

Debate On Freemasonry

(The following discussion appeared over several months in the *Preceptor* magazine beginning with the January, 1952 issue. Two members of the church, former Masons, did the discussing. They are known only as Alpha and Omega. Alpha is affirming the right of a Christian to belong to the Masonic Lodge and Omega is denying that he can be a member).

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

The Reason for This Discussion

In the last few years a great many revelations” of Masonry have been circulated in the brotherhood, creating in many places an “anti-Masonic” attitude. This attitude results in unjust treatment of brethren, who are also Masons. In some places these brethren are refused a public part in the worship. Do the brethren approve this? Shall we make Masonry a test of fellowship? We have the “anti-college” group, the “anti-Sunday school”; the “anti-this and

the anti-that.” Are we ready for an “anti-Masonic” faction? These questions deserve serious consideration, for it is no light matter to rend the body of Christ, and set brethren at variance one with another. This “anti-Masonic attitude, and the action growing out of it, is the reason for this debate.

The Proposition

Resolved: That a Christian can be an active Freemason consistently with the obligations of the Christian religion.

Definitions

In defining this proposition it is our purpose to make its terms as clear and specific as possible. This, I trust will prevent quibbling over terms.

1. A Christian: An obedient believer in Christ; A member of the body of Christ, the church.
2. Can be: Permissible; Allowable; Admissible.
3. Active: Performing the obligations, of; Taking part in Masonic work.
4. Freemason: A member of the Masonic Lodge. There is no particular import to the word “Free”.
5. Consistently: Living or acting conformably to one’s own belief or profession.
6. Obligations: Duties imposed
7. Christian Religion! The Law of Christ. Here is the proposition defined and stated in terms of the definition: “It is permissible for a member of the Church to be a member of the Masonic lodge, take part in Masonic work, and live and act in conformity with the duties imposed by the law of Christ.”

This is the issue clearly stated. My obligation is to prove that a Christian can be an active member of the Masonic lodge and live in harmony with the law of Christ. The ques-

tion then is: “What is the Masonic lodge?” “What, if any, is its relationship to things scriptural?”

Argument

Proposition 1. The Masonic Lodge is a human institution

I do not believe, neither am I trying to prove, that Masonry is of divine origin, nor do I believe that it exists by the authority of Christ. But, it is strictly a human institution. It is not, nor does it claim to be, a rival of the church. The Church was built to SAVE men “In”. Eph. 2:16. The admission that Masonry is not a rival of the church, makes void the charge that Masonry teaches salvation thru the lodge. Salvation is the BUSINESS of the church, NOT of the lodge. Christians do not seek salvation in lodges. Masonry originated in England in the Seventeenth Century. Claims to great antiquity merely represent the opinions of the particular writer, and carry no weight of authority. Originating with man it is a human institution.

Is a Christian therefore barred from membership in the lodge because it is a human institution? Not necessarily. If Christians are barred from membership in an institution because it is of human origin, then, one cannot be a member of a college faculty, the P.T.A., The Lions Club, The Rotary, The Chamber of Commerce, The Medical Association or any other Civic or Cultural organization originating with man. But, if the human institution stands for Morality, better relationships, or the improvement of government, and does not affect the Work and Worship of the church, there can be no objection to a Christian being a member of it. This I affirm of Masonry.

1. It is not a rival of the church.
2. It is a human institution.
4. It stands for morality.
5. It stands for better relationships.
6. It does not affect the Work and Worship of the church.

Therefore: A Christian can be an active Freemason consistently with the obligations of the Christian religion.

Proposition 2. The question of Masonry belongs in the realm of human judgement

The Bible clearly teaches that: There is a realm of faith and a realm of human judgement. In the realm of faith everything must be done “in the Name” (by the authority) of Christ. The realm of faith is, bounded, circumscribed by the word of God. But, where revelation ceases, faith stops. Where faith stops, human judgement begins. Let me make this point so clear that none can misunderstand it. 1. In the realm of faith (where God has spoken) there can be no opinion or human judgement. 2. In the realm of opinion or human judgement (where God has NOT spoken) there can be no question of authoritative faith.

All will agree that Masonry doesn’t stand in the realm of faith. Then, it stands in the realm of opinion or human judgement. Is this against it? Not if it agrees with the principles governing opinions. What are these? 1. An opinion must be morally right. 2. It must not affect the Doctrine, Practice or Government of the church. 3. It must be held in good conscience. Masonry agrees with these principles ,governing opinions. Let me state it like this:

1. A Christian can hold and practice an opinion, that agrees with the law governing opinions, consistently with the obligations of the Christian religion.

2. Masonry stands in the realm of opinion, and agrees with the law governing opinions.
3. Therefore: A Christian can hold and practice (be an active Freemason) Freemasonry consistently with the obligations of the Christian religion. Since the Masonic lodge is a human institution standing in the realm of judgment or opinion, "What, if any, is its relationship to things scriptural?"

Proposition 3. The Masonic lodge bears the same relationship to things scriptural as any other opinion, and the attitude and actions of brethren are governed by the same scriptural rules regulating their conduct in all other matters of opinion.

The Leaders of the Restoration Movement knew that unity could never be attained upon opinions, so, they set forth these principles as the only feasible basis of unity:

1. In faith and practice, a "thus saith the Lord."
2. In opinions, Liberty.
3. In all things, Love.

In applying these principles, we ask these questions: 1. Does the opinion change the word preached? 2. Does it change the acts of worship? 3. Is it immoral? If the answer to these questions is No, then a brother may hold the opinion in good conscience.

And the scriptural rule governing opinions is to be observed. To raise an issue, or judge the brother, over such an opinion, is a violation of the positive command of God. Rom. 14:3.

1. Does Masonry change the word preached? No.
2. Does it change the acts of worship? No.
3. Is it immoral? No. Then, Masonry is a valid opinion, and bears the same relationship to things scriptural as any other opinion. This being true, "the attitude and actions of brethren, over Masonry, are governed by the same scriptural rules regulating their conduct in all other matters of opinion."

These rules teach us: "to receive our brother, yet not for decision of thoughts (opinions). Rom. 14:1. Paul commands Christians not to judge one another over opinions. Rom. 14:3. He teaches that: the opinion is the concern of the one holding it, NOT of his brother. "Let each man be fully assured in his OWN mind." 14:5.

An opinion is a matter between a man and HIS GOD. The approval of his OWN conscience, is ALL he needs. God has never placed any MAN in the church to be the JUDGE OF HIS BROTHER'S conscience. The desire to judge another's conscience, is the desire to be his God. But, says someone: "I can't see how you can be a Mason." May I say, kindly: "It isn't necessary for you to see." Different viewpoints, make different mothers-in-law. A brother's being a Mason, doesn't affect you one way or another, nor does it change anything in the church.

The Mason doesn't sin against the consciences of his brethren. because those who object have no intention of following his example. The objector is guilty of being a meddler in another's matters, of judging his brother, looking on him as without conscience and insincere in his profession of faith. Such a one is guilty of sinning against God and his brother. Paul charges each man to act upon his OWN convictions, at the same time forbidding his brother to interfere with him. And to insure peace he commands: "The faith which thou hast, have to thyself before God." Rom. 14:22. This applies with equal force, whether you are for or against any opinion. When these positive divine commands are obeyed, the Masonic issue will end.

There is the third principle set forth by the Restoration Leaders: “In all things, Love.” The law of love teaches us that: though we may differ over opinions, we are still brethren. As such we are to do “nothing through faction or through vain glory, but in lowliness of mind each counting other better than himself.” Phil. 2:3. “Love —thinketh no evil.” 1 Cor. 13:5.

“Love worketh no ill to his neighbor: love therefore is the fulfillment of the law.” Rom. 13:10. When differing over opinion, the law of love says: “He is my brother, I count him to be as honest and conscientious as myself. I believe he will do what is right.” This is the attitude and action of a man governed by the law of God: and the law of love. Such an attitude will cause strife to cease and issues over opinions to die. May God grant that these principles may be taught learned and practiced until “His will is done on earth, as in heaven.”

1. These principles are to be applied to questions that do not affect the DOCTRINE, PRACTICE or GOVERNMENT of the church.
2. Masonry is a question that doesn’t affect the DOCTRINE, PRACTICE or GOVERNMENT of the church. practiced.
3. Therefore: These principles are to be applied to the question of Masonry.

1. These principles apply to valid opinions.
2. But: These principles apply to Masonry.
3. Therefore: Masonry is a valid opinion.

1. A Christian may hold and practice a valid opinion consistently with the obligations of the Christian religion.
 2. Masonry is a valid opinion.
 3. Therefore: A Christian may hold and practice (be an active) Freemasonry consistently with the obligations of the Christian religion.
-

THE FIRST NEGATIVE

The Reason For The Discussion

Brother Alpha traces our discussion to the unjust treatment brought on brother Masons by the “revelations” made by “anti-Masonic” brethren in the Lord. As the debate progresses we may discover whether brother Alpha has really studied any of these “revelations”, but I have studied a number of them, and being a Past Master of my lodge, am able to testify that they are, in the main, accurate. To list two or three: President Blanchard of Wheaton College wrote *Standard Freemasonry Illustrated*, an exceptionally illuminating and accurate volume studded with quotations from Masonic writers brother Alpha and I have known as outstanding. Then Edmond Ronayne, a late Past Master of Keystone Lodge No. 639, Chicago, Ill. has A book of four hundred pages, Mah-Hah-Bone, which is documented by representative Masonic writers, and another book, The Master’s Carpet, which is accurate.

I will further testify that brother L. C. Pope’s little pamphlet, “Christ or Masonry”, is accurate as far as it goes. Not that I think you, brother Alpha, will endorse nay confirma-

tions of these “revelations”, but I want our readers to know that some Masons (or ex-Masons) believe many of these revelations are accurate. Further, you know of Albert Mackey’s prominence as a Masonic writer and philosopher. Almost every point of these “revelations” are verified by passages in his voluminous works. You probably have his works; At least you know of them.

I know of a number of brethren who with me have purchased a set of Mackey’s *Encyclopedia of Freemasonry*. I am aware that he is not the pope for Masonry. Nevertheless he is cited as either representative or authoritative by various lodges I have known.

Now, brother Alpha, the preaching I have done against Masonry has had two motives: (1) to save brethren from the hurtful errors of Masonry (see below), and (2) to save the church from troubles created by Masonry. I have no “anti-Masonic” spirit -except as I am convinced I must be “Anti-Masonic” to be “anti-sinful”. Such convictions as these, and not an “Anti-Masonic” faction, are the causes of this discussion.

The Proposition and The Argument

I find no fault with brother Alpha’s definition of terms, but I will be more specific in my discussion of the “obligations of the Christian religion” and Masonry’s violation of them. Brother Alpha’s entire argument can be stated syllogistically as follows:

- (1) Christians are at liberty to hold, or not to hold, opinions which do not compromise or contradict the faith.
- (2) Masonry is such an opinion.
- (3) Therefore, “a Christian can be an active Freemason consistently with the obligations of the Christian religion”.

If the second premise, “Masonry is such an opinion”, be granted, Alpha’s argument is unimpeachable. But “there’s the rub!” Our purpose in the debate and our plan for the debate is to present unimpeachable proof that Masonry is not “such an opinion”. That is, Masonry does, according to our convictions, “compromise and contradict the faith”. If this be true, all of Alpha’s argument on faith and opinion goes for naught, unless (and this is unthinkable) he wishes to apply the rules governing opinions to that which compromises and Contradicts the faith.

Our procedure will be simple. Below are eight distinct “obligations of the Christian religion” and the proof that Masonry is inconsistent with each of them. Now brother Alpha must do one of three things: (1) deny the obligations, (2) deny the inconsistencies; or (3) accept both the obligations and the proof for the inconsistencies and renounce Masonry as I have done. Remember, brother Alpha, as long as one of these inconsistencies stands, your affirmative is a failure!

(1) The Christian is obligated to practice “pure and undefiled religion” (Jas. 1:27). Other religions are human, diabolical instead of divine. Now Masonry is a human religion. You argue first that Masonry is a human institution. I’ll grant that, even though the *Taylor-Hamilton Monitor*, formerly used in Texas does claim divine authority for it, extending it all the way back to creation (pp. 14, 20). Yes, it is a human institution, but also a human religion with religious claims, purposes and methods. Proof is now given. I have before me my copy of the July 1, 1950, *Masonic Home Journal*, described on its masthead as “The Official Organ of the Grand Lodge of Kentucky”. Nuff sed! This issue contains article 29 on Masonic symbolism, entitled, “The Perfect Ashlar”. From this article comes a statement repugnant to every true Christian. “Masonic symbols are but working tools by the

use of which we are seeking to form ourselves into perfect stones for that building which is to be our eternal home.” Is that a religious claim, brother Alpha? A religious purpose? A religious method? Reread the statement and recall your experience as a Mason.

Or get this choice statement from the April 15, 1951 issue of the same journal. “In dismissing the assemblage, Brother Ellis reminded all present that the lodge was indeed *a holy place*, every piece of material and every bit of labor now being dedicated to *the Grand Architect*, and that here was a building perfect in all its parts, and honorable to its builders.” (Emphasis-Omega.) Human institution, or Human religion, brother Alpha?

Albert Mackey confirms these two and caps the climax. I have before me now *his Encyclopedia of Freemasonry* which several others and I were encouraged to obtain. On page 774. “Of all the objects which constitute the Masonic science of symbolism, the most important, the most cherished by Masons, and by far the most significant, is the Temple of Jerusalem. The spiritualizing of the Temple is . . . that which most emphatically gives it its religious character. Take from Freemasonry its dependence on the Temple; leave out of its ritual all reference to that sacred edifice, and to the legends and traditions connected with it, and the system itself would at once decay and die. . . .”

Or, on page 619: “Masonry, then is indeed, a religious institution,” but “the religion of Masonry is not sectarian . . . it is not Christianity.”

Or, as Joseph Fort Newton, a great scholar, editor of “The Master Mason,” and a devout Mason till his death, put it, “Masonry is not a religion but Religion.” (*The Religion of Masonry*, p. 11. Published by Masonic Service Association, 1927.)

Or, as the Kentucky Monitor puts it: “Masonry is a religious institution” (p. 28). As Masons we used religious symbolism, largely the symbolism of the ancient Jewish temple, plus symbols from heathen religions. We also made claims to build character for that “eternal home” with those symbols. We had prayers, Masonic prayers, in our services, some of them mock prayers like the “Oh, Lord, My God, is there no help for the widow’s son?” at the supposed resurrection of Hiram Abiff. We also had scripture readings. I wondered about not reading of the church or the plan of salvation Remember, brother Alpha,

(1) Masonry is a religion. Your denial is not sufficient disproof of the evidence I’ve given.

(2) The religion of Masonry is not Christianity.
Self-evident!

(3) Therefore, the practice of Masonry is inconsistent with that only pure and unde filed religion.

(2) Another “obligation of the Christian religion” is to a void flattering titles (Matt. 23:8,9, 10). In our lodge and on the front page of every issue of the *Masonic Home Journal* (op.cit.) such titles as these appear: “Most Worshipful Grand Master”, “Orders of Christian knighthood”, “sublime degree of Master Mason.” Now brother Alpha, don’t tell me I don’t understand the “worshipful Master” title. I know perfectly well what he symbolizes and what moral connotations the title holds. I would appreciate your differentiation between the application of Matt. 23:9 to a Catholic priest and 23:10 to the “worshipful Master.”

