

of speculation and superficial Pyrrhonism for the scholia of a profound philosophy. To conciliate only these, it is demanded that Masonry shall dethrone God and set in His place a "Principle," of which no affection known to us, nor even intelligence, can be predicated; a force, an Impersonal Potency, between which and men there can be no sympathies; which cannot be for us a Providence; to which we and all our sorrows and sufferings and hopes and aspirations are no more than the dead sands of the sea-shores are.

It will not do for *us* to permit the Masonic world to suppose that we are not energetically opposed to the acceptance, in lieu of "One Living God, the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth," of a "Principle," perhaps inherent in matter, to which no idea of personality attaches. "To know God, *as* God," it has been truly said, "the Living God, we must assume his personality: otherwise, what were it but an ether, a gravitation?"

This "Principe-Createur" is no new phrase. It is but an old term revived. Our adversaries, numerous and formidable, will say, and will have the right to say, that our *Principe-Createur* is identical with the *Principe-Generateur* of the Indians and Egyptians, and may fitly be symbolized, as it was symbolized anciently, by the Linga, the Phallus and Priapus. "Phtha-Thore," says Matter, in his *Historie du Gnosticisme*, "*n'est qu'une autre modification de Phtha. Sous cette forme il est PRINCIPLE-CREATEUR, ou plutot PRINCIPLE-GENERATEUR.*" This Phtha, the Phallic God, holding the *priapus* in one hand and brandishing the *flagellum* in the other, was, in effect, "the Father of the Beginnings," "the God who creates with truth," the *Principe-Createur* of the ancient Egyptians.

To accept this, in lieu of a personal God, is to abandon Christianity and the worship of Jehovah, and return to wallow in the styes of Paganism. So it seems to us; and we can account for the assent of our English Brethren to the change, only upon the ground of inadvertence. Adopt it, and the Phallus will be a legitimate symbol of it in our Lodges and on our altars. The Linga is the symbol of it now, in the Temples of Hindustan. Nor does it help us, that it is "known as the Grand Architect of the Universe." For Chæremone tells that the "ancient Egyptians ascribed to the Sun that potent force which organizes all beings, and which force they regard as the *Grand Architect of the World*:" and Phtha, the Generator-Greator, was the Demiourgos or Architect of the Universe.

Where, if we substitute this Creative-Principle for God, are we to go to find a definition of it? The Sankhya philosophy, Ritter says, "usually paints the *Creative-Principle* as a blind force, and even appears at times to equate its notion to that of the corporeal. . . . The Creative-Principle, as being the "basis of the corporeal, is also conceived to be a body."

Even the Pagan Emperor Julian admitted an *Esprit-Createur*; a SPIRIT-Creator, of which Atys, he held (self-multilated), was a symbol. We are asked to accept a "Principle," which each may define for himself; to call which *Father*, and to pray to it, would be absurd; to accept which would be to abandon the idea of a personal Deity, that idea, root of all religions, upon which Free-

Masonry
it falls in

Those
to sweep
the old w
with the
fraternal
brotherly
in a spiri
a union o

May o
Council a

To the M

Propose
for
La

UN

Where
Accepted
Ancient
of the O
ideas and
stare supe
their fath
Createur
agreed on
tions of l
against ea
Articles,
Supreme