Eli Bruce, for the very acts which should have consigned them to infamy and punishment. The severity of their punishment has been alleviated in every possible way, by the sympathy, encouragement, and countenance of their masonic brethren, and the disgrace which usually attends a criminal conviction, has been in a measure averted, by cheering the unfortunate men upon whom it presses, with the idea that it was a martyrdom in the cause of heaven descended freemasonry. John Whitney, after he had returned from the southern states, where he had been hiding from justice for several months, was taken under the patronage of the fraternity, courted, cheered and sustained by them, and placed in a way of a lucrative and profitable business. After his release from the imprisonment to which he was consigned by the laws of his country,* he was received at his home with open arms, by the fraternity, and cheered and sustained by their countenance, support and patronage."

"Orasmus Turner, who was confined in the jail of Niagara county, for contumaciously refusing to answer proper and legal questions, was lauded in the Rochester Craftsman, and other kindred prints, as a miracle of constancy and firmness; and when the period of his imprisonment expired, he was conducted from the jail to a public tavern, in a coach and four, with enthusiastic respect by the fraternity." Mr. Cook, in his remarks in reference to the same case, says: "the first act they (the masons) did, after he

* One year and three months.

was lodged in the cell, was to procure for him certain articles of luxury and elegance, with which he was complimented. And young ladies, the daughters of masons, assembled, and went to the prison, and visited the young man while he was imprisoned." Let every reader make his own comment.

EXTRACTS

FROM RENUNCIATIONS OF SECEDING MASONS OF THE FIRST RESPECTABILITY.

The remark is often made by the friends and supporters of freemasonry, that some of the greatest and best men have belonged to the institution, and, therefore, it must be honorable, or they would not have become its patrons. This, so far from being an argument in favor of freemasonry, is made to turn directly and with irresistible force against it; for hundreds and hundreds of these very men, great and good men, ministers and members of christian churches, have left the order, dissolved their connection with it, and have proclaimed it to be a great imposition. Such men are to be found in every community. They tell us that, on an examination of the system, they found that they had been deceived and imposed upon; that masonry is not what they had anticipated from the high commendations which they had received from members of the fraternity. They have, therefore, felt impelled from a sense of duty to God and to their fellow-men, to come out from among them, and to separate themselves from the unclean thing; and, at the same time, they have cheerfully and harmoniously testified to the truth of the disclosure of masonic secrets by Morgan and others.

What say you to these things, gentlemen? How will you meet them? Will you say that these men are dishonest, are hypocrites and liars? No, you will not. No one would believe you if you were to do so. They were honest when they entered the lodges; for they were deceived. And they were equally honest in coming out from the lodges; for they have examined the subject for themselves, and have become undeceived. I could easily fill a volume with the renunciations of such men; but I must close this little volume with a few extracts from some of them.

I will place at the head of this list a name that is venerated wherever it is known—GEORGE WASHINGTON! To hold forth freemasonry as every way worthy of confidence and patronage, it is often said, Washington was a mason. Yes, it is true he was a mason; but he had seen so much of

O*

the dangerous tendency of the order, that he warned his countrymen against it. In his Farewell Address, he says: "Beware of secret societies." What did he mean? Did he not include freemasonry, as well as all other secret combinations of men? If he intended to make that an exception, why did he not say so? As he failed to do this, we are authorized to suppose that he intended to warn his country against freemasonry, as a dangerous foe to civil government.

Renunciation of Rev. MOSES THACHER, of Massachusetts. Extracts from his Address to the United States Anti-Masonic Convention, held at Philadelphia, Sept. 11, 1830.

"I confess, in the presence of this convention, and this respected audience, that I have been one of those who have been duped and decoyed, and made to pass through the degrading ceremonies of the lodge-room. This stain upon my religious and moral character, I do not expect ever to wipe away. But I am willing a record of my folly, and I will say wickedness, should stand in high relief, with the record of the Psalmist's iniquity, when he transgressed the laws of God and Israel, in the matter of Uriah.

"I have said that I was decoyed. So I was, Mr. President; for I had held up to my view false representations. I was told by a respectable clergyman, whom I esteemed, and in whom I placed implicit confidence, who had taken many degrees of the order, that there was in that institution, that which was exceedingly valuable to define certain passages of scripture, which could not be satisfactorily explained without masonic light: many passages in the epistles of Paul, and in the revelation of John the divine, to some of which we have had allusion, were to be seen in their literal meaning in the ceremonies of the lodge and chapter. This and many other considerations which time would fail me to mention, induced me to apply to a respected friend and relative, to propose me as a candidate for the lodge. This he cheerfully did.

"I was proposed to the lodge before knowing anything of the outrage on William Morgan. I should have known these facts if, as has been stated, the public press had not been muzzled. But at that time there was not a paper in Massachusetts, and I know not of any in the New England states, that dared record a syllable in respect to these facts.

