

THE MASONIC JOURNAL

GREENSBORO, N. C.

Friday, July 14, 1876.

E. A. WILSON, Editor & Proprietor.

TERMS:

1 copy One Year - - - \$ 2 00
1 copy Six Months - - - 1 00

No club rates.

Any person sending us 5 or more yearly subscriptions, with the CASH, will receive the paper one year free of charge.

Unless renewed, all papers will be promptly stopped at the expiration of the term of subscription, of which due notice will be given by a cross X mark.

Canvassing Agents:

W. E. EDWARDS, Elmwood Lodge, 246
J. B. DAVIS, Greensboro Lodge, 76.

Our Commissioned Canvassing Agents are authorized to receive and receipt for subscriptions and advertising.

Local Agents will have their subscriptions receipted from this office.

Correspondents desiring a reply must enclose a Stamp for return Postage, and all matter desired to be seen only by the Editor should be marked "PRIVATE" on the lower left-hand corner of the envelope.

THE MASONIC JOURNAL which is published at Greensboro is worthy of our support. It is ably edited, possesses a high degree of merit and contains, besides Masonic Literature, well selected matter which is calculated to make its visits desirable and instructive.

THOS. S. KENAN,
Grand High Priest.

The enterprise ought to succeed. We need a means whereby a more general Masonic communication may be had: a means for the more general diffusion of Masonic intelligence.

I hope every Mason will take the JOURNAL—every Lodge endorse it, and at once make it the Organ of Masonry in North Carolina. With such encouragement and support I am satisfied you can make it of incalculable worth to the Fraternity.

GEO. W. BLOUNT,
Grand Master.

All of which is endorsed by the Grand Lodge and Grand Chapter.

Avouchal.

QUESTION.—If a man comes to me and says he is a Master Mason (of course I am one) I examine and find him worthy and well qualified. Can I not vouch for him in my Lodge without having sat in a Lodge with him previous to my examination. I hold, according to my obligation, I can. My opponents older and better posted Masons than I am, take the opposite view, which is that you must sit in a Lodge with, to enable you to vouch for a brother.

ANSWER.—The older brethren are right. You may examine a strange brother so far as satisfy your self, but you can only vouch for him by having previously sat with him in a regular Lodge or having examined him at the lodge room by order of the Master.

The above question and answer clipped from the Suspension Bridge (N. Y.) Journal contains some strange doctrine to us. We have before ruled against it, and do so still. There are several rules by which the right of recognition and free Masonic intercourse are to be governed, among which are *due examination or legal Masonic information*. These are landmarks that cannot be altered or abridged. But there are several points that must also be considered, among which is, the Brother who vouches for another by examination must be sufficiently skilled in the work to make a thorough examination of the party for whom he proposes to vouch. An examination thus made, and under all the requisite tests and safeguards, is all that can possibly be required when done at the Lodge room and by order of the Worshipful Master. Due examination by a Brother, whether at a Lodge and in

the presence of many, or in a wilderness with none present but the two, is the same in the light of law and reason, and should always be accepted.

Will our good Brother please tell us what strength is added to the examination by its being done at the Lodge and by order of the Master, over that of any other place? We confess we are unable to see it.

Of course, having previously sat in a Lodge with him is the very best evidence, but must not be made the inexorable rule, or you debar many a worthy and bright Mason from visiting your Lodge, and abridge the Masonic rights of your best and brightest members, for, we hold, a test that is not sufficient to secure an avouchal will not justify a Brother in holding Masonic intercourse with a stranger.

To be sure we advocate great prudence and caution in such matters, but must oppose all such unreasonable and, to us, unwarrantable requirements.

We think if our good Brother will look over the law on this subject he will be convinced that we are right and he wrong.

"Ought the World to Know It."

Under this heading we published, last week, a communication from an esteemed correspondent, over the signature of "Omega," which was written in answer to an article of ours published a few weeks since. "Omega" has evidently persuaded himself that there is a wide difference in our views on this subject, whereas, if he will carefully read our article over again, he will at once see there is not as great a conflict in our views as he imagines there is.

Before proceeding further, we will state that there is a wide difference between revealing the transactions of a Lodge, and the result of those transactions, a distinction which seems to have been overlooked by "Omega." He says "in these latter days, the transactions of our Lodges are spoken of too heedlessly before the world." In this we agree, and we go further and say, that this heedless speaking of the transactions of Lodges before the world should be punished. It is a great evil, especially in some localities, and has led to much harm. Indeed it is pointedly against the written law of the Grand Lodge. Art. 13, Sec. 9, of the Masonic Code, says: "Disclosures to others than Masons, of important transactions within a Lodge," are regarded as punishable offenses, &c., &c. This refers especially to transactions in the Lodge—to the proceedings, business, discussions, &c., &c. It cannot refer to the result of the transactions, because in the same Article, Sec. 7, (5), it is made the duty of the Secretary to "report to each Annual Communication of the Grand Lodge, a list of the members suspended or expelled, during the year, which shall be published in the proceedings," and which proceedings may be read by any one. "Omega" says:

"If publicity is the shield by which Masonry is to be protected I would ask the Brother Editor why has not the Institution long ago sunk into dishonor and oblivion? To admit this would be to destroy one of the principal sources of its vitality and success; it would be placing a canker-worm at its tap-root, which would destroy the life of this beautiful tree, under whose wide-spreading branches, so many forlorn and weary travelers have found shelter and repose."

We did not say all that, good Brother. We said there were cases where it would be proper to publish. We say so still. Desperate cases require desperate remedies, and these remedies are being applied all over the country. Take up the Masonic Journals of the country, and it

will be seen that rogues and rascals are frequently published and the Fraternity warned against them. And this is right.