(3) The Christian is obligated to contend for the truth of the scriptures against error (2Tim. 3:16, 17; Jude 3) yet whereas the Bible represents Hiram, the widow’s son as having “finished all the work” he was to do for the temple, our Masonic legend has Hiram killed “before the temple was completed” (See I Kings 7:40; 2 Chron. 4:11).

(4) Christians must walk by, the same rule (Phil. 3:16), yet Masonic symbols constitute another rule, standing “for morality and better relationships,” a religious rule, “working

tools” in building stones “for that building which is to be our eternal home.” A Christian and a Christian Mason (can such be?) thus do not walk by the same rule. One has the Bible alone. The other has the Bible plus Masonic “light”.

(5) The Christian is “complete in Him who is the head of all principalities and powers” (Col. 2:10), yet the practice of Masonry is an aid to “better morality” and “better relationships.” If we are complete in Christ, then are we not complete morally in Him, and does not He teach the best relationships? If Christ’s doctrine of relationships is perfect, then is it not slander when we seek “better relationships” in Masonry?

(6) The Christian is obligated to shun the fellowship of unbelievers (2 Cor. 6:14; Eph. 5:11), yet Masons fellowship atheists! You read it right the first time. Now get it! Masonry is a world-wide, universal fellowship. Any lodge, or Masonic writer teaches that. But, in the first place, in countries where the religion is predominantly Mohammedan, the Koran is substituted for the ‘Bible. In the second place, according to Joseph Newton, late editor of the “Master Mason,” “the Religion of Masonry is Universe Religion, in which all men can unite.” (*The Religion of Masonry*, p. 52), yet on pages 6, 7, Newton says, “Of Masonry in Latin lands it is enough to say that, excepting that part of it which lives under English obedience or in affiliation with the Grand Lodge of England, it is frankly agnostic in its attitude toward the fundamental faiths of Religion. *Neither French nor Belgian Masonry requires faith in God as a condition of fellowship*” (Emphasis, Omega.) Now what think you, brother alpha? Have you not heard our “universal brotherhood” spoken of? Some brotherhood! filled with Agnostics, Muhammadans, Buddhists, and Atheists and Jews (in the Scotch Rite of our “universal brotherhood”).

(7) Christians are to believe, “Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord” (Rev. 14:13), yet as Masons we pronounce blessings on those who die out of the Lord. In Kentucky some brethren in Christ have been in lodges where such resolutions as the following were passed and sent on to the *Masonic Home Journal* to be published as Obituary notices: “Whereas it pleased Almighty God in his infinite wisdom to call from the *sacred lodge below* to that *Grand Lodge of the New Jerusalem above* the soul of our beloved friend and brother...”, and the tragic part of it is, the man wasn’t even a Christian! How did you vote, brother Alpha? did you compromise, the “in the Lord” part? Or would you preach Christ to such a gathering? With the hope that you will attend to each of these inconsistencies, we promise more of them next time and await your answer.

Sincerely,
Omega

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

“Convictions”

I like the way Brother Omega begins his part of this discussion. I like men of conviction. He is convinced Masonry is sinful and Christians who are members of it are sinners. Therefore, he is “convinced” it should be “preached” against. He is “convinced” Masons are sinners, yet he fellowships them! With “convictions” like yours, how can you

“consistently” fellowship sinners? Your “convictions” make you “preach!” against Masons, to save them from their hurtful errors, and, to save the Church from troubles created by Masonry, but, will not permit you to remove the “troubles and “errors” from the Church! Is this “consistent with the law of Christ?” May I say in the words of an eminent preacher and debater; “Oh! consistency where is thy jewelry!?”

You see, Brother Omega, you confirm my statement as to the reason for this discussion. What caused the “troubles in the Church over Masonry”? Why, someone was “convinced” Masons were “sinners”; and they “had” to preach against it. In preaching against Masonry they created a party opposed to it. An opposition party is an anti-party—a party in the Church is a faction. But this faction is opposed to Masonry. Therefore: An anti-masonic faction.

What does this anti-Masonic faction do? Why, it presumes to judge, and legislate for God! It judges all Masons; as having in their simplicity been hoodwinked and led into error, to be sinners. Not content with assuming the Divine prerogative of judgment; they also presume to legislate for God, by granting “partial fellowship” to Masonic brethren.

Consistency, did you say? The Bible teaches, one is either “in fellowship”, or “out” of fellowship. If one is “in” fellowship he is entitled to “all” the rights and privileges of that fellowship. If he is “out” of fellowship he is entitled to none. How do you “preach” this, Brother Omega? Will your “convictions” permit you to accept the conclusions? Can you “consistently” refuse to accept the consequences? If you accept them have you not made an opinion a test of fellowship? Is this “consistent” with the Christian religion?

While you were preaching against Masonry, did you forget some plain statements of Holy Writ, given to promote love, peace, and harmony, such as the following: “Of these things put them in remembrance, charging them in the sight of the Lord, that they strive not about words, to no profit, to the subverting of them that hear.” 2 Tim. 2:14. “But foolish and unlearned (untaught) questionings refuse, knowing that they gender strife.” 2 Tim. 2:23 “For we hear of some that walk among you disorderly . . . but are busybodies.” 2 Thess. 3:11. “For let none of you suffer . . . as a busybody in other men’s matters.” 1 Pet. 2:15. In the light of today’s preaching and practice will you tell me how these scriptures can be violated? The “other man” has no business, it is all “ours”! Is your “preaching” contributing to this condition? Do you approve the “busybody’s” and censure the one he condemns? Is this “consistent” with your “convictions” of the Christian religion?

The Negative Arguments

Brother Omega accepts My definition of terms and agrees that 1. Masonry is a human institution. 2. And, an opinion. This, he grants with reservations and modifications. He says: “If in the second premise, ‘Masonry is such an opinion,’ be granted, Alpha’s arguments is UNIMPEACHABLE.” Thank you sir. It is our purpose to PROVE IT, not to merely have it “GRANTED.” We can prove it by answering your eight objections. If I answer them, my argument stands, I have proved the proposition. This you concede. Now, Brother Omega, are you ready to accept the proposition as proved with the answer to these eight objections, or do you mean these eight plus eighty more? Then where do we go from there?

I do not, I did not, obligate myself to approve and defend every statement made by Masonic writers. I am sure, Brother Omega, you would neither approve nor defend, every statement made in the brotherhood in the last fifty years. I wouldn’t. Hence, the necessity of a standard. Since we both have MACKAY’S ENCYCLOPEDIA, suppose we limit our references and quotations to it.

1. Your first objection is: “Christians are obligated to practice one “pure and undefiled religion.” Jas. 1:27. 2. Masonry is another religion. 3. Therefore: Masons violate their Christian obligations by practicing two religions. Does the conclusion follow? Let us hear Mackey on this. Mackey’s Revised Encyclopedia, page 847-48, Article Religion: “But, that we may be truly understood, it will be well first to agree upon the true definition of religion.

There is nothing more illogical than to reason upon undefined terms. Webster has given four distinct definitions of religion:

1. Religion, in a comprehensive sense, includes, he says, a belief in the being and perfections of God—in the revelation of His will to man—in man’s obligation to obey His commands—in a state of reward and punishment, and in man’s accountableness to God; and also true godliness or piety of life, with the practice of all moral duties.
2. His second definition is, that religion, as distinct from theology, is godliness or real piety in practice, consisting in the performance of all known duties to God and our fellowmen, in obedience to divine command, or from love to God and His law.
3. Again, he says that religion, as distinct from virtue or morality, consists in the performance of the duties we owe directly to God, from a principle of obedience to His will.
4. Lastly, he defines religion to be any system of faith or worship; and in this sense, he says, religion comprehends the beliefs and worship of Pagans and Muhammadans as well as of Christians, any religion consisting in to belief of a superior power, or powers, governing the world, and in the worship of such power or powers. It is in this sense that we speak of the Turkish religion, or the Jewish religion, as well as of the Christian.”

“Now, it is plain that, in either of the first three senses in which we may take the word religion, and they do not very materially differ from each other, Freemasonry may rightfully *claim* to be called a religious institution. Closely and accurately examined it will be found to answer to anyone of the requirements of either of these three definitions. So much does it ‘include a belief in the being and perfections of God,’ that the public profession of such a faith is essentially necessary to gain admission into the Order. No *Disbeliever* in the existence of God can be made a Freemason. The “revelation of His will to man is technically called the spiritual, moral, and Masonic Trestle-Board of every Freemason, according to the rules and designs of which he is to erect the spiritual edifice of his eternal life.” . . .

“But it must be confessed that the fourth definition does not appear to be strictly applicable to Freemasonry. It has no pretension to assume a place among the religions of the world as a sectarian “system of faith and worship”, in the sense in which we distinguish Christianity from Judaism, or Judaism from Mohammedanism. In this meaning of the word we do not and can not speak of the Masonic religion, nor say of a man that he is not a Christian, but a Freemason. Here it is that the opponents of Freemasonry have assumed mistaken ground in confounding the idea of a religious institution with that of the Christian religion as a peculiar form of worship, and in supposing, because Freemasonry teaches religious truth that it is offered as a substitute for Christian truth and Christian obligations.

Its warmest and most enlightened friends have never advanced nor supported such a claim. It inculcates virtue, but it supplies no scheme of redemption for sin. It points its

disciples to the path of righteousness, but it does not claim to be “the way, the truth, and the Life.” This is a lengthy quotation, but there are several things we learn from it, in learning them, we refute his first objection.

1. Masonry is a religion in that it requires piety, reverence and respect, toward God.
2. It teaches religious truth: Virtue.
3. It teaches men to perform their duties to God, and their fellowmen.

All of these, they learn from God’s “revelation” to man, THE BIBLE, Is it sinful for men to believe and practice these things? Is it sinful for an organization to teach and require them? Is one violating his obligation as a Christian when he practices them? If not, your first objection is answered, my argument stands. Remember, Brother Omega,

1. Masonry is a religion. In a certain sense. I haven’t denied it.
2. The religion of Masonry is the teaching that men should perform their duties and obligations to God and men.
3. Therefore: The practice of Masonry is consistent with the only “pure and undefiled religion.”
2. Do you really take your second objection seriously? Hear McGarvey on Matt. 23:9:10. “Thus Jesus reproves those who make religion a matter of praise — *seeking ostentation*, whether they do so by seeking positions, or by peculiarity of dress, or by assuming or accepting titles of honor or distinction. This sin of ostentation was the first enumerated sin of the Pharisees.” Fourfold Gospel. Page 608. The objection is not to the title; but to the motive behind it. Paul assumed the title, Father, in 1 Cor. 4:15. Did he violate Matt. 23:9-10? If not, neither does the Mason with the right motive.
3. Is it a violation of the Christian obligations to say: “The Hiram Abif story is a legend, a tradition?” Hear Mackey: “There is no character in the annals of Freemasonry whose life is so dependent on tradition as the celebrated Architect of King Solomon’s Temple. Profane history is entirely silent in respect to his career. To fill up the space between his life and his death, we are necessarily compelled to resort to those oral legends which have been handed down from the Ancient Freemasons to their Successors. Yet, looking to their character, I should be unwilling, says Brother Mackey, to vouch for the authenticity of all; most of them were probably at first symbolical in their character; the symbol in the lapse of time having been converted into a myth, and the myth, by constant repetition having assumed the formal appearance of a truthful narrative.” Page 455. From this quotation it is evident Masons do not contradict the faith or deny the Scriptures. They admit it is a legend, more than likely, a myth.

Paragraph 4. and 5. may be answered together as they are different ways of stating the same objection. Hear Mackey again. “The ‘revelation of His will to man’ is technically called the spiritual, moral, and Masonic Trestle-Board of every Freemason, according to the rules and designs of which he is to erect the spiritual edifice of his eternal life.” Page 847.

To every Christian, “God’s revelation to man” is the Bible. The Lodge points each member to The Book, and says: “Therein is eternal life build on it.” Brother Omega. is this the rule by which you walk? If so, we walk by the same rule. Why not read the entire verse?

“Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing.” Now, hear Johnson: “The meaning is, Those who have not reached the status I have described, let them make the right use of all the light, ability and knowl-

edge they have obtained.” *Johnson’s Commentary*, Page 219. This puts a different light on it, doesn’t it? You walk by THE BOOK, in the light of your knowledge; the Mason walks by THE BOOK, in the light of his; are you not walking by the same rule? Do you condemn him because he hasn’t “attained” as far as you? When Masons come to understand the implications of their own principles; they will obey the Gospel.

No. 5 is answered in the same way. Brother Omega, you know a Mason is taught: “To take the Bible as his rule of faith and practice.” In doing this; he must be obedient to Christ. In obedience to Christ; he becomes “complete in Him who is the head of all principalities and powers.” Col. 2:10. Is this inconsistent with the Christian religion?

You must have succumbed to a debater’s temptation to make a play upon the words “better morality” and “better relationships.” Suppose I made a statement like this:

1. A Christian may be a member of an organization which stands for “better morality” and “better relationships.”
2. The United Nations is such an organization.
3. Therefore: A Christian may be a member of the UN.

Would you, or any of the readers of this paper, think I meant the U.N. stood for “better morality” and “better relationships” than Christianity? If so, I might as well quit now! ! Such assumptions are not to be reasoned with! Your sixth objection charges of fellowship with Atheists! Yet, you tell me, you are a Past Master. Did you never hear it said: “No atheist can be made a Mason for . . . ?” Does not

Mackey say: “No disbeliever in the existence of God can be made a Freemason?” Page 847. But, you quote: “Neither French nor Belgian Masonry requires faith in God as a condition of fellowship (Emphasis, Omega).” So What, do you recognize them as Mason? I don’t. Suppose someone charged you with fellowship with all the denominations of this country, calling them Christians, would you accept them? Neither do I accept your atheists as Masons.

If we believe the Masonry we were taught, we cannot believe an atheist is a Mason. Hence, I do not have fellowship with unbelievers. Your sixth objection is barren. I find but seven of your eight objections in this article, hence, I can’t attend to but seven this time.

No, Brother Omega, I didn’t vote either way! Do you think my vote would have changed his state? If it would, what would you have had me do? Vote him out or let him stay in Hell?

Seriously, Brother Omega, do you think Mason’s go back upon all their principles at the death of a member? If, at the beginning of Masonry we are taught “eternal life” is conditioned upon our building upon “The Book”, is it not still true at the end? Anything a Mason may say has behind it this principle. Is this inconsistent with the Christian religion?

I have answered all of your objections, and have shown them not to be contrary or inconsistent “with the obligations of the Christian religion.” Hence, my argument stands, and “Masonry is such an opinion”. My conclusion is “UNIMPEACHABLE”. Therefore: A Christian can be an active Freemason consistently with the obligations of the Christian religion.

Sincerely,
Alpha

SECOND NEGATIVE

Fellowship, Factions or Facts?