I was entirely ignorant of what had taken place at Batavia.

“After I was proposed to the lodge, I accidentally had an opportunity to see one of Morgan’s books. It was put in my hands by a free mason, merely to excite my curiosity, with this declaration: that the book was put in circulation to accomplish a political purpose, and that of making money by the compiler: that in this book the compiler had incorporated certain formalities in the Book of Constitutions and Monitor, and sent it forth to the world as masonry, and wished me to see what imposition was practiced. I gave the book a cursory reading. I said to myself, this cannot be freemasonry; it is too frivolous. It did excite my curiosity. It led me to converse with respectable members of the institution, relative to the subjects therein contained.

“I conversed with a member of the institution in Providence, Rhode Island, who was a man of high character in the fraternity, and a member of the encampment, who had been master of a lodge for many years, and was esteemed what was technically called, a bright mason. He told me that Morgan’s illustrations gave the fraternity no uneasiness whatever. He said it did not touch the subject of freemasonry; that it had nothing to do with the secrets of that institution. He supposed that Morgan was a mason, and a man of some address, but a worthless fellow of no character, a miscreant and drunkard; and that he was not murdered. If he was murdered at all, it was not by masons, but that the mob had beset him on this principle. They said that if he told the truth, he ought to die for violating those solemn obligations, which he professed to have taken; if not, he ought to die for imposing upon the public. In consequence of what was said by this gentleman, and as I had been proposed to the lodge, I went forward and was initiated. As soon as I had entered the preparation-room, and after I had been made to subscribe and declare to what has been presented as formulas, they began to prepare me for the rites and ceremonies. I then discovered that it was Morgan masonry. I remarked this to the junior warden. He said that some things were similar, but if I advanced I would soon be satisfied, and rejoice in becoming a member of the fraternity, as others had done; and I was told that Washington, Warren, and La Fayette had done the same before me; and I was, according to the illustration of Morgan, divested of all my apparel, to the last remnant of decency.

I was clad in a pair of drawers, and a cable-tow, or a rope, fastened round my neck. I was blindfolded, and, in this manner, led to the door of the lodge, where there were three distinct knocks, and answers, Who comes there? who comes there? who comes there?

"I was conducted in, and about the lodge, round, and round, and round. Not an individual did I know; not a face, not even of the master, for he too was a stranger. I had seen the junior warden who came to prepare me, and one other associate. I was fastened with a cable-tow, and how could I retreat if disposed? Where was my apparel? Could I go into the street in my then situation? I passed through the three first degrees of freemasonry in one night. I went through in conformity with a dispensation of the grand lodge.

"The same evening, after I had passed through the ceremonies, the master of the lodge administered the test oath, and gave what is called the check degree. He said that was necessary, because a worthless fellow at Batavia had disclosed the secrets of masonry as far as the third degree, and said if others got our keys, we must put on new locks. From this time, I discovered, that the illustrations of masonry had been studied assiduously by members of the lodges, in order to render them what is technically called bright masons. And I have known those illustrations to have been studied by different lodges, that they might be familiar with the rites and ceremonies of the institution.

"In view of such impositions as these, I feel myself perfectly free in denouncing the oaths and ceremonies of the order. If any man judges me guilty of moral perjury, I am willing to bear the shame forever; I glory in such perjury as this; I came forward and burst the bands, from a religious regard to the best interests of my country, and from a solicitude that young men might be prevented from being taken in the same snare; and if the declaration which I have made, and the record of my folly, should be the means of preventing one man from being ensnared as I have been, I shall feel myself paid a thousand times.

* * * * *

"I will not multiply examples in this particular, but will adduce facts to show that masons have considered it their duty to execute the bloody part of their masonic oaths. We have evidence that Morgan was murdered agreeably to

masonic law. It is said by masons that the authors of Jachin and Boaz, and Pritchard, were put to death. But in my neighborhood, it has been said repeatedly, not by the least of the order, but by high priests and grand prelates, that if Morgan had been put to death, he had been served justly and rightly. A member of the encampment in Massachusetts and Rhode Island, in my own neighborhood, conversed with me relative to the abduction of Morgan. He expressed it, as his view decidedly, and he was acquainted with the rights and principles of the institution, and I viewed him to be an upright man, that the masonic law should be executed, and gave this as a reason, that masonic law was antecedent to civil law. He regretted, however, that the Morgan affair had not been conducted more deliberately and prudently, and saved all this noise, and excitement, and injury to the fraternity. And to illustrate his views, he brought an example with which he was acquainted: either a brother-in-law to his wife, or himself.