For the benefit of our correspondent, we will relate an incident that occurred in this State, a few years since, and which came under our personal observation. Names are fictitious of course.

Bro. Jones was a prominent Mason in the town of Borough in this State, and was a reader of two or three Masonic Journals. One day he read an account of one Lieut. Rogers, who had perpetrated several rascalities, had left his State and had gone South, &c., &c. As it happened, on the evening of the very day that Bro. Jones read this notice of Lieut. Rogers, his Lodge met. Going to the Lodge that night, he found in the ante-room a stranger, who wished to visit the Lodge, as he confessed, for the purpose of asking assistance; stating that he had lost his purse, &c., and only wanted funds to enable him to reach his home, in an adjoining State. Bro. Jones heard his story, and when he had finished, he looked at him with a penetrating eye, and said: "Lieut. Rogers, I have heard of you before," at the same time taking the paper from his pocket and pointing to the notice. "You can get no assistance here." The Lieut. did not remain to hear the last words, but hastily retreated, and has not been seen since. But for the publication of this man's villainies, the Fraternity would doubtless have been imposed upon, because the Lieut. was represented as being very sharp, and a bright Mason. But it may be argued, that this was an extreme case. True, and it is only extreme cases that we would publish to the world.

MITCHELL, the highest Masonic authority in this country says that secrecy should be observed until final action, after which the world may know of the expulsion or suspension. Thus it will be seen that this distinguished author more than sustains our position. We only took the ground that extreme cases of expulsion might be published.

The error "Omega" has fallen into is confounding the transactions of a Lodge with the final action, or result of the transactions. When he comes to view the matter in its proper light, we feel sure that "Omega" will be convinced that there is not as wide a difference in our opinions as he seems to suppose.

Elections of Officers.

ORR LODGE, 104—WASHINGTON.

Seth Bridgeman,—W. M.
J. G. Bragaw—S. W.
D. B. Wharton—J. W.
J. F. Randolph—Treas.
E. S. Hoyt—Sec.
Adam Warner—S. D.
C. J. Lockyer—J. D.
R. W. Minor and Wm. Baynor—Stewards.

Jos. A. Farrow—Tiler.
Time of Regular Communications; First and Third Tuesday in each month.

JOSEPH WARREN LODGE, 93—STANTONSBURG.

F. M. Moye—W. M.
D. G. W. Ward—S. W.
W. H. Applewhite—J. W.
S. H. Tyson—Treas.
W. L. Grimmer—Sec.
J. W. Peacock—S. D.
J. H. Morgan—J. D.
A. S. Eason and J. V. Minshew—Stewards.

Wiley Smith—Tiler.
Time of Regular Communications: First Thursday in each month.

The funeral of Bro. B. B. Sauls will take place at his residence near Saul's X Roads on the third Sunday in July. All Masons in good standing are invited.

From the London Freemason.

The Vicar of Brigg and the Freemasons.

The following letter was addressed to the editor of the "Hull and Lincolnshire Times";

SIR,—You gave in your last issue an accurate report of the proceedings of the Freemasons at Brigg on the 6th inst., at the Lincolnshire provincial meeting. It is generally understood that the objects of the fraternity are the promotion of benevolence, morality—in a word, every charitable feeling and practice, and every Christian and moral virtue. On this occasion, as several clergymen belong to the Order, it was desired by some of the members, as was the case at Peterborough Cathedral the week prior to the last, and some time since at York Minster, to have a service at Brigg Church; but the vicar, the Rev. W. J. Wylie, A. M., claiming a gift of penetration beyond his clerical brethren, discovered such infidelity or expansion of religious views among Freemasons as to refuse them the privilege of the worst of sinners—*passim solum*—to join, as Freemasons, in his Church at Brigg (which by the bye, is a National Church), in the service of prayer and praise, and declined to allow one of the Grand Chaplains of their Order, a duly ordained minister of the Church of England, as well as Mr. Wylie, and whose teaching must conform to the articles and liturgy of the Church of England, to address Freemasons on their religious and moral duties in his church, or rather the Church of England, at Brigg. Furthermore, it may be stated as authentic that one of the sidesmen of Brigg Church, an influential resident in that town, aided the vicar by his influence and purse, very recently, to place a peal of bells in the tower of Brigg Church, and this gentleman is well known to be the leading Freemason in the town of Brigg; and the Master of the Freemasons' lodge at Brigg, at the present time, is a neighboring clergyman, Mr. Wylie's equal in ability, moral conduct, orthodoxy, and piety. Now, can there be a more wanton exhibition of the absence of brotherly love, or a more tyrannical aggression on the rights of the laity, than to exclude them from the service of common prayer, the prescribed ritual of our National Church? Such an assumption of power as to exclude, or rather excommunicate, both priest and people from the services of the Church of England is to reach the acme of petty popedom in England, and to set up a capricious clerical test as the condition of public worship. As a beneficed clergyman of the Church of England, and a doctor of divinity of both English Universities, I record my protest against this audacious yet puerile aggression on the rights of conscience and the principles of civil and religious liberty. Such drivelling sentimentalism, evinced in action by tyrannical authority, only rouses the laity to personal indignation, and leads some to argue, however illogically, for the disestablishment of the Anglican Church, which, in common with others, I so strongly deprecate. Let the Pope of Rome, if his Holiness please, place Freemasonry, as he does the Church of England, under his ban. We require not, but rather protest against, any mawkish imitation of the decrees of the Vatican, with respect to Masonry or other matters, from any clergyman who eats the bread, and ministers in the church, of the British Reformation.—I am, Sir, yours obediently. DANIEL ACE, D. D.

One of our exchanges contains an advertisement: "Masonic jewelry made and engraved free of charge." That sounds liberal.