Brother Alpha hopes to sidetrack our discussion to a quarrel over factions and fellowship. If, after he tries his hand in dealing with the *facts* about Masonry I present, he wishes a discussion on fellowship, I will be ready. However, I will stay with *facts* about masonry in this discussion, and let him fuss over factions. My plan is to center each article for a while on some major inconsistency between Masonry and the

Bible; by this plan brother Alpha and I should be able to “thrash out” pretty well the salient issues involved. Many readers, both Masons and non-Masons, will lack familiarity with some facts to be presented in this discussion. I propose a way for you to verify what is presented.

Brother Alpha has seen the “necessity of a standard”, suggesting Mackey’s works. So you outsiders ask the Masons in your community to suggest a good work recommended for outsiders by their lodge. Any work they recommend, while it won’t reveal their „secrets”, will confirm the main facts presented in this discussion. I challenge my ex-brethren in the lodge to ask their fellow Masons concerning Mackey, or Pierson, or Chase, or Webb, or Morris, or Sickel, or, if you are (v. the Scottish Rite, Albert Pike’s *Morals and Dogma*. This way, all can ascertain whether *facts* are presented. This article is concerned primarily with one of the major issues involved in the debate, viz., the relation between Masonry and religion, and Masonry and Christianity. So we present now, as

Fact No. 1. Masonry is a religion. The Kentucky Monitor says this on page 28. and Alpha says, “I haven’t denied it.” We: will presently inquire as to the “certain sense” in which Alpha says it “is a religion”, but now get Alpha’s predicament:

(1) Masonry is a religion. Alpha admits it.

(2) Masonry “is a human institution originating in the seventeenth century.” Alpha’s first affirmative says this.

(3) Alpha’s conclusion: Therefore, it is consistent “with the obligations of the Christian religion” for a Christian to be in a “human institution” which “is a religion”. What a conclusion! Remember, brother Alpha, Masonry is a religion, and a human one. Is this the “Jewelry” of your consistency, to say a Christian can embrace two religions, one human and the other the “pure and. undefiled religion”? Tell us, Alpha, which of these is Masonry? If Masonry’s religion is “pure and undefiled religion”, that makes the religion of James 1:27 “human”, or as you put it in your first affirmative, “not of divine origin”. Masonry 4 a religion a human institution, not of divine origin, according to you, yet you say, “When Masons come to understand the implications of their own principles, they will obey the gospel.” Alpha, does a human institution, not of divine origin, yet “a religion”, have “implications” that say a man “must be obedient to Christ”? You say obedience to Christ is in the “implications” of Masonry, yet the truth is, The lodge does not stand, and has never stood for the implications. No one, as a Mason, was ever taught that Baptism for the remission of sins into the church of Christ is a Masonic implication.

Yet baptism is necessary to obedience to Christ. Therefore, on this point and many others, Masonry does not stand, and has never stood, for obedience to Christ. But, cries Alpha, it is right to be a Mason, because Masonry teaches one to “take the Bible as his rule

of faith and practice”, even though Masonry does not teach the “implications” of the Bible for undenominational Christianity. Note the deadly parallels to Alpha’s reasoning:

- (1) “The Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants” (Chillingworth).
- (2) If Protestants “understood the implications of their own principles they would obey the Gospel.”
- (3) Therefore, Alpha’s argument demands it is consistent with the obligations of the Christian religion for a Christian to be a denominationalist.

Or again,

- (1) The Methodist Church is a religion teaching that men should perform their duties to God and man.
- (2) If Methodists understood the implications of their principles they would obey the Gospel.”
- (3) Therefore, declares Alpha’s reasoning, membership in Methodism is consistent with that only “pure and undefiled religion”.

Or again,

- (1) A Christian may be a member of an organization standing “for better morality” and “better relationships”.
- (2) The Baptist Church is such an organization.
- (3) Therefore, Alpha argues unwittingly, a Christian may be a member of the Baptist Church.

Alpha remonstrates: But I said, “United Nations”. My dear Alpha, the U. N. is not parallel with Masonry because “Masonry is a religion” and the U. N. is not. Right?

Mackey on that “certain sense” *Alpha garbles Mackey*. Alpha tries desperately to make Mackey teach that Masonry is not a “system of faith and worship” as in Webster’s fourth definition. Dear reader, study carefully the four definitions in Alpha’s article. Two cases of misinterpretation are obvious:

(a) Mackey misses Webster’s fourth definition and (b) Alpha garbles Mackey. Mackey quotes Webster’s fourth definition of religion, but in his application overlooks this part of it after the examples given: “any religion consisting of belief of a superior power or powers governing the world, and in the worship of such power or powers.” Yet this last is precisely what both Mackey and Alpha declare Masonry is, i.e., faith in, and worship of, God. Now Alpha, Mackey does not say, Masonry is not “a system of faith and worship.” He does say, it is not “sectarian system of faith and worship” (Emp. Omega). Thus Masonry is “a system of faith and worship”, but, not a sectarian one “in the sense in which we distinguish Christianity from Judaism, or Judaism from Mohammedanism” (Ency. p. 618). Read carefully the following from Alpha’s standard:

“But the religion of Masonry is not sectarian. It admits men of every creed into its hospitable bosom, rejecting none and approving none for his peculiar faith. It is not Judaism, though there is nothing in it (the first three degrees — the ones the various rites have in common —Omega) to offend a Jew; it is not Christianity, but there is nothing in it repugnant to the faith of a Christian. It’s religion is that general one of nature and primitive revelation handed down to us from some ancient and patriarchal priesthood—in which all men may agree and in which no men can differ” (ibid., p. 618).

Yea, brother Alpha, I Masons understood the “implications” of this bit of balderdash, they might logically become Jews or Muhammadans. You garbled Mackey. Hear Mackey further under the specific heading of “The Christianization of Masonry”, (p. 149).

“Hutchinson, and after him, Oliver . . . have, I am constrained to believe, fallen into

aggrave error in calling the Master Mason's Degree a Christian institution. It is true that it embraces within its scheme the great truths of Christianity upon the subject of the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body, but this was to be presumed, because Freemasonry is truth, and all truth must be identical. But the origin of each is different . . . The principles of Freemasonry preceded the advent of Christianity. Its symbols and its legends are derived from Solomon's temple and from people even anterior to that.

Its religion comes from the ancient priesthood; its faith was that primitive one of Noah and his immediate descendants. If Masonry were simply a Christian institution, the Jews and the Moslem, the Brahman and the Buddhist, could not partake of its illumination. But its universality is its boast. In its language citizen of every neon may converse; at its altar men of all religions may kneel; to its creed disciples of every faith may subscribe."

Undoubtedly, brother Alpha, to have a religion like Masonry that "is not sectarian" like Christianity is a great blessing to the race. Yes, if we understood the "implications" of these principles we might obey the gospel— Buddha or Mohammed! All such teaching by "brother" Mackey makes "better men", eh Alpha? just like Buddha stood for better morality and better relationships; made better men!

The Koran? or The Bible?

Alpha says, Masonry "points each member to the Book, and says: Therein is eternal life, build on it." But hear Alpha's "standard" give Masonry's view of the Bible (Ibid., p. 104). "The Bible is properly called a greater light . . . " If it is a "greater light", Alpha, what other lights are needed to build for "eternal life"? Why not say, *the only light*? But hear Mackey. The Bible is used among Masons as a symbol of the will of God, *however it may be expressed*, and therefore, whatever to any people expresses that will may be used as a substitute for the Bible . . . Thus in a lodge consisting entirely of Jews, the Old Testament alone may be placed upon the altar, and Turkish Masons make use of the Koran. Whether it be the Gospels to the Christian, the Pentateuch to the Israelite, the Koran to the Mussulman, or the Vedas to the Brahmin, it everywhere Masonically conveys the same idea—that of the symbolism of Divine will revealed to man (Idem., Emp. Omega).

Some standard, isn't it Alpha? If you decide you don't like this "standard", please suggest another. In case our readers think Mackey is alone in this, I herewith quote *Chase's Digest of Masonic Law*, p. 206: "To require that a candidate profess faith in the divine authenticity of the Bible . . . is a serious innovation in the very body of Masonry (first three degrees) . . . It is anti-masonic to require any religious test other than the candidate should believe in *a God*, the Creator and Governor of the Universe" (Emp. Omega). That "certain sense" in which Masonry "is a religion" almost has scents, Alpha. Study your sophistry, below.

(1) You say Masonry is a religion in the sense that it teaches members to believe in (a) God, (b) the revelation of God's will, and (c) and in man's obligation to obey His commands. But it now comes out: Mackey meant belief in *a God*, a revelation and some commands—not *the* God, the revelation and the commands of the Bible.

(2) You say "Masonry is a religion" in that it stands for the performance of all known duties to God and man. My frustrated brother Alpha, any lodge can *know* Acts 22:16 by reading it, or your reading it to them. Did you ever hear of a lodge that stood for Baptism into the Body of Christ as a duty to God, No? Then it should read, some commands, for Masonry chooses which commands it will stand for.

(3) But Alpha cries, the Masons are told, theoretically at least, “take the Bible as their rule of faith and practice”, and, since they simply have not “attained” as far as I, I should not condemn them, for we both “walk by the same rule”. You garble Johnson, too. You take what he says about Christians and apply it to those who haven’t obeyed the Gospel, and you have alien sinners “walking by the same rule” as Christians. To garble is not even Masonically ethical. But will you admit, Alpha, that Christians who have “attained” to an undenominational status would do wrong to go back and “walk by the same rule” as the denominationalist? Note this deadly parallel:

(1) Both Masonry and denominationalism theoretically take the Bible as a greater light or as the rule of faith and practice.

(2) Neither Masonry nor Denominationalism have “understood the implications of their own principles” to attain so far as “obedience to the Gospel” or to an undenominational, pure Christianity.

(3) Therefore both Masonry and Denominationalism “walk by the same rule” and in the same sense.

(4) Therefore, Alpha’s logic demands, it is “consistent with the obligations of the Christian religion” for a Christian to practice both Masonry and *denominationalism*.

Since Alpha believes denominationalism is inconsistent with the Bible, we conclude that, till Alpha does better than he has so far, it is not consistent with the Christian religion for a Christian to be either a denominationalist or a Mason. Why? First, Masonry is a human religion, taking in all religions and all denominations. So say Alpha and his standard. Second, Alpha’s arguments support the practice of denominationalism as much as Masonry. Whatever supports denominationalism must be inconsistent with Christianity. Next time we will center our attention on another inconsistency, and review more “answers” by Alpha. Till then, Mahhah- bone, brother Alpha.

Sincerely,
Omega

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

Fellowship, Faction or Facts?

Brother Omega has forgotten what proposition we are discussing. Here it is: “A Christian can be an active Freemason consistently with the obligations of the Christian religion.” “Consistency with the obligations of the Christian religion” *is* part of the proposition! Such discussions would never occur, IF, Omega, and those of like persuasion would act “consistently with the obligations of the Christian religion.” When I question brother Omega upon his inconsistencies; he shies around them like a mule around, a hole in the bridge. He becomes as careful as an Old Maid on her first date! Relax!, Omega, I shall be a perfect gentleman!

Omega wants to postpone the discussion of *consistency* to “some more convenient season.” My book says, “Now is the acceptable time.” If you have any “Facts” that will throw any “light” upon your “actions” and “convictions”—let’s have them -Now! I am not surprised, Omega, doesn’t know what the proposition is. He switched propositions in his first article.

He has been affirming all the while; “It is according to his “plan” of the debate. He took one look at my “plan”, and “fled to the woods”, coming out with a new proposition! If this is your 11 plan”, write out your proposition; head it affirmative, consider it signed, I’ll put negative on mine.

Omega has admitted, Masonry is a human institution, and, an opinion. On this we agree. We have found some common ground. I hope we shall find more as we progress. When you present a REAL objection; I shall acknowledge it; if it is unreconcilable with Christianity, I will renounce it. To this point, your objections reveal an utter misapprehension of both Christianity and Masonry! I think you were “lost on the way to Joppa!”

Now To Attend To Your “Facts”

Omega’s “Facts” resolve themselves into “garbled” quotes” of my words. Any objection dependent upon such a method for force is no objection at all. Omega preaches, as all gospel preaches should, to properly understand a writer, see his statements in their context.

Furthermore, to take a statement out of its context, and give it a meaning foreign to the purpose of the writer, is to pervert the writing. This, Omega believes, preaches and practices, until he starts debating! Then, if he can make an argument by “lifting” a word, phrase or clause, out of its context . . . THE ARGUMENT MUST BE MADE! CHRISTIANITY? CONVICTIONS? PRINCIPLE? CONSISTENCY? — MAKE THE ARGUMENT! I understand why he doesn’t want to talk about “consistency with the obligations of the Christian religion.”

When Omega saw those statements in their proper context, he said: “The argument is unimpeachable.” He hopes you have forgotten that, and will not look for them! I am satisfied with the arguments I made; NOW, that I have seen the method used in an effort to answer them, I appreciate them MUCH more!

Masonry is a religion ! Alpha admits it! Yes, Alpha admitted it. I want Omega to make all out of it he can! This has been the “Big Buggeroo” of all the objectors I have ever met.

When Omega saw that statement, like the fearless knight of old, he mounted his trusty steed, and with lance at the ready, charged furiously forth to slay the Dragon! Dismount! Don! Ground your lance!; I’ll cut the windmill off! Omega answers questions so well; I’ll give him some more! Your answers to these questions will show us HOW serious an error the religion of Masonry IS!

1. In becoming a Mason; were you asked to change your faith in any way?
2. Did they point out another “revelation”% and ask you to accept it?
3. Did they tell you they intended to ask you to do something contrary to your faith?
4. Did becoming a Mason weaken your faith in the Bible?
5. Is Masonry a religion requiring acceptance of a creed, with a formal order of worship? Be “specific”!
6. In becoming a Mason, what doctrine does a Christian ADD to his faith? Omega, lets have a little “specific” light here!
7. If a Christian ADDS anything to his faith; HOW could you have become a Mason?
8. Is it necessary for him to accept anything-he doesn’t already believe?

The “fact” of the matter is, “Masonry is a human institution emphasizing the actual practice of certain religious principles.” For this reason, it may claim to be called a religious institution or a religion. This, is what Alpha admits. The statements of Ma-

sonic writers mean no more than this. **THIS** is the religion of Masonry! What a Dragon! All good men should arm themselves, and hurry out to slay it! Don Quixote Omega will lead the charge! When you get to the water trough; see if the *Windmill* isn't off!

Omega thinks I am in a predicament. If one doesn't know the difference between Christianity, Masonry, and Denominationalism I am! But, to one who is able to see the difference, it is no predicament at all! Omega wants to patch up James 1:27. What makes James 1:27 "pure and undefiled religion"? Is it "pure and undefiled" when practiced by a Christian, and "human" when practiced by a non-christian? Is this your idea of it? Lets have a little "light" here! Your dissertation on "implications" amuses me! There is a difference in a general principle, and a "specific" positive Divine command! Omega, is Baptism a general principle, or a positive Divine command? Objectors never die; they just "fade away" with their absurd contentions!

Omega's parallels reveal a lack of discrimination. Of the Masonic Lodge I said: "it is not a rival of the church." Omega places the Baptist and Methodist churches in the same category! Does Omega affirm these are not rivals of THE Church? If not, your argument is a fallacy of confusion!