"Peter and John (I will use fictitious names,) were residents in one of the back towns of Rhode Island. Peter was a regularly made mason and a member of the lodge. He instructs John clandestinely in the rites and ceremonies of the institution. By means of this instruction, John works himself into the lodge; he is received as a member, and obtains the office, I think, of junior warden. After having been some time a member of the lodge, it leaked out, that Peter had instructed John clandestinely. John was made over again, and the oaths administered in due and legal form, and he was retained as a member of the institution. Peter very soon after happened to be in Providence at a time when the grand lodge was in session. They summoned him to appear before them; and in obedience to their call and the master's oath, by which he had promised to obey all signs, &c., he obeyed. They had certain resolute members appointed to take care of him. They did take care of him; they murdered him. And I was informed that he was taken down the Providence River. The report was, that he had absconded.

"I will name but one instance more, and that is, of warning a brother of danger. A masonic deputy sheriff pursued two villains to the cape, who had been breaking open stores in Providence. He was successful in apprehending them, and brought them part way back; but they made known to

him that they were masons, and he put them in custody of some masonic brethren, and went another way, under pretence, as he stated, of apprehending other rogues. He had scarcely turned his back, before the men were missing; and it appeared he had put them in possession of his brethren in this way, in order that they might be missing. He did not want to dismiss them himself, but was willing that others should do what he was unwilling to do himself.

"I have these facts upon substantial evidence, and bring them forward to show, that masons have considered their oaths binding, to the letter; and consequently, the position taken in the address before us, is substantially correct. Since I have been in this city, I have conversed with a venerable and respectable clergyman, whom I well knew in my youth; and in respect to this subject, he told me, that he had been a mason for many years; but for more than thirty years he had had the same opinion of the institution, that it was dangerous to society, and subversive of good order; and that thirty years ago, he had a deliberate conversation with his father, whether he should not sit down and write and publish all he knew. His father, upon due consideration, advised him not to do so, saying, that he would not be believed, and that he would lose his character and life, if he did it.

"Mr. Newell, a missionary to the east, some time since deceased, was induced to take the masonic degrees before he sailed. When he took the knight templar's degree, he was so disgusted, that he said to his companion, "Why have you suffered me to be so imposed upon; my feelings have been shocked by these blasphemous rites. I will sit down and write all I know about it, and expose it to the world, so that others may not be duped as I have been." His friend argued with him till midnight, to induce him not to carry his plan into execution, saying to him, that by such an act he would destroy his character and lose his life."

RENUNCIATION OF DEA. WM. A. BARTLETT, OF PELLA, IOWA.

From the age of 14 until I was regularly initiated into the fooleries of ancient freemasonry, I had a very exalted opinion of the institution, and a great desire to become instructed into its mysteries, and pledged myself, at that age, to an associate of mine, to do so as soon as convenient after I

should become of age. I was 21 in May, 1826, and the September following became a member of the order, by joining Constellation Lodge, in the town of Perry, N. Y. At that time, rumor was afloat that Morgan had made a revelation of the secrets of the order, and that his book could be had at Batavia. I inquired of those whom I had notified that I wished to join, what that rumor meant. I was told that Morgan had put out a spurious work on freemasonry, and had run away, to make the people think he had been murdered, and thereby effect a great sale of his book, and, when that was accomplished, he would return. That was satisfactory to me, as I placed great confidence in those who said so. I was initiated, passed and raised to the sublime degree of master mason, in less than two weeks time. I was afterwards informed that they had done so, fearing that if my passing and being raised had been delayed until the next regular meeting, that I might, during the time, get hold of Morgan's revelation. That led me at once to the conclusion that it was truthfũl, which I afterwards found so to be.

I was very much disappointed in not having my expectation realized, and felt as though I had been imposed upon. I kept those feelings to myself. During the winter or spring following my initiation, a resolution was offered in the lodge for adoption, and to be published outside the lodge, condemning the abduction of Morgan. After much discussion, the worshipful master called another to the chair, and said, "Brethren, what do you mean by offering such a resolution as this? Had you or I been at Batavia, we would have done just what those brethren have done, and taken the life of Morgan, because the oaths of masonry demanded it at our hands. And now will you condemn brethren for doing what you would have done, had you been there? I trust not." When the vote was taken, but three were in favor of the resolution. This, with other things which I considered iniquitous, and that prevented justice from taking place, led me to conclude that I had formed an unholy and wicked alliance. In the fall of 1827, I trust by the grace of God, I became a convert to christianity, and felt called upon to leave the lodge, conceiving it to be no place for a christian. I petitioned the lodge for a discharge, which was granted, and shortly after I united with the church of Christ. And, although I felt willing to condemn the institution as wicked and dangerous, yet, it was some time before I felt willing to

disclose the secrets which had been committed to me as such; but now I am free from all such masonic obligations.

WM. A. BARTLETT.

Pella, Iowa, Jan. 14, 1860.

RENUNCIATION OF JONAS BROWN, OF SHELDON, VT.

