

PERSONAL.

In this month's issue of the *Gavel and Freemasons' Journal*, we are attacked personally, by the Editor and by an anonymous correspondent, because of an article that appeared in the September number of the *CRAFTSMAN*. We may have something to say in reply to the former in our next issue, and we have only to say to the latter, that "ordinary etiquette" should have suggested to him the propriety of addressing his communication to the Editor of the journal upon whose conduct he animadvert.

"QUESTIONABLE MASONIC COURTESY."

Editor of the *CRAFTSMAN*,

SIR,—Under the above heading, you take me to task for some reference made to your journal in a letter addressed to the *Gavel and Freemasons' Journal* for October. You characterize my remarks as "discreditable and untruthful," and, growing more elegant as you proceed, allege that I have "slandered" the present publisher of the *CRAFTSMAN*. Your conclusion, which, I trust, is as consolatory to you as it must needs be overpowering to me, gives me over to a reprobate mind, in these emphatic words:—"If he deludes himself with the idea that he is acting the part of a man and a brother in endeavoring to destroy our character, &c., let him continue in that delusion."

It is a somewhat threadbare device of some editors, especially those who conduct religious or masonic journals, to arrogate to themselves the entire family of christian virtues. The editor of the *CRAFTSMAN* is only a feeble wayfarer in a well-beaten path. So much easier is it to lecture a dissentient, from the stand point of the Pharisee, than to argue with him fairly on a controverted point. At the very moment when you are reproaching me with failing to act "the part of a man and a brother," you are affording evidence of your conception of the part, glaring enough to astonish, if it does not edify, your readers. For whilst you comment upon my letter you have not the fairness to reprint it, although you copied Bro. White's communication to which it was a reply—an exemplification of brotherly kindness which would have caused a smile of moral approbation to illumine the features of Samuel Pecksniff or Joseph Surface, but for its exceeding clumsiness.

Your assertion that I cheerfully availed myself of the opportunity of eulogizing Bro. White in order to slander your publisher, is quite gratuitous. Pray, what right have you, to use your own words, "to impute to me motives of the basest;?" or have you one notion of the duty of "a man and a brother" for precept, and a diametrically opposite one for practice? I have had some little connection with the press, and have no hesitation in asserting that there is not a secular journal in the Pro-