Who "Garbles" Mackey? Read It! "But it must be confessed that the fourth definition does not appear to be applicable to Freemasonry. It has no pretension to assume a place among the religions of the world as a sectarian system of faith and worship, in the sense in which we distinguish Christianity from Judaism, or Judaism from Mohammedanism. In this meaning of the word we *do not* and *cannot* speak of the Masonic religion. Here it is that the opponents of Freemasonry have *assumed mistaken ground in confounding* the idea of a religious institution with that of the Christian religion *as a peculiar form of worship*, and in supposing because Freemasonry teaches religious truth, that it is offered as a substitute for Christian truth and Christian obligation." page 847. Mackey says: "Its opponents assume mistaken ground in supposing the religion of Masonry *is a peculiar form of worship*." This, is what Omega labors to prove, but Mackey says, *it isn't!* Are you still with Mackey?

Omega makes a play on *a God*. My proposition says: "A Christian", and a Christian knows: "For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or on earth; as there are gods many, and Lords many; yet to us there is *ONE* God. . . "Howbeit, there is not in all men that knowledge." I Cor. 8. Apparently Brother Omega doesn't have this knowledge! But, Gospel preachers should have more knowledge than that!

He isn't satisfied with his efforts on "walking by the same rule", so, he tries his hand again. When you were in the lodge; did you walk by the Koran, and the Bible? I would like to know about that? How many rules did you have? And you were a Christian all the time?

Be "specific". Notice his deadly parallel! "Neither Masonry nor Denominationalism have "understood the implications of their own principles" to attain so far as "obedience to the Gospel", or to an undenominational, "pure Christianity." Well, lets see:

1. The Leaders of the Restoration Movement were in Denominationalism.
2. They accepted, and came to understand, the principle of taking the Bible as "their rule of faith and practice."
3. Therefore: They obeyed the Gospel, and restored "pure Christianity." History is on my side of this argument! How do you think the Church began in America? We have been teaching for years: A man can take the Bible and find the truth. Omega says, "They have never followed the "implications" to obedience to the gospel!" "Balder dash!", he calls it. I wonder, if he is arguing from a "national restoration" view point? Is that what you mean has never happened? Are you looking for it to happen sometime? Give us some "specific" light here!

We have considered Omega's labored objections; "weighed them and found them to be wanting" of any "fact" which would prevent: "A Christian from being an active Freemason consistently with the obligations of the Christian religion."

Come on, Omega; "I have been with you in seven troubles; I'll not forsake you in the eighth."

Sincerely,
Alpha

THIRD NEGATIVE

The Proposition

Alpha's antics over my refusal to "fuss over factions" are understandable. He charges I changed the proposition, yet he had done his level best all along a change the original proposition to the following: "A Christian may not fellowship brethren who are Masons consistently with the obligations of the Christian religion." *This is not the proposition, Alpha!* But, Alpha objects, "consistency with the obligations of the Christian religion is part of the proposition." Since the question of "fellowship and factions" is involved in the obligations of a Christian, therefore, argues our prize-winner in illogic, it is the theme we are discussing. A parallel would be, faithfulness in taking the communion is one of the "obligations of the Christian religion." Our proposition mentions those "obligations."

Therefore, Alpha and I really intended to discuss the Lord's Supper! *Remember, Alpha, the issue is: whether a Christian can be an active Free Mason, not whether Christians may fellowship certain erring brethren.* This latter question could well succeed our present one, but they are not the same!

My Plan

If I deny that Christian membership in the lodge is "consistent" with Christianity, I thereby affirm that there are inconsistencies between the two. If I can prove that membership in Masonry is inconsistent, i.e., sinful, I thereby deny it is consistent. Don't you see that, dear Alpha? If a missionary Baptist affirms that the church was set up before Pentecost, do I change the proposition, when I prove it was established on Pentecost? Our ex-masonic brother apparently knows nothing of debating. One perfectly valid method to use in denying a proposition is to prove a counter proposition. Another method is to reduce the proposition to absurdity. I have used both methods so far: I proved Masonry is a human religion with prayers, purposes, and methods copied from, even if they are perversions of, the Bible. I showed that, since Masonry is a human religion, as Alpha admits, it cannot be the one and only "pure and undefiled religion." I further proved from Mackey that Masonry is a mongrel religion accepting many religions, symbols, flattering titles, revelations, and prayers, yet not as "sectarian" as Christianity. Then I reduced Alpha's arguments to absurdities by proving they support denominationalism equally as much as Masonry. In my next article I will center my attention on one phase of masonic error, but

now see The Arguments Thus Far Alpha's first affirmative said simply, if Masonry is a harm. less opinion, it can be held "consistently with the obligations of the Christian religion." I countered in my first negative:

if Masonry is *harmless*, I agree that it can be practiced by Christians. But, I continued, my contention is, *there are inconsistencies*, i.e., Masonry is not a harmless opinion, i.e., *Masonry is harmful to the Christian*. I then listed seven inconsistencies between the practice of Free Masonry and the word of God. I give below the present status of these seven inconsistencies.

1. Masonry, a human religion, is an addition to the only divine one, therefore inconsistent with the only pure and undefiled religion. Alpha objected that Mackey, his "standard" in the discussion, says that Masonry is not a religion in the sense Christianity is. I replied, the point to Mackey's statement is, Masonry is not *sectarian* like Christianity. But now Alpha quotes a similar statement from Mackey to the effect that Masonry is not "*a Peculiar form of worship*" like Christianity. Again, Mackey does not say Masonry is not a form of worship, but he does say Masonry is not a peculiar form like Christianity. His whole encyclopedia, indeed all of his voluminous writings emphasize the worship aspect of Masonry. Now Alpha on this very point, *listen carefully. Please. Please-give some comments on, answers to, or repudiation of your standard on pages 149 and 104*. Dear reader, you go back and reread these quotations in my second negative. You will see immediately why Alpha desperately avoided these two bits of balderdash from his "standard". To these two, add the following climactic assertion Mackey makes on the religious aspect of Masonry. Now, get it, Alpha. Mackey is talking about the "sublime" lesson you and I learned in becoming Master Masons. *Where did we learn the lesson? From the Bible? No! But, in this case, from tradition!*

"It was the single object of all the ancient rites and mysteries practised in the very bosom of Pagan darkness, . . . to teach the immortality of the soul. This is still the great design of the Third degree of Masonry. This is the scope and aim of its ritual. The Master Mason represents man, when youth, manhood, old age, and life itself, have passed away as fleeting shadows, *yet raised from the grave of iniquity, and quickened into another and a better existence*. By its legend and all its ritual it is implied that we have been redeemed from the death of sin and the sepulcher of *pollution*. 'The ceremonies and the lecture,' says Dr. Crucefix, 'beautifully illustrate this all-engrossing subject; and the conclusion we arrive at is, that youth, properly directed, leads us to honorable and virtuous maturity, and that life of man, regulated by morality faith and justice, will be rewarded at its closing hour, by the prospect of eternal bliss'." (Mackey's Encyclopedia, pp. 474, 475, Emphasis-Omega).

Alpha affirms that a Christian, a regenerated person, can practice these legends and rituals which imply redemption, from sin and pollution! No wonder so many Christians are renouncing Freemasonry. They are beginning to see it in all its hideous, heathenish color.

Picture Alpha's predicament. Watch a "born-again" Christian go to a lodge as a candidate for the first degree. Now hear Mackey describe this Christian as he appears to Masons: "There he stands without our portals, or the threshold of this new Masonic life, in darkness, helplessness and ignorance. Having been wandering amid the errors and covered over with the pollutions of the outer and profane world, he comes inquiringly to our doors *seeking the new birth and asking a withdrawal of the veil which conceals the divine truth from his uninitiated sight*. . . There is to be not simply a change for the future, but also an extinction of the past; for initiation is as it were a death to the world and a resurrection to a new life" (Mackey's *Ritualist*, pp. 22, 23)."

In the initiation of an apprentice in Masonry . . . the initiate, entering upon a new life . . . passes into a new birth. This is, or ought to be, necessarily accompanied by some ceremony which should symbolically represent this great moral change . . . The shock of entrance is then . . . the symbol of the agonies of the first death and of the throes of the new birth” (*Encyclopedia*, 687).

Poor non-masonic Christian; Darkness, ignorance, pollutions covering him, no new birth, profane, divine truth hid from him, agonies, helplessness—these describe the nonmasonic child of God to Masonic eyes! But for Christians to perpetuate such descriptions is “consistent”, Alpha? Yes! “Consistent” with Satan!

2. Christians are obligated to avoid flattering titles (Matt. 23:2-10). Christ says, “Neither be ye called masters: for one is your master, even Christ.” Alpha says, Be called masters, “The objection is not to the title; but to the motive behind it.” Then a Catholic priest can be called father-provided his motive is pure! Alpha offers the Catholic quibble: Paul called himself father. Yes, but Paul “fathered”, begot, the Corinthians (I Cor. 4:15). I challenge you, Alpha, to try to prove that either the Catholic or Masonic use of the title is parallel to Paul’s. I reckon Alpha could reason this way, Mackey calls the worshipful master “the dispenser of Masonic light.” But Masonic light says Alpha, is only the true light of God’s word; therefore the worshipful master is the dispenser of God’s light; hence can be called “worshipful master.” Oh, yes, Alpha, I forgot to remind you: McGarvey is not my “standard”. Nor is Johnson.

3. The Hiramic legend, the “death, burial, and resurrection” of Hiram Abif, has, says Alpha, “the appearance of a truthful narrative,” but is a lie. Yet, in such serious matters as immortality, spirituality, and eternal life, Masons act out a lie (more on this later). To call it a legend and treat it as truth, is not “consistent” with anything but wrong.

4. Christians must walk by the same rule (Phil. 3:16). When the non-masonic Christian uses only the Bible to build for eternity, and the Masonic Christian adds the Masonic symbols 11 as working tools by which to form ourselves into perfect stones for that building which is to be an eternal home”, they do not walk by the same rule. Alpha’s reply? He quotes, and misrepresents Johnson. Try quoting 2 Tim. 3:17, Alpha.

5. The Christian is complete in Christ (Col. 2:10), yet he is in darkness, pollution, profanity, errors, the world, agony, and ignorance, till he seeks “the new birth” in Masonry (Mackey’s Ency. p. 687).

6. The Christians must come out from among unbelievers according to 2 Cor. 6:14-18, yet according to Alpha, he not only can get in with them, but also says Alpha, the Christian Mason and the denominational Mason “walk by the same rule.” Alpha, do you apply 2 Cor. 6 to fellowshiping denominationalists? How can you fellowship them in one religion, Masonry, and disfellowship them in another religion, Christianity?

7. Christians are to believe, “Blessed an be dead that die in the Lord” (Rev. 14:13), yet as a Mason (till I Named better), I gave the impression that the dead who die out of Christ and in denominations were “blessed with the prospect of eternal reward.” My brethren in Oklahoma, Florida, Texas, or wherever, certainly know the impression Masonic funerals leave. As quoted from a Mason& paper, one dead sectarian brother was called from the sacred lodge below to that Grand Lodge of the New Jerusalem. And brethren in Christ voted that such a resolution be printed in the Masonic paper. Alpha’s feeble reply was, “do you think Masons go back on their principles at the death of a member?” Brother, the only principle they have to go back on is the theoretical acceptance of the Bible. And they, and the denominations, go back on that continually. Since nei-

ther Masonry nor denominationalism teaches the Lord's specified conditions of salvation, neither one needs to go back on anything but its theoretical acceptance of the Bible. No, Alpha, your vote can not change the dead man, but it can affect your destiny. I still wonder what state you live in that you were never faced with such resolutions in the lodge. If you were, would you, as a Mason, have said, "no brethren, he died out of Christ; he has not gone to eternal bliss." Or would you do as I did, compromise the faith either wittingly or unwittingly?

Alpha's Questions

(1), (2)—Yes, although I did not realize it till later.

(3)—No, they didn't say they intended to.

(4)—Yes, but I didn't realize it till later. You haven't realized it yet. When I did realize it, my faith in the Bible destroyed my faith in Masonry, and I repented and began to teach others it was wrong!

(5)—Yes, though they call the masonic credo by different names.

(6)—Fellowship of unbelievers, many others.

(7)—Same way you did, through ignorance,

(8)—Yes, Masonry.

Omega

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

CROSS-EYED LOGIC

Our logical brother's first article charged me with "inconsistency with the Christian religion" in fellowshipping atheists, I pointed out that he fellowshipped the "sinner" who fellowshipped the atheist! His charge is logical; my reply is "illogical." Why? Alpha! Don't you know it isn't "logical" to limit an objector to consistency! We must give them license to use fallacies as valid arguments; to employ generalities other than "specific" instances. When I point out these things, he cries: "Alpha wants to fuss over fellowship and factions"; "Alpha is inexperienced and illogical." Poor, inexperienced, illogical, Alpha now knows—it is not only illogical, but, also contrary to the nature of an objector to act "consistently with the obligations of the Christian religion! But, credit where credit is due. I give him credit for being "consistent" in one thing; he misses the point more consistently than any man I ever knew. You will excuse me for not holding a stake while you strike!

His Plan

His plan, he tells us, is to destroy my position with a counter proposition and to reduce my arguments to absurdities. If he can do this by valid reasoning; well and good. But, in trying to do this he has worked the fallacy of accent overtime. As an example: in his

first article he *accented* the terms “morality” and “better relationship” to make me say Masonry stood for *better morality* and *better relationships* than Christianity. I pointed out his unfair and fallacious accent of these terms by the U. N. argument. Did he admit the fallacy? No! He seized the opportunity to commit another!

Omega knows: It is always unfair reasoning to use argument for another purpose, or for any purpose, contrary to the design of the writer, and the scope of his reasoning. Whether Omega did this intentionally or unintentionally, I leave to his own conscience, and his God. But, he must have done it intentionally or unintentionally, if intentionally, he acted inconsistently with, and unworthy of, the Christian religion. If unintentionally, he reveals an utter incompetency. By these methods, fallacy and unfair reasoning, he tries to reduce my arguments to absurdities. By these methods he reveals the barrenness of his resources; the paucity of his objections!

The Arguments Thus Far

In my first article, I proved Masonry to be a human institution, and, an opinion. Omega granted this, but objected it was also a religion. To make the issue clear I gave the Masonic definition of religion with Mackey’s explanation of it. From this, we showed conclusively that: “Masonry is not a sectarian system of religion”; not a peculiar form of worship.” Yet, Omega insists, on using it in this sense. He implies that in becoming a Mason a man accepts *every religion represented in Masonry by its members*. There are Masons, in the Church and out, reading these articles, and Omega knows, they know it isn’t so! Your statement, “Masonry is a mongrel religion accepting all religions,” is the most absurd thing I ever heard a “logical” man say. Don’t you know the difference between *acknowledging* a man is religious and in *accepting* his religion? I am sure our readers understand this; I doubt Omega does. He saves me the trouble of reducing his arguments to absurdities; they are self evident.

I asked him to give us the creed and the form of worship of the Masonic religion. This would have ended the debate. Why hasn’t he given them? He can’t. We present it like this:

1. A sectarian system of religion has a creed and a form of worship.
2. But, Masonry is not a sectarian system of religion.
3. Therefore: Masonry doesn’t have a creed and a form of worship.

1. A sectarian system of religion requires the renouncing of some items of faith and the acceptance of others.
2. But, Masonry is not a sectarian system of religion.
3. Therefore: Masonry doesn’t require the renouncing of some items of faith and the acceptance of others.