In the fall of 1829, I made the resolve that I would not conceal the truth with falsehood, but acknowledged that Morgan's book was correct, and masonry was revealed; for which, in April following, I was expelled for unmasonic conduct, as the following certificate will show:

"Jonas Brown, of Swanton, once a master mason, and member of Franklin Lodge, No. 10, at the last regular communication of said lodge was expelled therefrom, by unanimous vote, for unmasonic conduct.

"L. ROYCE, Sec."

"Masonic Hall, St. Albans, April 3, 1830."

Mr. Brown further says: I hereby certify, that in the fall of 1826, I attended Franklin Lodge, No. 10, St. Albans, at which time the Rev. Isaac Hill was introduced as a visiting deputy grand master from the grand lodge, and, in the course of his remarks to the lodge, said, there was an individual in Batavia who had been writing masonry, and it was now out to the world, up and down the west side of the lake, (Champlain,) and would soon be here. He cautioned the lodge to be careful how they received strangers. He was then asked by a member, "Do you think the real master's word is revealed?" "I do suppose it is." Another member said, "I would ask, should mason's acknowledge this?" He said they should not.

Jan. 4th, 1860.

JONAS BROWN.

Renunciation of Rev. JOSHUA BRADLEY, of Rock Spring, Ill.: once "Knight of the Red Cross, Knight Templar, Knight of Malta, and Grand Chaplain of Washington Encampment;" and author of a book entitled "Some of the Beauties of Freemasonry."

Elder Bradley was extensively known in the United States as a Baptist clergyman, and a zealous and high mason. After spending many years in the active service of freemasonry, traveling and laboring extensively to promote its interests, and while preparing himself in the time of the

anti-masonic excitement to defend the institution, he, like thousands of others, became convinced of its corrupt character, and was constrained, like an honest man, to come out and renounce it. Here follow some extracts from communications from his pen on this subject:

“Masonry in every country has been changing its positions, constitutions, obligations and lectures, and muffling itself in fine robes, smiling and courting certain virtuous characters to form an affinity with it, that others might think favorably of it, and in this way aid in opening wider its jaws to the innocent, and proclaim abroad that the great, the learned and the good were members of this ‘ancient and honorable fraternity of free and accepted masons.’ Here permit me to say, without fear of contradiction, that those great and good men, of whom masons are continually boasting, never concerned themselves about its financial affairs and intriguing management. Those great men occasionally visited a grand lodge or a grand chapter, heard an oration on masonry, and then retired and left the transactions of the fraternity to others. Why is this? Because these gentlemen have other avocations, more honorable to themselves and more important to their fellow-men, than to spend their time or intermeddle any longer with the belittling system of masonry. These gentlemen in their younger years may have been masters of lodges, or high priests of chapters; but they are no more fascinated with the low, foolish and degraded work of bringing about of candidates, &c., &c. As many may be offended at my renouncing masonry, and my plainness in stating my conviction of its fallacy, I beg leave to say, that the whole system, so far as I can trace it back, is deceptive and its members who frequent lodges and chapters become discordant and contentious—for they find nothing in masonry to render them happy, and they see many things wrong and find many individuals with whom they cannot hold fellowship, or even walk in procession at the solemnities of a funeral.

* * * * *

“From those days till the present, animosities, fraud, evil speaking, conventions called, divisions made, and every kind of malevolence, and even the murder of Morgan justified, and desperadoes supported from masonic funds to unite and publish defamation against the rulers of our nation and the ministers of Jesus, whose characters are fair among the

P

churches, and their preaching attended by the influences of the Holy Spirit to the salvation of souls. Now, my brethren, if you do not believe me, read for yourselves. Find, if you can, one single chapter or verse in the sacred scriptures, where speculative masonry is mentioned, or supported. All those passages which have been published in their books, and their having the Bible open in their lodges, is a piece of deception, and was invented to obtain influence among the more serious parts of community, that not only the men of the world, but members of churches might be taken by the craft; the fountains of justice defiled, the temple of the living God filled with confusion, the pillars of government torn away, and 'the whole wheel of nature set in a blaze.'

"Every mason who has taken ten degrees or more, can either recollect, or can turn to obligations published in part belonging to those degrees, and can easily discern, that those obligations have been formed by different men, at different times; and by men extremely ignorant of the obligations taken in the lower degrees and are wicked beyond the power of language to describe. * * * * *

