

between four of the Grand Lodges in the United States, to wit: Between Missouri and New Mexico, and Minnesota and Dakota. There is now one Lodge in the territory of the Grand Lodge of Dakota, namely, Bismarck Lodge, No. 120, at Bismarck, which continues its affiliation with the Grand Lodge of Minnesota, the latter having resolved that she "will support, defend and maintain its rights, and execute authority and control over it, till such time as by its own free will and accord it shall desire to withdraw its connection with the Grand Lodge of Minnesota." In like manner there are two subordinate Lodges, at Silver City and Cimarron, in the territory of the Grand Lodge of New Mexico, which were chartered by the Grand Lodge of Missouri, and which refused to join the new local Grand Lodge. The Grand Lodge of Missouri *advised* them to affiliate with New Mexico, but they have *refused*. The Committee on Correspondence of Missouri said on this subject:

"The Grand Lodge of Missouri is the mother of all the Lodges that united in that formation of the Grand Lodge of New Mexico. She loves her children, and very cheerfully give them her blessing when they 'went to housekeeping.' She regrets that all did not heartily unite in the organization. We think it mistaken policy for *just two* Lodges to refuse co-operation, and after the organization is an accomplished fact. The mother Grand Lodge will not force (if she could) the two Lodges into undesired union with the new Grand Lodge; nor will she leave them like

"Mary of the wild moor,"

to freeze and die out in the cold. They are her children still; but they can live longer and far better by uniting their fortunes with the Grand Lodge where they are located. Certain it is that the Grand Lodge of Missouri will do nothing to disturb the harmony and comity already established and recognized between the two jurisdictions. Silver City and

Cimarron Lodges will be allowed to board in new Mexico, but we cannot do much for them. We take the liberty of advising them to unite with the Grand Lodge at home, receive charters and numbers therefrom, and terminate a seeming division where unity alone can secure strength. Our Grand Lodge having formally recognized the sovereignty of the Grand Lodge of New Mexico, will not recede from her position by encouraging the above named Lodges in any act that will contravene the rights of her foster-child and (now) youngest sister.

Now as to principle. As we understand the Masonic law applicable to all of these cases, it is the law of the legal formation of a new Grand Lodge. This law we believe to be as follows: Whenever a number of subordinate Lodges (whether chartered by one or more lawful Grand Lodges) exist in unoccupied territory, that is, in territory where no independent Grand Lodge exists and has jurisdiction, any number of Lodges *not less than three*, and constituting a *majority of the whole number* of subordinate Lodges in the State, territory, or *quasi* independent province in question, may lawfully combine together and organize a Grand Lodge. After being so organized, and demonstrating for a time the continued Masonic character of her proceedings, such new independent Grand Lodge will be entitled to receive fraternal recognition from the various Grand Lodges of the world. But what is the status of those subordinate Lodges which, located in the territory of the new Grand Lodge, refuse to join it? They were, undoubtedly, lawfully warranted. Having been so, do they lose their lawful warrants by the force of so called Masonic international law? This is the vital question at issue.

In 1878 the Grand Master of Missouri (one of the Grand bodies above named) while discussing the status of the Grand Lodge of Quebec *quo ad* of the Grand Lodge of Scotland, said:

"It has been a settled principle