From these deductions it is evident that the Faith and practice of a Christian is not *changed* or *altered*, in any item or manner, when he becomes a Mason. Neither does he *endorse*, *approve*, or *accept* any doctrine of any *religion represented in Masonry*.

Masonry, Its Origin and Religion

Omega insists Masonry is a human institution with a human religion; what he means by a human religion he never says. An organization may be human in origin; the principles

it stands for may, or may not be. I will state the principles (religion) of Masonry; you be the judge of whether they are human or not. 1. In origin it is human. 2. It is called a religion because of its emphasis of certain *religious principles*. These principles are *not exclusively distinctive of, or peculiar to, any body of religious people*. This, is what Masonry means when it says: “It is *not sectarian, it is not Judaism, or Christianity*. But it is a religion (principles) all men can accept regardless of their religion.” What are these principles?

1. God is the creator of man; the designer of the universe. 2. The Fatherhood of God; the brotherhood of man. 3. Man owes his creator reverence, respect and obedience. 4. The performance of our duties to God and man because of these relationships. These are the principles (religion) of Masonry “upon which all can agree”, and “none can disagree.” Masonry does not tell men how they are to perform their duties to God; this is an individual obligation. Each man does this according to the dictates of his own conscience, and in the light of his own knowledge. Masonry does not say: “Lo! here; Lo! there; thus far and no farther!” She does not limit or interfere with the Faith of any man. These, are the principles (religion) of Masonry which Omega says are “inconsistent with the Christian religion.” Omega, did you give up these principles when you left Masonry? Do you preach we should renounce them?

In condemning Masonry you condemn these principles; whether you know it or not. You quote from Mackey, pages 474-75; 687, attempting to prove Masonry teaches the forgiveness of sins, and the new birth, are offered in it. To find the real meaning to these quotations, listen to this statement: “without a belief in personal immortality, religion is like an arch resting on one pillar, like a bridge ending in an abyss.” Each member brings his own personal belief in immortality into the lodge, and the degree illustrates that belief. There is a world of difference in what it means, and what Omega want to make it mean. Now note:

“Masonry accept religious men; religious men believe in the immortality of the soul; the degree *illustrates this belief* of the men it accepts.” “The degree illustrates the three stages of man’s life, youth, manhood, old age, and what may be expected after this life is over, if he has been *directed by divine truth*.” All the terms he emphasizes has. this thought in mind: the condition of man in the resurrection state. Omega, did you tell me you were a Mason? Man reaches this state by being *directed by divine truth*; not by being a Mason.

As to the “new birth” Masons do not use it in the sense Omega wants you to understand it. If Masons use it in the New Testament sense it is wrong; if they don’t, Omega has perverted it. We may determine the usage in this manner:

1. Either the Masonic and the New Testament usage of the term “new birth” is the same, or it isn’t.
2. In N. T. usage it is a part of the “scheme of redemption for sin.” But, Masonry has no “scheme of redemption for sin.” Mackey page, 848.
3. Therefore: The Masonic and the N. T. usage of the term “new birth” is not the same. Neither the Masonic Lodge nor Masonic writers teach “a scheme of redemption for sin.”

When Omega uses these terms as he has; he declares to all Masons he doesn’t know what they mean. Again, I am referred to Matt. 23:9:10. He doesn’t like my answer; and rejects McGarvey’s comment on the passages. “McGarvey is not my standard”, he says. No, nor mine. The N. T. is my standard. But, McGarvey was “a Prince of Bible scholars”, and, an exegete of no mean ability. I accept his comments, as I do all other Com-

mentator's, when they are in harmony with the design and scope of the sacred writers. His comments on these passages are not only true to the book; but, the *only one* within the design and scope of the speaker. The wording of your objection "flattering titles" show you use the passage according to McGarvey's interpretation!

Their *motive* was *praise* and *glory* from men; the titles "flattered" them; it gave them what they sought! Until you can quit thinking of, and using, the passages in this sense; don't question the accuracy of McGarvey's exegesis! You, unconsciously, put his construction upon them.

The Hiram legend is *dealt* an *ugly epithet*. Which, of course, reduces it to an absurdity. Omega is a *literalist*. What does the Hiram legend do? According to his own quotation it illustrates—pictures—not an *actual occurrence*, nor is it intended to do this, but, a universal fact—resurrection. His position requires that "a factual narrative must be used in all illustrations." I wonder why he doesn't call the O. T. story of the trees electing a king a lie. A Does he think it *actually* happened? Is it a *truthful* narrative? Was the prophet telling a lie? No, he expected them to see the *point*. Neither do Masons tell a lie, or act a lie, they expect men to see the *point*. Both stories are told with "all the appearance of a truthful narrative", but, neither the prophet nor Masons expect men to be *so simple* as to demand verification of the truthfulness of the stories.

We are walking by the same rule again! Omega thinks Masonic symbols are another rule by which I am walking. Masonic symbols are not an *addition* to any thing. Give me some symbols which *add* to a Christian's Faith and I will agree you are right. Until you do my position is correct. I showed in the first part of this article *Masonry does not use the terms* Omega has emphasized in the sense he presents them. Yes, a man is *complete* in Christ. *Masonry does not change or alter, add to nor take from, his completeness in Christ.*

I fellowship unbelievers (non-Christians) in Masonry the same way I do in every walk of life. I *acknowledge* they are *religious*; but I do not *endorse, approve or accept* their religion. Can you understand this, Omega?

"Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord." Omega thinks I usher unbelievers into eternal bliss, by being a Mason. I have never voted on such a resolution as he presents, strange as it may seem to him. But, Masonry makes "entrance into eternal bliss" conditional. Any thing they may say have these conditions attached. I suggest You readers ask Masons if they think they will go to heaven because they *are Masons*. I know what the conditions of entrance into eternal bliss are, and as a Christian I act consistently with them in the lodge or out. He wants to know what I would do if faced with a situation like this; I resolved before entering the lodge that the first thing I saw contrary to Christianity I would stop. I haven't changed my mind. If, as a Mason, I can't refuse to vote a man into heaven who has never obeyed the gospel. I don't want to be a Mason. So far they have never required me to-do. anything contrary to my convictions. Omega, were you a Mason and didn't know how to keep him out, if you didn't want him in?

Sincerely,
Alpha

FOURTH NEGATIVE

If steam were logic, Alpha would be an Aristotle. This is the only reply relevant to his first two paragraphs, since in them he makes no arguments and only *asserts* there was a fallacy in one of mine, conveniently forgetting to point out just what the fallacy was.

As to paragraph three, Alpha quibbles that Masonry does not accept all religions, but only acknowledges their participants to be religious. Also, Alpha declares, each man brings his religious beliefs into the lodge. Here then is the mongrel mess Alpha's Masonry is in: *Masonry is a religion in which a Christian participates with men of other religions, yet without limiting or interfering with the faith of any man.* It would be inconsistent with what we owe Christ if we, as Masons, tried to limit or interfere with a Jew or Mohammedan in our religious order, eh, Alpha? I held my sides with laughter as I read your syllogisms in paragraph 4. Were I teaching logic, I would use your syllogisms as perfect examples of fallacies. Converting them to conditional arguments they are perfect examples of denying the antecedent, as in the following:

- (1) If turtles were birds, they would lay eggs.
- (2) But turtles are not birds.
- (3) Therefore, turtles do not lay eggs.

But turtles *do lay eggs*, even though they are not birds. And Masonry *does have a creed and a form of worship* even though it is not a sectarian religion. Note my *valid* reply to your fallacy.

- (1) Mongrel religions have creeds and forms of worship.
- (2) Masonry is a mongrel religion.
- (3) Therefore, Masonry has a creed and a form of worship.

Alpha, as illogical as you are, you can see the difference between *acknowledging* a man to be religious and actually *participating* in a *non-Christian* religion with him. My *valid* reply to your second *silly-gism* follows:

- (1) A Mongrel religion requires inconsistencies with Christian obligations.
- (2) Masonry is a mongrel religion.
- (3) Therefore, Masonry requires inconsistencies with Christianity.

Facts Louder Than Claims!

Because Masonic writers claim not to contradict Christianity, Alpha and many other Masons are blinded to the factual inconsistencies between the two. Tell us, Alpha, can a system claim not to interfere with a man's Christianity, while contradicting that claim by actually interfering with it? This is precisely what Masonry does, Alpha notwithstanding. Proof that Alpha is wrong, and that Masonry does contradict its claims, is hereby given from a standard work on Masonry, the *Kentucky-Monitor*. Listen, my Kentucky brethren, this is the book you use and whose *teachings you support*. (Tennessee brethren, take notice, quotations next month will come from your *Tennessee Craftsman*.)

On page 9 of the *Ky. Mon.*, the candidate is told, "these obligations contain nothing

which can conflict with duties you owe to God.” I wonder how the writer, a denominationalist, knows what things are inconsistent with New Testament Christianity? Anyway, on page XXI of the same monitor, Masonry is represented as saying, “*I am a way of common men to God.*”

Now, Alpha, are these two statements contradictory? Answer, please! If they are contradictory, would you say Christian brethren in Kentucky can be Masons still using this monitor and remain consistent with Christian convictions? Did the *Ky.-Mon.* go back on its claims? If you say yes, then you admit an instance of the very thing you have heretofore denied. If you say no, you admit it is consistent with Christ for Masonry to be “a way of Common men to God.” Answer either way. Watch next month to see Alpha impaled on one of the horns.

Again, the *Ky.-Mon.* says, pp. 73, 74, “the speculative Mason, therefore, is a moral builder for fitting immortal nature for that spiritual building which shall exist” in eternity. Now, if, as Alpha admits, men of all religions engage in this building program each in his own way, the Christian can be there building right alongside the Jew who says Christ was an illegitimate child? Right, Alpha? Ugh!

The Masonic Creed

Alpha vs. Masonry vs. Alpha. Our confused brother spends half his time denying that Masonry has a creed, the other half setting that creed forth. For what Alpha sets forth as Masonic teachings is, in part, what Mackey, Newton, and the Monitor calls their creed. Joseph Forte Newton, “than whom”, the *Ky.-Mon.* says, p. XI, “there is no greater Masonic scholar today,” says in giving “the Masonic creed” (*Religion of Masonry*, pp. 3-5),

“In English speaking lands, . . . our Masonry is essentially and nobly religious, both in its faith and practice . . . To ever our lodges a man must confess . . . faith in God—though he is not required definitely to define in what terms he thinks of God—in the principles and practice of morality, and in the immortality of the soul; though here again the exact nature of the future life, whether it be a physical resurrection or a triumph of spiritual personality, is not usually defined.”

So Masonry does have a creed, viz., (1) belief in a God regardless of how that god is conceived, (2) belief in morality whether it be that required by Moses, Confucius or Christ, (3) and belief in immortality whether viewed in the “light” (2 Tim. 1:10) Christ shed on it or not, and (4) belief in the will of God whether that will is expressed in the Koran, the law, or the Cyclopaedia of Buddhism. What noble principles. Incidentally, Newton’s *Religion of Masonry* is another perfect example of how Masonry contradicts its claims, for in this work, the author says, “everything in Masonry has reference to God” (p. 59), then says on p. 78. “Yet oddly enough at first, if all the teaching of Masonry implies the Fatherhood of God, its ritual does not actually affirm that truth, much less make it a test of fellowship. It is not an oversight, but a bit of true wisdom for which all men must be grateful, if they know what lies back of it. If Masonry made faith in *God the Father* a basis of membership, it would debar many a noble man who is unable to attain that faith, much as he wants to hold it and tries amid the tragedies of life to win it.”

Newton, remember, is the one, “than whom” the *Ky.-Mon.* says “there is no greater Masonic scholar today”. And this book, the *Religion of Masonry*, is published by *The Masonic Service Association of the United States*. Does Masonry contradict its claims, Alpha?

Masonic Worship

Newton, the great Masonic Scholar praised in the Ky.-Mon. says, Masonry is “not a church, but a worship, in which men of all religions may unite ... It is not the rival of any religion but the friend of all. (Ibid., p. 11, Emph.—Omega). Masonry’s peculiar form of worship is lodge worship through Masonically worded prayers, songs and ceremonies. In the Kentucky Monitor such songs and prayers abound, but there is no reference to the mediatorship of Christ. Christ’s name is left out of their prayers as a rule. Masonic symbols are used idolatrously, as the letter G, for example. The Ky.-Mon. describes the meaning of the letter G in the lodge, under which be “Worshipful Master” sits, as “That hieroglyphic bright which none but craftsman ever saw, alludes also to the name of Deity” (p. 101), and the Monitor says, “No brother who has in his heart bowed before that emblem can be profane” (Idem.).

So, Alpha Masonry has a creed and a form of worship. You sing with Jews, pray with Modernists, go through religious ceremonies with Methodists, and support a book, the Monitor, which says Masonry is a “way of common men to God”. All this is consistent with Christ’s teaching, eh, Alpha? Oh yes, Alpha, you have not yet commented on, repudiated or explained Mackey on pp. 104, 143. (See Feb. issue, pp. 20, 21.) Please do so next time!

Alpha Capitulates

Alpha has done went and done it now! He says, “Masonic symbols are not an addition to anything. Give me some symbols which add to the Christian’s faith and I will agree you are right.” Here are nine of those symbols, Alpha.

1. Lambskin—“In all ages the lamb has been deemed an emblem of innocence” (Mackey’s Ency., p. 421). This sign . . . teaches immortality as well as being emblematic of innocence and beauty (Ky.-Mon., p. 59). Does it add to a Christian’s faith, Alpha, to put an emblem of innocence on a Jew or Modernist?
2. All-seeing Eye—“The ancient Egyptians hieroglyphically represented their principle deity, the sun-god Osiris, by the figures of an open eye emblematic of the sun ... In like manner, Masons have emblematically represented the omniscience of the Great Architect of the Universe” (Ky.-Mon., p. 116). Is idolatry consistent with Christ, Alpha?
3. Acacia—In Mackey’s Lexicon, art. on “acacian” “signifying a Mason, who, by living in strict obedience to the obligations and precepts of the fraternity, is free from sin.” Believe it if you can, Alpha.
4. The Bible—You mean the Bible is only a symbol? Hear it: (Mackey’s Lex., art. on Bible; Ky.-Mon., p. 11), “The Bible is used among Masons as the symbol of the will of God, however it may be expressed.” Does it add to the Christian’s faith to view the Bible only as a symbol for the will of God rather than being itself the will of God? You said, Alpha, “I will agree you are right”. Will You?
5. Shock of enlightenment—“This mental illumination this spiritual light, which after his new birth, is the first demand of the new candidate, is but another name for Divine Truth” (Mackey’s Ritualist, p. 33). Who misunderstood, Alpha? Again, “Speculative Masonry is the application of the rules and principles of operative Masonry to the veneration of God and the purification of the heart” (Ibid., p. 39).

Alpha can boast all day long about Mackey's claim that Masonry "supplies no scheme of redemption from sin", but his boast is vain, for Mackey contradicts himself.

6. The common gavel—"A symbol . . . of the purification of the heart" (Ibid., p. 40). Can hearts be purified without a scheme of redemption, dear Aristotle?