* * * "Neither do I mean to cast any reflections upon those who conferred degrees upon me, nor charge myself with sins unpardonable, in being instrumental in deceiving many; for I was captivated with the same fascinating delusion, that those were who brought me to their altars, &c., &c. If I were now to ballot for candidates, and aid in conferring degrees, as I formerly did, my criminality would be great. In those labors I firmly believe I shall never engage. And can you, my brethren, who enjoy the humble and soul nourishing influences of the Spirit of Christ? Can those lifeless ceremonies and repetitions which we used in lodges and chapters afford you any real consolation? Are you still tenaciously fond of masonry, after all that has transpired, that has been said and written upon this subject? What can you expect to accomplish by continuing your membership? The alarm is given, investigation has commenced, and more than five millions have been roused from lethargy, who will not be persuaded to lie down and sleep, while about two thousand masonic halls enclose secret assemblies, (at least one per month,) who dare not utter their transactions to their most intimate companions and friends who belong not to the fraternity? Can you enjoy religion, and feel the sanctifying influences of grace, while you are

daily contending for the existence of an institution that has received its death blow, and must inevitably expire? Perhaps you fear the consequences, and are unwilling to encounter the calumnies and falsehoods that masonic presses pour out in torrents upon all who dare leave the order? This you may expect, for none have escaped who were influential among them. Had I not been willing to have my name cast out as evil and to have all kinds of falsehoods published against me, and even expose myself to frowns, jests, and as much contemptuous treatment as these giants in infidelity can raise against me through all the ranks of their beardless militia, I would have held my peace.

“But, my brethren, what have we professed and what are our obligations to God, his church, and the world of mankind? Is this vain world a friend to grace? We must pass through evil report and good report. It is through great tribulation that we enter the kingdom of heaven. Shall the righteous cower and forsake the cause of God in an evil day? Is it not said in the book of God, that they ‘look up and are as bold as a lion?’ ‘Say ye to the righteous, that it shall be well with him.’ Read the 8th chapter of Romans, and then ask yourselves if you can fear the frowns, threats, and contempt of mortals? *A lying spirit is abroad, and speaks through all masonic presses*, and this spirit inflames all who hate the truth, and will make them wax worse and worse, till sudden destruction shall overwhelm these workers of iniquity, to the astonishment of every beholder. Then masonry will rise no more to trouble Zion, and spread delusion and death amid civilized nations.

* * * * *

“The indescribable wickedness of some masons in the Morgan affair, had waked up a host of new, learned and scrutinizing enemies, who were penetrating every region around them, and seizing every weapon to destroy the whole fabric. In surveying the vast field of their occupancy, I found only two positions of strength and importance, viz: 1st, that secret societies ought not to exist; 2d, that obligations taken by their members are not binding. Could these two be fairly removed, every other might, and masonry again rise and gain a triumph. In 1827 I was solicited to deliver an address in St. Louis on the 24th June; I accepted, and then briefly exhibited my sentiments on masonry, to a large congregation, in which were a number of the order from dif-

ferent parts of the Union, of respectable standing and holding offices of great responsibility in our national government. This discourse was approved and published. Some of my remarks against anti-masonic performances and exertions, put forth against this mystic society, I now detest. For some months I stood prepared to meet their advance upon the fraternity, spreading over the vast valley of the Mississippi. I almost came to a determination to send some of my views to be published in your region; but my distance from the seat of opposition, and my knowledge of men in the order of greater ability and erudition than myself, who resided in the midst of the contest, prevented me. I fondly hoped that some would enter the field and come off triumphant. None have yet appeared sufficiently clothed in truth, to overthrow the two positions above mentioned, and I am now fully persuaded that they are founded in righteousness and cannot be demolished. That lively confidence, which once appeared to glow among masons, now withers and must finally vanish away.

“The commotions in the east have awakened me to consider anxiously what I must do as an individual. I have tried to persuade myself to hold a neutral position for some months past, on account of the afflicting hand of Providence upon my wife, that must soon lodge her in the grave, if not removed, and my present residence in a city where masonry is respected, and moves onward without any annoyance. Neutrality, in this day of prevalent divisions, is unpleasant and unreasonable, in my estimation. Therefore, I am willing it should be known with whom I can associate, for the happiness of mankind, and the glory of God—‘*Magna est veritas, et prevalebit.*’

“Should my friends in your vicinity deem this communication of any importance to the public, for the promotion of anti-masonry, it is at their service. My next will be an address to professors of religion who are still in the fraternity, and others whom I may have grieved with my former publications on masonry, and my zeal and labors among them.

“*May 9, 1829.*”

JOSHUA BRADLEY.”

RENUNCIATION OF REV. MR. MANN, OF SUFFIELD, CON.

The following renunciation will be read with interest and pleasure throughout the country. The author of it is exten-

sively known in Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts and New Hampshire. No man's character stands fairer than his does, as a man, a gentleman, a Christian, and a Christian minister.—*A. M. Intelligencer.*

Mr. Editor—The subject of freemasonry, affecting as it does the reputation of individuals, the welfare of the churches, and the peace of the community, is a subject of great importance. Every movement in regard to it, whether on the part of its friends or of its enemies, should be made with due consideration. In deciding on the merits of an institution which has a mixture of good and evil in its composition, and against which popular opinion has arrayed itself, and that, too, with uncommon energy, we are liable to misjudge. Realizing the truth of this, I have endeavored for some time past to examine seriously and candidly the nature and tendency of freemasonry. The result of this examination, I now communicate under a sense of the duty I owe to my friends, to my country, and to the church of the Redeemer.

