

pire and the Continent of Europe with almost lightning rapidity, carrying with it the "blessing" of "Peace and good will to all men."

But no sooner had it become apparently unassailable, and impregnable, even although the Romish Church darted its arrows and anathemas against it; progress continued; but the intent and ends were laid hold of by designing and intriguing men. The notorious Chevalier Ramsay—the Prince Pretender to the British Crown and others were foremost in their endeavors to amplify it, thenceforward; every empiric—Charlatan and Masonic philosopher? grasped the idea of using the Symbolic degrees as a foundation to erect new Rites thereon. From these sprang what is known as the Council of Bordeaux, which took under its wings the Chapter of Clermont. Thus the Body known as the Scotch Rite was formed into 25 degrees.

But that did not satisfy the wisecracks in Masonry. It expanded itself into Thirty-three Degrees, as we find, not only in the work of the Metropolitan Council at Geneva, working under its name-sake of Scotland, but also that of Namur and other places. We find the following in Bro. Gould's "Freemasonry":—

"The A. and A. Rite 33^o, can boast of a very respectable antiquity, being descended in a direct line from (the Degrees) the Emperors of 1753, and possibly from the Chapter of Clermont, of 1754.

We may ungrudgingly confess that the compilers of their *Historia Ordines*, have displayed more moderation and greater respect for the unities than are generally found in the history of the high degree rites."—Gould's Freemasonry.

The good and learned brother might have gone further, and compared the A. A. S. Rite with Symbolic Masonry; as well enquired what actual benefit has the latter been to the world. Do we not see that one Supreme Council at least receives into its bosom Masons so-called, who have dis-severed their connections with their parent lodge and pay nothing toward

its sustenance? Does it not thereby destroy what is looked upon as a "Landmark?" Has it not essayed to depreciate Symbolic Masonry and set it aside by introducing a new theory of "Symbolism?" Does it not preach one thing and act contrariwise?

Has it not assumed a line of arrogance and insiduousness in teaching of Symbolic Masonry? Is it not in violation of the vows its members have all taken; to scatter with an unsparing hand, tons of scandalous and malignant vituperation against brother Masons who differ with them. And we also ask, how they can conciliate the fact that all of the so-called Supreme Councils of the World, still use the Symbolic degrees, in violation of every principle of honor and honesty. None have relinquished the right to induct their neophytes into them, outside of the United States, and they have the temerity of styling their work Freemasonry.

Did not DeGrasse Tilley when a prisoner of war in 1813-15 make Masons from the first degree upwards within his prison walls? His Supreme Council in Paris, and those descended therefrom, to this day make Masons from the first to the Thirty-third Degree, and claim affiliation with Symbolic Lodges. Is this the Masonry of 1717? We say No.

There is no true Masonry, beyond the first three degrees, maugre the fact, that elaborate and subtle essays have been printed to prove the contrary. "Ancient Craft Masonry" needs no apologist. It stands like the Rock of Ages upon its own intrinsic merits. It knows no difference between the king and the peasant.

All are brothers. Not so the A. A. S. Rite, (with one honorable exception.)

The A. A. S. Rite especially in Europe ignores the rights of the poor man, for none but those who are noblemen, can rarely find an entrance into their bodies. Those who do, never attain beyond the 14th or 18th degree. Those beyond are only