7. The Grip of recognition. It is "called a token because it is an outward sign of the covenant of friendship and fellowship entered into between members of the fraternity" (Mackey's Lex., art. Token).

1. Masonry is a religion.

2. It involves the fellowship of non-Christians.

3. Therefore Masonry violates 2 Cor. 6:14-18.

8. Aaron—"In the degree of "chief of the Tabernacle", which is the twenty-third of the Ancient and Accepted Rite of Masonry, the presiding officer represents Aaron, and is styled, "Most Excellent High Priest" (Ency. p. 1). Is this an addition, Alpha? Or get this choice morsel: "Freemasonry and Alchemy have sought the same results (the lesson of Divine Truth and the doctrine of immortal life), and they have both sought it by the same method of symbolism. It is not, therefore, strange that in the eighteenth century, and perhaps before, we find an incorporation of much of the science of Alchemy into that of Masonry" (Ibid. p. 44). Nice associates you have, Alpha!

9. Shock of entrance—Get this from the Kentucky-Monitor, p. 26, your book, Kentucky brethren.

"This opening unto you and your reception within the lodge is a symbol of the disruption from the ties of the world and your introduction into the life of Masonry. It is a symbol of the agonies of the first death and of the throes of the new birth. There you stood without the portals, on the threshold of new Masonic life, in darkness, helplessness, and ignorance. Having been wandering amid the errors and covered over with the pollutions of the outer and profane world. You came inquiringly to our doors, seeking the new birth, and asking a withdrawal of the veil which concealed the divine truth from your uninitiated sight. And here, as with Moses at the burning bush, the solemn admonition is given, 'Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.' Ceremonial preparations surrounded you . . . to indicate to you that some great change was about to take place in your moral and intellectual condition. There was to be not simply a change for the future, but also an extinction of the past; for initiation is, as it were, a death to the world, and a resurrection to a new life."

Where is this mess to be found? Not in some publication of clandestines, but right on page 26 of the Kentucky-Monitor. What do you plan to do about it, brethren? Would Jesus engage in such mockery? What would Paul do? Poor Alpha, however, feebly remonstrates, "but they don't have a scheme of redemption." How pitiable when it is so obvious that Mackey, the Monitor and all Masonry contradict their claim, and call this process, "an extinction of the past, a death to the world, and a resurrection to a new life." Well, we now have nine symbols which contradict and add to the Christian faith. Alpha said, "give me some symbols which add to the faith, and I will agree you are right." What about it, Alpha?

The Hiram Legend

The Kentucky-Monitor declares, "The three really grew rituals of the human race are the Prajapati ritual of ancient Hinduism, the Mass of the Christian Church, and the Third

Degree of Masonry. Widely as they may differ in detail, . . . yet together they testify to the profoundest insight of the human soul—that God becomes man that man may become God” (XX)!

Now, brethren, that you may see that this legend is not only listed along with the Hindu ritual and the Catholic mass but also that it is made equal with Christ’s death, burial and resurrection, I now give from the Kentucky-Monitor, p. XV, the most shocking revelation made in this discussion. Listen Alpha, Listen Kentucky brethren, it is your book, your doctrine, your lodge teaching:

All ancient religions “believed in a future life to be attained by purification and trials; in a state . . . of reward and punishment; and in a Mediator or Redeemer, by whom the Evil Principle was to be overcome and the Supreme Deity reconciled to his creatures. The belief was general that he was to be born of a virgin and suffer a painful death. The Hindus called him Krishna; the Chinese, Kioun-tse; the Persians, Sosiosch; the Chaldeans, Dhouvanai; the Egyptians, Horus; ... the Christians, Jesus; and Masons, Hiram.”

Now Alpha, and all Masons, tell us what you think of the Kentucky-Monitor. Is it fit for use in lodges where there are Christians? All of you will do one of three things upon reading the above trash from the Monitor. (1) quit the lodge, (2) or demand a different Monitor, or (3) stay in the lodge using this blasphemous -Monitor and thereby stifle your consciences, killing every ounce of spirituality left in you. Which will it be?

Dear Hiram

The third degree of Masonry is founded on the death, burial and resurrection of one Hiram Abiff, or Hiram the widow’s son, who was the foreman in Solomon’s temple construction. Now Notice! In the following ceremony of the death, burial and resurrection of Hiram-Abiff, the candidate for the Master Mason’s degree plays the part of Hiram and finally is raised and receives the secret word at the close. The story and ceremony now begin: Fifteen thugs conspired to extract the secret word from Grand Master Hiram, but twelve of them went back on their agreement. These the Masons have glorified as “knights”.

The other three, Jubelo, Jubelum, Jubela, kept their vow and, failing to get the Master Mason’s word from Hiram, they killed him. The candidate is accordingly “killed” in the likeness of Hiram’s death. The thugs hid Hiram’s body marking the spot with the acacia sprig. In due time Solomon’s detectives found the truth by the twelve thugs having turned “stoolpigeon”, and by overhearing the penitent wail of the three. So they properly executed the three, viewing them today as the very embodiment of Satan. The question arises, how is Hiram’s body to be raised? The fun begins, first, the Senior Warden tries to rake the body with the grip of an Entered Apprentice (grasp hands as in ordinary hand-shaking, and press ball of thumb hard against the knuckle-joint of each other’s forefinger) of course the effort fails, so the Worshipful Master gives the grand hailing sign of distress, and wails the mock prayer, “O Lord, my God, is there no help for the widow’s Son?” Then a song of lament. Then the King is told, “the skin slips (from Hiram’s body) and it cannot be raised.” The Senior Warden then tries to raise the Candidate with the fellow-craft grip, (pressing his thumb hard on Hiram’s second finger), but fails, exclaiming, “the flesh cleaves from the bone, and it cannot be raised.” The Master says, “Oh Lord, my God” three times, and offers the prayer found on pp. 131, 132 of the Kentucky-Monitor, but it is not a prayer in Jesus name. Then the Master asserts, “though the skin may slip from the flesh, and the flesh cleave from the bone, there is strength in the Lion of the tribe of Judah, and he shall

prevail.” So after this mockery, the Master takes Hiram by the hand with the “lion’s paw” grip (thumb and fingers pressing hard on hand and wrist of each other), and with the help of the Senior Warden raises Hiram (alias the candidate, then the Master and Hiram embrace on the “Five Points of Fellowship” which are: foot to foot, knee, to knee, breast to breast, hand to back, and cheek to cheek, or mouth to ear, the inside of their right feet being together, right breasts together, and the mouth of the Master to the right ear of Hiram—Of these five points of fellowship the Kentucky-Monitor declares, p. 134,

“Thus by be five points of fellowship, are we linked together in one indivisible chain of affection, brotherly love, relief, and truth, which will sufficiently serve to distinguish us from those who are strangers to our Masonic order, and may demonstrate to the world in general that the word ‘brother’ among Masons is something more than a name.” (I can just see Paul embracing a Baptist preacher on be five points of fellowship; can’t you, Alpha?)

Anyway, the ceremony continues. When the Master and candidate embrace on the five points of fellowship the Master whispers into the candidate’s ear that “grand Masonic word” which can never be given save in the same manner. But I now proclaim publicly to the world; Listen, brethren, my tongue is not falling out, my breast is not split open, my bowels not torn asunder, but I now give that stupid, puerile, worthless sound: Mah-hah-bone! That’s right, all that ceremony, then Mah-hah-bone! What a noble sound! what edification! What grace seasoned with salt? What tommy-rot! What fellowship! Yes, “what fellowship hath light with darkness?” (2 Cor. 6:14-18).

Notice now what the Ky.-Mon. claims for this mythical Hiram, p. 152, “Then let us imitate our Grand Master Hiram Abiff in all his varied perfection.” Oh dear Hiram, what a paragon of perfection thou art! How noble! How consistent with Satan and his religions!

- (1) Masonry consists of religious ceremonies involving prayers, etc., that rest not on scripture, but on tradition.
- (2) The Lord condemns such ceremonies (Mark 7:1-9; Mt. 15:1-9)
- (3) Therefore, the Lord condemns Masonry.

Or again,

- (1) The ancient idolatrous mysteries were abominations in God’s sight.
- (2) Masonry “is identical with the ancient mysteries.” (Mackey’s Lex. p. 195; Ky.-Mon. p. XII).
- (3) Therefore, Masonry is an abomination in God’s sight.

Farewell, dear Aristotle, Sincerely, Omega.

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE

Omega hasn't had so much fun since his grandma fell in the well. From the tone of his last article I think I jogged something besides his funny-bone. Frankly, I am enjoying his articles as much or more than he is mine. Not since I was a boy, and read the stories of Eli Perkins and Bill Nye, have I read such articles of exaggeration. He even has the seriousness of their exaggeration, which makes it even more realistic. I can close my eyes and see again the potato bug, looking over the store-keepers books to see who had bought seed-potatoes.

He has another peculiar habit; he changes positions as fast as a bare-foot Negro on a hot griddle. He Ore charged Masonry with being a mongrel religion for accepting all religions. Now, it is mongrel for participating with men of other religions. We pointed out the foolishness of his first objection; he called it a quibble, but he changed his objection. When he grants Masonry doesn't limit or interfere with the faith of any man; Away goes his arguments that Masonry has a creed and a form of worship. Thank you, for paragraph two.

Conversion of Propositions and Syllogisms

Omega "converted" my proposition; when he completed the "operation", my proposition failed to appear in the Major, the Minor, or the Conclusion. This is "conversion" with a vengeance. Plato, the conversion of propositions may be simple or otherwise. But, the proposition remains the same. Gather your class around, and try your hand on this "converted" proposition:

1. If it has a creed and a form of worship, Masonry is a sectarian system of religion.
2. But, Masonry is not a sectarian system of religion.
3. Therefore, it hasn't a creed and a form of worship.

Here is another which, like a neon sign, glows with truth in every line.

1. If Omega is a logician, assertions are arguments.
2. But, assertions are not arguments.
3. Therefore, Omega is not a logician.

As Omega picked up his turtles, and ambled thoughtfully home, one of them looked up, and timidly said: "Boss, if you is thinkin' on convertin' us, don't do it, yo' convertin' is too radical!"

My answer to your silly-gisms:

1. If Masonry is a mongrel religion, it has a creed and a form of worship.
2. But, Masonry doesn't have a creed and a form of worship.
3. Therefore: It is not a mongrel religion.

1. If it requires inconsistencies with Christian obligations, Masonry is a mongrel religion.
2. But, Masonry is not a mongrel religion.
3. Therefore, It doesn't require inconsistencies with Christianity.

Facts — Evidence — Testimony

Omega multiplies quotations from Masonic sources, harangues with all the zeal of a

Crusader, parades them with a flourish, then impeaches their testimony! Masonic writers, he says, give conflicting and contradictory testimony. With such testimony, how can one determine what is true and what isn't? Are they telling the truth when their statements can be made to agree with Omega's position, and lying when they disagree?

Could it be possible for Omega to have put the wrong construction upon their words? I demonstrated this in the argument on the new birth. He treated it very respectfully; he left it entirely alone. His position is a case of the army being out of step with Jimmy.

If the facts he produces are so unreliable; they don't prove anything. Unless they prove Omega doesn't know what they are talking about! Remember, Omega impeached the witness. If the writers are unreliable, conflicting, and contradictory, why quote them?

After attempting to discredit them; he cab their testimony facts. If they are FACTS, when he quotes them they are FACTS when I quote them. My position must be true, because I can harmonize the statements, he can't. If he is right, and the statements are conflicting and contradictory, the only way to render a judgment on such testimony is to be biased one way or the other, and render it in accordance with your prejudice. Hence, after all this time and space, as far as Omega's arguments and "facts" are concerned, we are right where we started. . Moreover, by taking this position he proves my point in the first affirmative when I said: "it is a matter of opinion." Dr. Plato, its time to shift to the other footsie, this one is getting hot.

In this article I shall present some Facts in answer to Omega's quotations, these will show he doesn't know what his quotations mean. First this explanation of his quotations/

From p. 9, and 21 of the Kentucky-Monitor. I accept the one on p. 9, that's the way I learned it, on that condition I became a Mason. I have searched my Manual of the Lodge closely for anything resembling the quotation you make from p. 21, it isn't in mine. I didn't expect to find it, I am in a different jurisdiction. But, if it was a general Masonic principle, it would be in all the Manuals. We find extremists and zealots in every group composed of men, but, we don't agree with them; nor defend them. I am as ready as you to deny there is salvation in the Masonic Lodge. I made that statement in my first affirmative. You err in citing an isolated instance to prove a general truth. Masonry doesn't contradict itself, this isn't general Masonic teaching.

Moral Purpose

In answer to Omega's quotation from the Kentucky-Monitor, pp. 73, 74, Hear Mackey, p. 959. "These are dependent on, and spring out of, its character as a social institution. Hence among its numerous definitions is one that declares it to be "a science of morality," and morality is said to be symbolically, one of the precious jewels of a Master Mason."

"Freemasonry is, in its most potent and prominent sense, that which most readily and forcibly attracts the attention of the uninitiated; a fraternity, an association of men bound together by a peculiar tie; and therefore it is essential, to its successful existence, that it should, as it does, inculcate, at the very threshold of its teachings, obligation of kindness, man's duty to his neighbor. 'There are three great duties,' says the Charge given to an E. A., which as a mason, you are charged to inculcate—to God, your neighbor, and yourself,' and the duty to our neighbor is said to be that we should act upon the square, and do unto him as we wish that he could do unto ourselves."

"The moral design of Freemasonry, based upon its social character, is to make men better to each other . . . To relieve the distressed . . . to speak well of the absent to bear evil

with fortitude, to be prudent in life and conversation, and to dispense justice to all men, are duties that are inculcated in life and conversation, and to dispense justice to all men, are duties that are inculcated on every Freemason by the moral doctrines of his Order.” The moral teaching of Masonry is to make men better to each other; not, “fitting immoral nature for that spiritual building which shall exist in eternity.”

“Than Whom”

I give you Albert G. Mackey, “than whom” there was, nor is, no greater Masonic, to refute his argument on the Masonic Creed, p. 960:

“The Religious Doctrines of Freemasonry are very simple and self-evident; they are designated by no perplexities of sectarian theology, but stand out in the broad light, intelligible and acceptable by all who have a belief in God, and the immortality of the Soul. He who denies these tenets can be no Mason. . . . And the Ceremonies of Initiation into Symbolic Masonry terminate by revealing the symbol of a life after death, and an entrance upon immortality. The Old Charges prescribe that a Mason while left to his particular belief, must be of that “religion in which all men agree; that is to say, the religion which teaches the existence of God and an eternal life.”

Remember, Omega’s charge in Masonry is a human religion with a human creed. Is the belief in God and the Immortality of the Soul, human doctrines? Is believing them, believing in a human creed? This is the issue, tell us, don’t be bashful. Paul preached these facts in Acts 17, was he preaching a human creed? You find it all right there. The Fatherhood of God— The Brotherhood of Man — The resurrection of the dead, he showed that regardless of how a man thinks of God; yet God made him, and will raise him from the dead, That’s all Masonry says. Is that belief in a human creed, or in a divine proposition? My proposition is true; it has no Human Creed.

Please! Please!

We have been reminded, and exhorted, to pay our respects to Mackey on p. 104. First, not what Masonry says of the Bible, p. 136.