I became a member of this institution in my native town, and was raised to the degree of master mason within a year after completing my course of education at college; and some time previous to my settlement in the ministry I was advanced to the degree of mark master mason. Subsequently to this, in compliance with the wishes of particular friends, I proceeded to the royal arch degree. My attendance on the meetings of the fraternity have been discontinued for the few last years, and always have been limited principally to public or special occasions. The reason of this has been that I have not been fully satisfied with the institution, and have feared that all was not right concerning it.

It is not my design, in this communication, to rail against an institution with which I have long been connected, nor to divulge its secrets, nor to criminate any of its members. Many of them I esteem and love as good citizens, and good Christians. Nor am I sensible that by doing this I am actuated by any selfish motives. I am aware that by taking this step I shall wound the feelings of some, and, perhaps, excite the ill will and severe reproaches of others. The latter I shall endeavor to forgive, and by the former I shall hope to be forgiven.

* * * * *

Without declaring the institution a downright imposition in all its parts, I confess, that I was greatly disappointed at

p*

every step of advancement through its degrees, as to the benefit to be derived from it. I doubt not, that many a man has felt ashamed and conscience-smitten when he has appeared to be satisfied with a thing of such inanity. The moral precepts which are to be found among its instructions, may be much better learned from the gospel itself. As to the union which it is said to form among men, it may be observed, that the religion of Jesus effects the most important and lasting union among good men which can be formed on earth; and, as to bad men, to bind them together by solemn oaths in secret societies to stand by, and defend, and promote each other, must be regarded as a dangerous procedure, both in relation to church and state.

The recent disclosures of facts made to the legislature of New York, and in numerous other ways, has shown clearly that, in regard to our political interests, the institution of masonry is to be greatly dreaded. It is a powerful engine, which may be wielded with tremendous and destructive force against the liberties of our beloved country.

But, Sir, permit me to add an objection, which, a little while ago, I could not have supposed would ever exist against an institution which professes to be founded in pure morality and benevolence. It is stained with the blood of the innocent. It has perpetrated murder in the most outrageous and horrid manner. It has trampled thus on the laws of God and man. It has set at defiance all authority, and even every principle of humanity. The evidence is overwhelming, that these shocking barbarities, at which the inquisition itself might blush, have been committed by masons; and they have been justified by masons, as being in accordance with the obligations of the institution; and the wretched perpetrators have been screened from justice and protected by masons! Sir, I can no longer regard such an institution as a moral one, much less as a religious one. If this is a practical exposition of its laws, it ought not to be tolerated by any friend of our species.

I feel that I cannot free my garments from the blood of the murdered, if I countenance or uphold an institution which has committed such deeds. Does not the blood of the martyr of Batavia cry to heaven for the vengeance of Him who hath said, Vengeance is mine, I will repay? Do not the cries of the widow and the orphan ascend to the ear of Him who styles himself, the Judge of the fatherless and the

widow? Against whom is this cry uttered? Not merely against those whose hands have laid hold on violence; but, against those, also, who continue to sustain a society which is guilty of such atrocities.

It does not satisfy my conscience to say as many of my brethren do, that we disapproved of the violent measures which have been pursued. The question I have to ask is this;—were the proceedings against Morgan in accordance with masonry or not? If they were, how can any of the fraternity be free from the implication of murder, in a moral sense, who continue to uphold and favor such an institution? Under such circumstances, is not the maintenance of masonry a virtual justification of the whole procedure?

RENUNCIATION OF JOHN R. MULFORD.

In making the following statement of my views and disclosures on the subject of speculative freemasonry, I am not conscious of being governed by any motives except a desire to discharge my duty as a member of civil society, and of the church of Jesus Christ, and also to promote the cause of truth and justice in our social relations; but above all, the cause of a pure und undefiled religion, as it is taught in the living oracles of God, without the corrupt mixtures of human invention.

I joined Whippany lodge, in this county, about thirteen years ago, and took the first three degrees of masonry, and continued to visit the lodge about five years—then I silently withdrew, and have since had no fellowship with masonry.

My reasons for thus forsaking the lodge, and why I feel it my duty publicly, and forever to renounce the order of freemasonry, are as follows, viz:

That the principles of masonry inculcate neither religion, morality, truth, nor justice, but the contrary of all these, which I have both experienced and witnessed. While I continued a lodge-going member, a mason told me he did not believe there was any better religion than masonry. This alarmed me; and I began to look at the institution with a more jealous eye. Since that time, I have seen and felt its pernicious influence in many ways, some of which I will mention.