“The rule and guide of Masonic Faith is the Holy Bible. Of all the books is, the one of leadership, the Book Supreme blazing the way with Light of noblest excellence to man, the Bible. Within these covers are laid down the moral principles for the upbuilding of a righteous life. For centuries the Bible has Awe the beacon light of promised immortality, he hope serene of union eternal with the beloved who go ohm Here is he message for Masonic comfort when all else falls, the rays of truth glorifying God enlightening man.” Again, “Freemasonry, my Brother, looks for no blind obedience to its commands—Hence in so important a matter as that which concerns your own ‘faith and practice,’ you are commanded to study this sacred book and learn to way to everlasting life.’ “

Read these slowly, thoughtfully, see for yourself the teaching of Masonry on the “way to God.”

Second, What is the only purpose of placing another book in the Lodge? Hear it: “To make binding the obligation of one who accepts it as a revelation from God. This is the extent of Masonic acceptance of “another revelation.” Mackey, p. 848.

Symbols

To conserve space we shall give the principle of Symbolism, and from it point out Omega's errors of interpretation. Mackey, p. 1002.

"The word 'symbol' is derived from a Greek verb which signifies to compare one thing with another; and hence a symbol or emblem, for the two words are often used synonymously in Freemasonry, is the expression of an idea derived from the comparison or contrast of some visible objects with a moral conception or attribute. To study and compare these visible objects—to elicit from them the moral ideas which they are intended to express—is to make one's self acquainted with the symbolism of Freemasonry. Hence, the symbol stands for an idea; as an emblem or a badge it reminds on of the idea.

Not that one has the thing symbolized. Take the Lambskin for an example, It is to "be an ever-present reminder of that purity of heart and uprightness of conduct so essentially necessary." Omega, does it add to a Christians faith to be reminded that "the pure in heart shall see God." That's what the Lambskin does, "reminds of that purity of heart necessary to see God." There is a world of difference in reminding one of WHAT is necessary; and in saying he has it.

I have never seen a man strive so desperately to make out a case against Masonry. Do you ever use a blackboard to illustrate a sermon? The characters you put on it stand for ideas, do they not? Does the congregation worship idols in viewing your characters on the board? I turn you over to the "anti" brethren.

Acacia—Mackey says: "Hutchinson, indulging in his favorite theory of Christianizing Freemasonry; but it is needless to say that the Hutchinsonian application of the word 'Acacian' to signify a Freemason has nothing to do with the theological reference of the term." p. 12.

"It is a symbol of immorality, of innocence, and of initiation. But these three significations are closely connected, and that connection must be observed, if we desire to obtain a just interpretation of the symbol. Thus, in this one symbol, we are taught that in the initiation of life, of which the initiation in the Third Degree is simply emblematic, innocence must for a time lie in the grave; at length, however, to be called by the word of be Great Master of the Universe, to a blissful immortality. Combine with this instruction the recollection of the place where the 'twig of acacia' was planted—Mount Calvary—The place of sepulture of Him who 'brought life and immortality' to light, and Who, in Christian Freemasonry is designated, as He is in Scripture, as 'the lion of he tribe of Judah, and remember, too, that in the mystery of His death, the wood of the cross takes the place of the 'Acacia.' Therefore, in this little and apparently insignificant symbol—we have a beautiful suggestion of all he mysteries of life and death, of time and eternity, of the present and future."

The fact of the matter is, this symbol never did mean that a Mason is free from sin, or has received remission of sin in becoming one.

I answered No. 4 under Please, Please. In answer to 5, 6, and 9, get this from the Murrow Masonic Monitor, Okla.

"If the object of the first degree is to symbolize the struggles of a candidate groping in darkness for intellectual light, that of the second degree represents the same candidate laboring amid all the difficulties that encumber the young beginner in the attainment of learning and science. The E. A. is to emerge from darkness to light; (intellectual light).

The F. C. is to come out of ignorance into knowledge. This degree—is intended to typify these struggles of the ardent mind for the attainment of truth—Moral and intellectual.— p. 95.

Why all the furor? Masonry is a three act play, in which the candidate becomes the leading character, depicting the way of “all flesh” from birth to death. As the candidate makes the imaginary journey thru life he plays each part, or state of man, youth, manhood, old age; the symbols constantly remind him of the moral requirements of his Creator; not that he has them; but, that if he expects to reap the reward of a life wellspent; he must possess them. That he may have them he is referred to The Bible as the “way of everlasting life.”

The Hiramic Legend

That you may see the tortuous effort of our brother to prove his point; I give some facts from the Okla., Monitor, pp. 116, 117.

“Your representation of Hiram Abiff is a type of the upright man in his journey through life. He enters life at the S. G. in the sunny period of youth; here he is met with allurements which like the ruffian would turn him from the paths of duty; but deaf to their siren tones, he moves to the W. G.; here he is assailed by misfortune, disease and trials, tempting him to betray his trust; but with integrity No deeply rooted to be swayed by the vicissitudes of fortunes, he presses on unfalteringly till it arrives at the E. G., that avenue through which he looks out upon a brighter and better world. Here he is met by the inexorable enemy before whom all must bow. At the fatal blow of Death, he sinks into the grave, and buried in the rubbish of his earthly nature, but not for ever, for by the S. of A. we am reminded of that immortal pan within us which survives to grave and which can never, no, never die.”

This is the Masonic interpretation of the Legend of Hiram Abiff. The trouble with Omega is his approach to Masonry. Whereas the degrees of Masonry constitute a drama of three acts, symbolic and emblematic; he demands that it be literal, actual, and historic Masonry can never be reconciled to such an idea.

Compare these facts, and this view of Masonry with Omega’s labored efforts, and decide for yourself whether it is a serious error or a harmless opinion. As for me; I am satisfied my position is correct, and these facts prove it.

Sincerely,
Alpha

FIFTH NEGATIVE

Now that I have taught Alpha to correct the logical form of his arguments, I must remind him of the necessity of their being true as well as formally valid. Masonry is still a system of religion, Alpha testifying, whether it is sectarian or not—a system of religion in which the Christian sings, prays and worships otherwise with “men of other religions”.

Thus by the Christian’s participation in this worship my charge is upheld, viz., that Masonry accepts all religions in the sense that it stands for just any god, any immortality, and duties which any religion enjoins. The masonic members fill in these beliefs any way they choose and the Christian, as a Mason does “not limit or interfere with these beliefs in

any way.” So Masonry accepts all religions the same way a Gospel preacher accepts modernism by fellowshiping and worshipping with modernists.

Alpha’s sneering slurs against the principle of conversion in logic will remind the thoughtful of a wise remark by McTaggart, “No man ever broke with logic but what logic ultimately broke him.” But our brother is learning. At least he used the correct logical form this time. Now, Alpha, just accept the apparent truth that Masonry is inconsistent with Christ, and you’ll be all right. So much for your immature display to cover up for having committed such a gross logical fallacy.

Equivocation on “Facts”

Of course I quote from Masonic sources then disagree with them. Our dear “cousin weak-eyes”, however, cannot see that he is guilty of equivocation on the word “facts”. A simple illustration will suffice. I quoted from Pendleton’s Manual in a debate with a Baptist to prove that Pendleton taught certain things. The fact is, Pendleton did teach the doctrines. The doctrines, however, are falsehoods, not facts. Get the difference, cousin?

So with Masonic sources. I quote from them to prove the fact that Masonry teaches such things. I disagree with them because what Masonry teaches are falsehoods, not facts. That was a definite boomerang, “weak-eyes”.

“General” Alpha

I quoted from the Ky.-Monitor (xii), a book used by all lodges in Kentucky to prove Masonry teaches it is a “way of common men to God”. Alpha objects saying that a book used by every lodge in a whole state is not “general” enough. Such nonsense only emphasizes that Alpha is a fine one to talk of everybody being out of step but Johnny.

Now, Alpha, if specific Masonic teaching contradicts itself, why not the general? By the way you must hold a pretty high position in the lodge to sit in judgment on all the lodges under the grand lodge of Ky. and declare they have become ungeneral. Oh yes, Alpha, we demand that you be a man and come on and say it, listen: should the brethren in Ky. quit the lodge or demand a new monitor or what? Don’t be mealy-mouthed about it.

Face the music! The Ky.-Mon. did go back on its claims, eh, Alpha?

Masonry and Morality

We shall return to this heading for a fuller discussion later. I quoted from the Ky.-Mon., p. 73, “The speculative Mason is a moral builder for eternity, fitting immortal nature for that spiritual building which shall exist” in eternity.. What does Alpha say?

Why he gives his ipse dixit, That’s “not so!” Who arrays authorities against each other, cousin? Does this too, demand that our Ky. brethren quit the lodge? Then, what does “General” Alpha say about my quotation from Newton’s book, endowed and published by the Masonic Service Association of the U.S.A.? In spite of the fact that the Ky.-Mon. calls Newton Masonry’s greatest living scholar, our pompous “General” decrees, Newton, the state of Ky., and the U.S.A. are not general enough. How general can we get, General? Oh I forgot, Mackey (and any others that might help your case) is your authority. Well, you’ll get all you want of Mackey in a moment. Just now I must notice the paragraph in which you almost had Paul a Mason. Your argument is, since Paul preached the three doctrines

of God, the hereafter, and duty, therefore, Masonic doctrine is divine. Well, cousin, since the Athenian religions and a form of the same three, and since Masonry leaves them to their particular form, therefore, their doctrines at Athens were divine. Shame on Paul for trying to get them to give up Divine doctrines! Masonry says the Athenian doctrines were just as divine as Christian ones. If not, how could Masonry leave each one to his “particular beliefs”?

Please Please PLEASE!

Maybe the third Please will do it this time. Alpha said he was going to answer my argument on Mackey, p. 104. Then our forgetful cousin saw what was on that page (see below), and bolted, flew the coop, left the track like a derailed freight car, and never came back to it. Here is the passage again:

“The Bible is used among Masons as a symbol of the will of God however it may be expressed. And, therefore, whatever to any people expresses that will may be used as a substitute for the Bible in a Masonic lodge. Thus in a lodge consisting entirely of Jews, the Old Testament alone may be placed on the Altar, and the Turkish Masons make use of the Koran. Whether it be the Gospels to the Christian, the Pentateuch to the Israelite, the Koran to the Mussulman or the Vedas to the Brahman, it everywhere Masonically conveys the same idea, that of the symbolism of the Divine Will revealed to Man.” The Ebb in the Masonic Lodge is only a symbol of God’s will, and any other “revelation” will do just as well if the members accept it. A foolish person indeed is he that cannot see therefore that Masonry in telling all these members to build for eternal life on their respective books is teaching the damnable doctrine of salvation in all religions.

Readers, this is the real issue, to which I have gradually brought our deluded brother in the Affirmative. He cannot escape! In just a few paragraphs I shall prove and underscore the fact that Masonry as Masonry teaches Salvation in all religions and on the basis of various “revelations”.

Masonry, Mackey and the Bible

Alpha tries desperately to make us believe that Mackey, “than whom there was, nor is no greater Masonic scholar,” Kinks that Masonry as such exalts the Bible above other “revelations”. But I now invite you to hear from Mackey, Alpha’s standard, his own avowed disdain of the Scriptures from a Masonic viewpoint: **The following words are important enough to read and reread in bold print; Hear Mackey:**

“Within a few years an attempt has been made by some Grand Lodges to add to these simple, moral and religious qualifications, another, which requires a belief in the divine authenticity of the Scriptures. It is much to be regretted that Masons will sometimes forget the fundamental law of their institution, and endeavor to add to or detract from the perfect integrity of the building as it was left to them by their predecessors. When this is done the beauty or our Temple must suffer. The Land-Marks of Masonry are so perfect that they neither need nor will permit of the slightest amendment. Thus in the very instance referred to, the fundamental law of Masonry requires only a belief in the Supreme architect of the Universe, and in a future life, while it says with a peculiar toleration, that in all other matters of religious belief, Masons are only expected to be of that religion in which all men agree . . . Under the shelter of this wise provision, the Christian and the Jew, the Moham-

medan and the Brahmin, are permitted to unite around our common altar, and Masonry becomes in practice as well as theory, universal” (Jurisprudence of Masonry, p. 57).

Read these words, Masons, and let your hearts burn within you, for saying the Bible is imperfect. The Masonic moral temple is perfect; to add to it faith in the Bible as God’s Word is to cause “the beauty of the Temple” to “suffer.” Therefore it follows with the force of demonstration that to stand generally for morality rather than for specifically Biblical morality is, according to Masonry, more perfect than to require faith in the Scriptures. Maybe this is the reason Albert Pike, another noted Masonic scholar says, and Mackey agrees, “The morality of Freemasonry is the morality of every creed of antiquity” (Morals and Dogma, p. 541). Brethren, these statements against the perfection of Bible morality are put forth simply to promise salvation to men of all these other creeds and “revelations”. Our “than whom” scholars get rough, eh, Alpha! But below is the capping stone of all this Masonic Mess.

Salvation in all Religions

That’s right. Masonry, as Masonry, teaches salvation in all religions. There is no escape. If Alpha is an honest man, he will give it up now. Hear it. Alpha said in his second affirmative that “at the beginning of Masonry we am taught eternal life is conditioned on building on the Book. But now he admits that there are “other books” placed in the Lodge, and Masonry does not interfere or limit the faith of its members in these books. So when Masonry says to its devotees, you can have eternal life by building on your particular book it teaches the damnable doctrine of salvation in all religions.

Since the religion of Masonry is that in which all men can agree, they can all agree on the principle that they should follow whatever “revelation” they have accepted religiously. And they all agree also that they shall receive a “glorious Master Mason’s reward by building on their particular “Divine Truth”. The Mohammedan is directed to the Koran as “the way of everlasting life.” The Brahmin is taught, your eternal life is conditioned on accepting the Vedas, your Masonic trestleboard. The Jew is taught, you have eternal life by living according to the Old Testament, not by the New. To the Jew the Old Testament is his Masonic Trestleboard, “according to the rules and designs of which”, in the words of Aristotle, “he is to erect the spiritual edifice of his eternal life.” What can Alpha do? I repeat, if you are an honest man, Alpha, you will renounce Masonry, for now it teaches that there is salvation in all religions. Alpha cannot say that the members of other religions are not told in their lodges to build their eternal life on the revelation they regard as Divine truth. For, he would deny one of the universal principles, Divine

Principles, Eternal Principles, if you please, of Masonry. And in the process he would convict himself of using ungeneral Masonic teaching as the basis of his argument back when he uttered the pious words, “if Masons understood the implications of their principles they would obey the Gospel”. Dear Alpha, were you ungeneral? I blush to ask it! Perish the thought! No, you were hitting at a “universal” principle all right. Therefore, Masonry, being committed not to take away the other books like the Koran, the Shasts, the Vedas, the Old Testament, in telling these sinners you can have eternal life by continuing in a fake religion, stands guilty before God, before the church, before the world, of teaching the heinous doctrine of salvation in all religions. Try your hand at this one, Aristotle.

(1) Masonry teaches that the edifice of eternal life is built on the Masonic trestleboard, that is, revelation.

(2) But this trestleboard may be any one of a dozen various “revelations” of that many religions.

(3) Therefore, Masonry teaches that eternal life is to be had in all these different religions.

Is it consistent for a Christian to be in another religion, Masonry, which teaches salvation in all religions? Harmonize this doctrine with Acts 4:12, Aristotle: “Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.”

The Tennessee Craftsman next time. Selah! Maybe “Eli and Bill” could help you, cousin.

Omega

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE

Omega’s statement that he has “taught me correct logical form” reminds me of Paul’s question to the Jew: “thou that teachest another, teachest thou not thyself?” Evidently not; or he wouldn’t be so vulnerable! He erected the gallows of conditional syllogisms to hang me on; but, ended swinging in his own noose!

There are features of Masonry other than the religious; this, Omega ignores or doesn’t know. His charge and argument on Masonry “accepting all religions” is a confusion of the different features of Masonry. This, is a characteristic of the democratic nature of Masonry. This same charge he can bring against our government and its constitution.

“Oh,” he says, “The government is not a religion,” No, in this feature Masonry isn’t either! None are refused citizenship because of their religion. But, the government doesn’t subscribe to the religion of all its citizens. Masonry accepts men, granting them freedom of conscience. Therefore: Masonry is democracy in action. To use Omega’s term: SO Masonry accepts all religions the same way the government does; and the Christian, as a Mason, accepts them the same way he does as a citizen of the U. S. A.

When a man can see “sneering slurs” against the principles of conversion in logic in my last article; I am not surprised at anything he can see in Masonry. When I show our venerable brother what a converted proposition looks like; he thinks I am indulging in an “immature display.” I made a regular negative syllogism; he thought I was making a conditional one, but, I think he has learned his lesson.

Equivocation and Boomerangs

Omega admits he has been using the term “fact” to mean falsehood! Yet, I am guilty of equivocation! His entire position is founded on equivocation. He isn’t “weak-eyed” he’s blind. It isn’t a fact they teach the doctrines he ascribes to them; only by equivocation can it be made to appear as though they do. The law of evidence says: “In all plural testimony whether oral or written, the several witnesses are required to agree in every important circumstance.” All the witnesses he has introduced agree in denying the doctrines he ascribes to them. Therefore, cousin, the things you present, as Masonic doctrines, are not facts in any sense. The only place they appear to be facts is in your confused conception of Masonry!

But, your weak effort can't brush aside the force of my argument. Grant they give "conflicting" and contradictory testimony; how shall we decide what is right? As Omega does? By rejecting all that disagrees with his viewpoint. Get it, if there is testimony for two viewpoints, there is evidence for two opinions. Therefore: Masonry is an opinion.

Omega accepts the opinion which agrees with his prejudice; but, condemns others for doing the same! "Verily, the legs of the lame are not equal!" Here is your boomerang, cousin, you prove my proposition.

"General"

Our brother began this discussion with logic, force, power and convictions, but, has simmered down to a puffing walk. If all the churches in Ky. put out a manual endorsing Premillennialism would not be "general" enough to present as the teaching of the church in America? Does the greatness of the state of Ky. have anything to do with the truthfulness of this proposition? He demands that I make a statement on his quotation from the Ky. monitor, before I do, I want to see that monitor. This is the reason I suggested we use one common source as a reference book. I do not propose to defend all the statements made by Masons or members of the church.

"Ipse Dixit"

If Omega will keep writing our readers will begin to wonder how he can correctly represent Masonic writings when he can't correctly represent mine? He says: "I gave my ipse dixit, that's 'not so'." Read my last affirmative. I quoted from Mackey p. 959, to show the purpose of the Moral Doctrine of Masonry. That quotation said: "The moral design of Freemasonry, based upon its social character, is, to make men better to each other."

From this statement I drew the conclusion "Not one word resembling Omega's quotation from his monitor," pp. 73-74. "The moral teaching of Masonry is to make men better to each other." Not, "fitting immoral nature for that spiritual building which shall exist in eternity." Let's keep the record straight. Our readers will help you do it.

Somebody loan our logician a New Testament. My argument was: "Did Paul set forth a human creed in Acts 17?" "if not, Masonry doesn't have a human creed." Are these principles divine truth? Are these things divine and true because believed by you and me and other Christians; or because taught by the Lord? Are they not divine truths regardless of who believes them? Don't quibble and evade; I intend to keep the issue before you.

These truths make my syllogisms correct, not only in logical form, but, in fact. Please Please Puh-lease Omega proceeds on the assumption that Masons teach salvation in the lodge. But, Masons emphatically deny this. Hear it once more. "We arraign no man's political opinion, nor do we interfere with his religious creed. To himself and his country we leave the one, and to his conscience and his God we commit the other." Mackey, p. 194.

Language cannot be plainer; the politics and religion of its members is not the business of Masonry; nor does it seek to make it so.

Our brother is long on assertions; but short on facts. If you will read my last article, you will find this: "Second, what is the purpose of placing another book in the lodge?" Hear it; "To make binding the obligation." This is the extent of Masonic acceptance of "another revelation." Mackey, p. 848.

Our objective brother has reached the climax of his arguments; his cob home stands or falls on this proposition: "Masonry teaches salvation in all religions." The proposition

is an erroneous assumption, for Masonry doesn't teach salvation. if it taught salvation it wouldn't leave it to 'one's conscience and one's God.'" Again, if it taught salvation it would "have a scheme of redemption for sin." What its members believe, is necessary to salvation, does not concern Masonry; it neither affirms nor denies. Therefore it is evident that Omega's cob house is erected on a confused and far-fetched conception of what Masonry is and of what it does.

Omega and I were members of lodges under the American jurisdiction; in this jurisdiction we found open Bibles in lodges wherever we went. We never found any other book. Christians believe that God is, that He has spoken to man, that the Bible is the record of that which He spake, or the revelation of His will to man. Their belief in, and acceptance of, the Bible as the revelation of God, is not dependent upon the decision of the Masonic Lodge. But, in every lodge where Omega and I have held membership or in any we have visited the Bible was received as the revelation of God; and they called it "The Bible, the inestimable gift of God to man."

Masonry is a social organization; that's what the word lodge or society means. Omega's position is absurd; for, it denies social intercourse with any man, or group of men, not holding in every particular his doctrinal position; His position is contrary to both revelation and reason. See Matt. 9:13; Luke 15:2—"Now all the publicans and sinners were drawing near unto him to hear him. And both the Pharisees and the scribes murmured, saying, This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them." The Jews heard Paul until he said he was told "to get thee far hence unto the Gentiles." An this law claw there is a group, rising in the church, voicing these same sentiments. Such sentiments will reduce the church to the same status as 'that of the leading sect among the Jews.

Remember, association in the Masonic Lodge is social. A Christian can consistently walk in any social group. It isn't WHERE he is; but WHAT he is. Think it over,

Sincerely yours,
Alpha

SIXTH NEGATIVE

Alpha's death throes are more painful to him than I really expected them to be. His discussion of "other features" of Masonry is pathetic. Catholicism has "other features" besides the religious feature. So does modernistic Methodism. A Modernistic Methodist Church would be far better as a parallel than our government. Modernistic Methodist Churches require no particular tenets of their members, but accept them in fellowship.

Methodism and Masonry, unlike our government, are religious organizations. Alpha can see this all too clearly.

A Challenge to the General!

When I quoted from Mackey and the Monitor that "Masonic symbols are the working tools by the use of which we are seeking to prepare ourselves for the perfect building which shall be our eternal home" or by using which we are "fitting immortal nature for that spiritual building which shall exist in eternity." Alpha searched his monitor, parallel in his

state to the one used in Kentucky, and claimed to be unable to find such a statement, declaring pompously that Omega is ungeneral. I showed him how every lodge under the grand lodge of Kentucky supports this statement, and that it appeared also in the Masonic Home Journal, official organ of the grand lodge of Kentucky, also that the Masonic Service Association of the whole U.S.A. endorsed it. He feigns ignorance of such a statement yet. All right General, get ready. Here it comes. Listen, you send me your monitor and I'll find that statement or its equivalent in it. Send it to the Preceptor, and they will forward it to me. Will Alpha do it? He knows better. I will return it immediately so he can check on my quotations from it. What about it, General?

Will your monitor be general enough? I doubt it. Send it on now for next time. Our readers will know why if you don't. Well, if the Kentucky-Monitor is not general enough, let's add to it now the Tennessee State Craftsman. It ought to add to our blessed generality.

The Tennessee State Craftsman

The monitor for the state of Tennessee has the following six statements which confirm what I have said of Masonry and make it imperative for every child of God to leave the lodge, for it is not consistent with the obligations one owes to Christ.

(1) The purpose of Masonic symbols: "the more noble and glorious purpose of divesting our minds and consciences of vices and superfluities of life, thereby fitting us as living stones for that spiritual building, that house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens" (p. 12). Ungeneral, Alpha? Bosh!

(2) Where Masons hope (desire-expect) to go: "The covering of the lodge is the canopy of heaven where all good Masons hope at last to arrive ... and which admonish us to have Faith in God, Hope of Immortality, and Charity to all Mankind" (p. 21). O Blessed hope! What does Ephesians 4 teach, Alpha? Poor benighted brother. God help you!

(3) What do Masonic garments accomplish? "If you wear it without soil and blemish, you will be received at the pearly gates of heaven and there be presented with the pure white robes of righteousness . . ." (p. 60).

(4) What do Masonic garments accomplish? "if you wear enjoy the happy reflection consequent on a well spent life, and die in hope of a glorious immortality" (p. 91). Excuse me. I almost forgot. Alpha has done told us in this issue, "Masonry doesn't teach salvation." Please pardon me, brother. I almost forgot to respect your ipse dixit. Tennessee gets so ungeneral. Shame on Tennessee. Tell us, General, would you have your lieutenants write a new monitor for Tennessee also?

(5) What Masons will receive: ". . . and you will receive from your Almighty Father an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled that fadeth not away" (p. 123). Oh Dear, I forgot Alpha's ipse dixit again, "Masonry doesn't teach salvation." Pardon again. If that kind of inheritance doesn't mean salvation, it ought to.

(6) Graveside declarations concerning a brother Mason: He is said to have "life immortal" (p. 150). Again on p. 146, "The soul of another brother has been summoned from this mortal life to join that innumerable host whose spirits dwell with the immortals." This could go on ad infinitum, but enough have been given to show Alpha's ignorance (or deception—I doubt that our brother would deceive, however). Here are six statements which prove that Masonry teaches what Alpha denies it teaches. Puff real loud with your ipse dixit. That is all you have to answer with—unless it might be the charge of ungenerality

in which case, send me your monitor! I can't resist another quotation from the Tennessee State Craftsman. On page 13, the candidate who might have been a Christian for years, is nonetheless told, "You have commenced this night, 'the great task . . . of erecting in your heart a temple for the indwelling of God.'" Alpha, and all Masons, come out of this nonsense which makes a mockery of Christianity. The idea! A Christian, in whom God dwells by His Spirit (Ephesians 2:19, 20), yet goes through this puerile ceremony in which he denies that God dwelt in him before. Alpha, you can't conscientiously go on defending this stuff and claim to be a member of the Lord's church.

Come out from the lodge. Be a Christian; you will be "complete in Christ" (Colossians 2:10), and Masonry cannot add to that completeness one whit!

The Back-breaking Straw

I knew the back was breaking, and the "other revelations" argument was the final straw. Last time I quoted from Alpha, how Masonry says you get eternal life by building on the Book. Then I quoted from Mackey, Alpha's standard, how various books may be substituted for the Bible (p. 104, remember?); then I showed from Mackey and Alpha, how Masonry claims to be universal. Then I sprang the trap with this syllogism.

(1) Masonry says you get eternal life by erecting according to the designs of the Masonic Trestleboard or Revelation.

(2) But Masonry says there are any number of actual Trestleboards or Revelations.

(3) Therefore, Masonry says you get salvation in any number of other religions.

Oh if only Alpha had seen that coming. Now it is too late. He can't deny the first premise for he said it; he can't deny the second for Mackey said it and Alpha endorsed it. So what does he do? He just rants about the social and democratic features of Masonry. You might as well write of the number of king pythons in North Africa as far as this proposition is concerned. I started out to show that Masonry is inconsistent with the obligations a Christian owes to Christ, I have done that so Alpha replies by discussing "other features" which are not inconsistent. I could do the same with Catholicism. It is about like the fellow with his head off being told, but you do have pretty feet Fine comfort in that Alpha cannot get out by denying that he fellowships the others in their other revelations or that the other revelations are unmasonic. Alpha, why didn't you take up the statement from your standard Mackey, and explain why the American lodges, like Ohio, are unmasonic in making faith in the Bible a requirement for being a Mason? Yet Mackey admits that it is fully Masonic to ask all to believe in a Masonic trestleboard. All of which shows, according to your rules of evidence, you were guilty of equivocation. For Mackey says when they "called it the Bible the inestimable gift of God to man" they could not Masonically mean really the Bible, but God's Will however it is expressed. He says the Bibb "everywhere Masonically conveys the same idea . . . that of the symbolism of the Divine Will revealed to man" (p. 104). Don't tell us what Christians believe; we know that better than you apparently. What do Masons believe as Masons, according to your standard? Not in the Bible as the Revelation, but only as a symbol of Divine Revelation.

God have mercy on you, my brother. It is just possible that some brethren in the church in various quarters feel that Mackey, Alpha's standard, is not representative or accepted universally in Masonry. So in answer to this need, I republish verbatim below a letter forwarded to me by the Preceptor brethren, a letter written by Mr. Lawrence Taylor, Editor of The Indiana Freemason, official organ of the Grand Lodge of Indiana. Mr. Elza

Bruce wrote Mr. Taylor and asked him three questions: (1) Is Albert Mackey's authority recognized in Masonry? (2) Is this recognition the same on both sides of the Mason-Dixon Line? and (3) Mr. Bruce quoted the controversial statement we have had from Mackey on the position of the Bible and the other revelations in the Masonic lodge.

Then he asked, Does the Masonic lodge accept the statements attached hereto, as being the beliefs of Masons universally? Here is the reply he received from the ungeneral state of Indiana.

The Indiana Freemason, Official Organ of the Grand Lodge F. & A.M. of Indiana. Lawrence R. Taylor The Indiana Masonic Home Editor Franklin, Indiana

**Mr. Elza Bruce
Box 355
Farmersburg, Indiana
Dear Brother Bruce,**

I am happy to respond to your welcome letter of April 24. Albert G. Mackey is universally recognized as one of the greatest Masonic historians and authors that our Fraternity has ever produced. This recognition is universal, meaning worldwide, and is not limited by any territorial line . . .

Concerning the notes to which you have referred, and which are attached hereto, I would say that the explanations contained therein conform not only to the practices of Freemasons all over the globe, but also to the recognized basic Masonic Conception of Masonry's one Great Light. The "meat" of Mackey's explanation lies in the closing words of the first paragraph . . . 'it (the Bible) everywhere Masonically conveys the same idea . . . that of the symbolism of the Divine Will revealed to Man.'"

There it is, Alpha. Read it and burn with shame. It would be contrary to Masonry's one Great Light to make the Bible the Divine Revelation of God's Will. The question for now I leave with you, Cousin, and it is a serious one: Will you continue to support an organization which denies by its "democratic principle" that the Bible is God's One and Only Revelation besides which there has been and can be no other? Think on it, yes, do think on it seriously.

**Seriously and sincerely,
Omega**