I have seen a grand jury selected by a masonic sheriff, with an express view to prevent an indictment against a brother

mason, and was told by the foreman of that jury, that had it not been the case of a brother that was coming before them, *he* should not have been there. I have also seen a mason brought up to be tried on an indictment, and observed him make the masonic signal of distress, and another sign to the jury, which latter sign of the hand drawn across the throat, two of the jurors answered; and these same jurors when out, refused to convict on a clear case of guilt. I have also seen masonic signs exchanged between the bar and bench. I have also seen its influence in the choice of public officers, having heard it mentioned in the lodge that such a brother was to be run for assemblyman, by which I understood that we (the brethren) were to support him, and he was run and elected. I have seen three editions of Morgan's *Illustration of Masonry*; and to guard the public against deception in so important a matter, I feel it my duty to state that the first one is a true and genuine exposition of masonry as I was taught it in the lodge; whereas, the two last have been altered; the one in many particulars, and the other in pass words and in changing the signs, no doubt to deceive the people. For these reasons, and many more that I could name, I consider masonry as a corrupt and awfully wicked system, and unfit for the society of Christians or honest men; and considering the pretensions it makes of republicanism, charity, the handmaid of religion, &c., I view it as one of the greatest impositions ever practiced upon mankind, that of Mahomet not excepted. I am perfectly satisfied from what I have seen, that had the masons the reins of power in their hands, or in the hands of men whom they could, as they say, "MANAGE," we should soon be reduced to a state of "hewers of wood and drawers of water," they our "Grand Masters, Most Worshipfuls," &c., and we *the people their* SLAVES. I would here forewarn all persons, especially the youth, from entering the lodge to find the secrets of masonry, or anything good; they will only find a scene of folly and wickedness, and purchase this at the expense of both money and credit.

Of this latter class, I have known individuals to enter the lodge with correct morals and steady habits; and in a few years become dissipated and worthless members of society. Such is its corrupt and corrupting influence.

If such persons wish to know the true secrets of masonry, and will take the trouble to call on me, I will communi-

cate to them as far as I have gone in this "mystery of iniquity," "without money and without price."

As a member, therefore, of the church of Christ, and of civil society, I do hereby publicly, "solemnly, and sincerely" renounce freemasonry forever, and can, and will hold myself no longer bound by its horrible and bloody oaths.

JOHN R. MULFORD.

*Genungtown, Chatham Township, }
Morris co., N. J., July 31, 1828. }*

RENUNCIATION OF COL. JOHN HOAR.

Colonel Hoar, author of the following renunciation, is well known to be a gentleman of good report, and he stands fair before the public. He long ago expressed to some of his friends the trouble and trials freemasonry had brought upon his mind. Uniting with free masons he considers one of the greatest errors of his life. The institution he considers a high-handed piece of wickedness and abomination before Heaven, affording no peace, safety or security to those who labor to support it. He has no desire to hurt the feelings of any of his masonic brethren; he would rather honor and respect them; but the institution which they labor to support he believes to be a useless, worthless, wicked thing, (it is so to them,) a device of wicked men, inconsistent with the Christian religion, and of immoral and irreligious tendency.
—*Free Press.*

TO THE PUBLIC.—The time is come when a strict inquiry into the principles and practices of freemasonry is instituted, and many of the brotherhood who heretofore thought but little of either, are beginning to examine the subject in the light of Divine Truth, and the more they examine, the more are they dissatisfied with the institution.

This, in a good measure, is the case with myself; and I feel a sacred obligation resting upon me as accountable to that Being who sways the sceptre of universal dominion, and whose omniscient eye penetrates the abodes of darkness, and takes cognizance of the most hidden transactions, to renounce my standing in the *masonic fraternity*. My eyes have been opened to see the labyrinth of folly and guilt into which the institution is decoying men. My better judgment has been shocked, and my feelings greatly excited, while hearing men of abilities, men on whom nature had lavished

her richest gifts, express a belief that *masonry* would carry them to HEAVEN.

To assist in riveting still closer the chains of a most awful delusion, by encouraging and supporting the institution, or to remain silent as the grave on the subject, will, I am persuaded, call down the displeasure of Heaven upon me; the blood of souls will be required at my hand. Therefore I consider it an imperious duty to withdraw immediately and entirely from the institution, and to exhort all my Christian brethren who belong to the fraternity to examine the subject candidly and prayerfully, and if they find they are wronging their fellow-men by encouraging them in delusion, and their own souls by feeding on husks; if they find they are wounding the feelings of their Christian brethren by their walk and conversation, to come out from masonry, without delay, and be separate. What concord hath Christ with Belial? What communion hath light with darkness, and what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?

To masons at large I would say, if you draw from the fountain of masonry your greatest hope and consolation, it will certainly fail you at the giving up of the ghost. Therefore, flee to the ark of safety and take refuge in the blood of the everlasting covenant.

JOHN HOAR,

Member of the Church in Monson.

EXTRACT FROM THE RENUNCIATION OF ARTEMAS KENNEDY,
OF MILTON, MASS.

I am impelled, on examination, to acknowledge that freemasonry, in its nature and tendency, is hostile not only to our religion, but to the civil institutions of our country—to the regular and equitable administrations of justice, and to the general diffusion of social happiness.

I solemnly declare, the oaths, obligations and principles of masonry, to the tenth degree, to be all faithfully and truly delineated by Morgan and the Le Roy Convention, on which account I now consider myself as breaking no masonic obligation, and only assenting to a truth already told and openly published to the world by a thousand witnesses. My greatest astonishment, at present, is, that so many of the order expose their veracity to such strong suspicion, in denying the truth of those late disclosures, and the probable murder of Morgan. His murder is in such strict accordance with

masonic principles, that I have been lately told by a member of Christ's church, in this county, *that he hoped Morgan was murdered, and that if he was, he was rightly served.* Not being able to subscribe to, or approve of such principles myself, I have suffered, lately, injury and persecution, and have been threatened this day, by a royal arch mason, from a great distance, and whom I never before saw, *that he would be one of four to dispatch me.* Thus convinced and thus instigated, I feel it a conscientious duty to disown all future connection with such society and such principles. The call to this duty is so loud, that it breaks the slumbers of the night; it visits me at the table; it arrests the progress of my daily employment; and will, if not duly regarded, pursue me to the dark recesses of my tomb! I obey the call, break the bond, and *declare myself free of masonic thralldom;* and in so doing I feel nobler freedom, I behold a more serene and purer light, than ever the *mystic order* presented to my unblinded eyes. ARTEMAS KENNEDY.

EXTRACT FROM THE RENUNCIATION OF COL. H. C. WITHERILL,
OF HARTFORD.

Masons say, in defence of their institution, that it is a good one, but, like all others, it has been disgraced by bad members, and that if *all would live up to their obligations* it would be an honorable and useful institution. *But nothing can be more erroneous than this assertion. Community has been saved from the worst of evils, FROM THE VERY FACT, that masons do not at all times live up to their obligations; if they should, the institution would be STILL MORE DANGEROUS than it actually is*—a volume could not contain all the evils which it would produce; our prisons would be liable at all times to be beset by mobs, and the guilty felon would be set at liberty—prisoners at the bar would have a right to look to jurors for relief—pirates on the high seas would claim their life and liberty; and the midnight robber and murderer would fly to masonry, as to the horns of an altar, for protection.

RENUNCIATION OF LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR LELAND.

From the Anti-Masonic Christian Herald.

The Rev. Aaron Leland, late Lieut.-Governor of Vermont, and formerly Deputy Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of

that State, recently renounced masonry before the Baptist Holland Purchase Association, New York.

In a report of the committee on the subject, of which he was a member, he remarked that he had been led by a vain curiosity to unite with the lodge, and had been led on from step to step to the royal arch degree,—had been master of a lodge for five years—had been Deputy Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of the State of Vermont, and had left the institution about nine or ten years ago. He stated that the first objection which presented itself to his mind was the practice of *praying for the soul of a brother mason after he had been dead two, three, and sometimes four days*—that he persisted in the practice for a short season to the injury of his conscience—that it was a Romish custom, and he never would preach at the burial of a mason when masonic forms and customs were attended to—that he never would preach to a lodge of masons as *such*, and that he was ashamed that he had ever participated in the principles and practices of the institution.

IMPORTANT RENUNCIATIONS.

We, the undersigned, having formerly associated with free masons, deem it our duty, without intending to increase excitement, or to wound the feelings of our masonic brethren, publicly to declare, that the system of freemasonry is, in our judgment, of a tendency, on the whole, pernicious to the moral habits, and dangerous to the civil and religious institutions of our country.

LEONARD BLEECKER, New York.

LEWIS TAPPAN, “

REV. MATTHEW L. R. PERRINE, D. D.,
Auburn Theological Seminary.

REV. JOEL PARKER, Rochester, N. Y.

REV. CHAUNCEY EDDY, Penn Yan, N. Y.

HENRY BRADLEY, ESQ., “

LEANDER REDDY, “

SAMUEL BUCKINGHAM, “

THOMAS MARBLE, Arcadia, N. Y.

WILLIAM WINFIELD, “

FRANCIS BATES, “

REV. JARED REED, Reading, Mass.

REV. LYMAN CASE, Coventry, Vt.

THE BORROWER WILL BE CHARGED AN OVERDUE FEE IF THIS BOOK IS NOT RETURNED TO THE LIBRARY ON OR BEFORE THE LAST DATE STAMPED BELOW. NON-RECEIPT OF OVERDUE NOTICES DOES NOT EXEMPT THE BORROWER FROM OVERDUE FEES.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY
BOOK DUE
DEC 30 1982
7651158

7118.60
rs on freemasonry,
ner Library

006672000



2044 089 015 317