

32078

# SERMONS AND ADDRESSES

—ON—

# SECRET SOCIETIES,

—BY—

REV. LEBBEUS ARMSTRONG, REV. DANIEL DOW, REV. W. F.  
McNARY, REV. R. T. CROSS, REV. JAMES WILLIAMS,  
REV. J. SARVER, PREST. J. BLANCHARD, PREST.  
H. H. GEORGE, PROF. J. G. CARSON,  
REV. M. S. DRURY, REV. ROBERT  
ARMSTRONG, AND REV. A. L.  
POST.

FOURTEEN PAMPHLETS IN ONE VOLUME.

---

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.

EZRA A. COOK, PUBLISHER.

1882.

## ADVERTISEMENT.

These fourteen pamphlets are here bound together for the convenience of those who wish them in permanent form for public and private libraries.

The attentive reader will not fail to find in this volume arguments with which to meet the most subtle attack of the powers of darkness.

Quite a number of the authors speak from their own experience in these Secret Orders; and others are reckoned among the clearest thinkers and most logical reasoners in the nation.

All speak from a thorough knowledge of the subject and no christian or patriot will think of joining any secret order after a careful perusal of this volume.

These pamphlets are still published separately in paper covers.

EZRA A. COOK

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.

THE RELATION OF THE  
**CHRISTIAN CHURCH**  
—TO—  
**SECRET SOCIETIES.**

ADDRESS OF  
PRESIDENT H. H. GEORGE,  
—:OF:—  
*Geneva College, West Geneva, Ohio.*

**AT THE SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY**  
**OF THE**  
**National Christian Association,**

*Pittsburgh, Pa., June 8th,—10th, 1876*

---

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS:  
**EZRA A. COOK, PUBLISHER.**  
1882.

# THE RELATION OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH TO SECRET SOCIETIES.

---

It is needless to say, in entering upon a discussion of this subject, that we have no personal contest with our opponents. We have no quarrel with any individuals identified with the secret orders. On the other hand, for many connected with them, we have a high personal regard.

But when men combine together in such associations as these, and lay their plans to wield an influence so far reaching, so deeply affecting the welfare of society, their institutions become a legitimate subject for investigation, and their doings, whether right or wrong, must bear the verdict of a dispassionate and scrutinizing enquiry.

The assertion so often and so positively made by the fraternities, that no one knows any thing about them except such as have been initiated, is a very feeble defense of their cause. Aye, more, it is a libel upon the intelligence and upon the facilities for intelligence in this noonday of the nineteenth century.

Such assertions once might have had some weight, but since the well attested exposure of Free Masonry by Captain Wm. Morgan, in the year 1827, his abduction and murder on account of it, since the secession of 45,000 members because of that candid and unequivocal exposure; and since scores of volumes of indisputable information have issued from the press, yes, and from the press of most reliable craftsmen, all such assertions are but the vapid boastings and hollow babblings of weak minded men, who ought to know that they will not be believed.

To say that we have no right to investigate the principles of their organization, or examine their works of secrecy; to say that we have no right to portray their true character, or decide upon

the legitimacy of their aims, is presumption of no ordinary kind; it is a challenge of the inalienable rights of free thought and free speech. And to brand with falsehood and treachery the testimony of all those who have once been initiated into their lodges, and who, from solemn convictions of duty, have come out and renounced all connection with them, is an absurdity immeasurably preposterous.

The truth is, if Masonry, (and I draw all my illustrations from Masonry, believing it to be the mother of the whole brood of secret fraternities,) be a hidden wrong, as we hold it is, the renunciation of it by any man, and especially by any trustworthy and reputable man, is a strong additional reason why credence should be given to every word of his testimony.

When a man takes a wrong step, the only righteous course is to retrace that step. "Break off thy sins by righteousness," says the Holy Inspiration.

If an oath that has been taken be profane and wicked, to continue under that oath is to continue in profanity and wickedness. No man is bound by a profane oath; no, not an hour after he is convinced of its profanity.

If it can be shown that the oaths, for example of Masonry, are unwarrantable, profane in their obligations and cruel in their penalties, and ought never to have been taken, the inference is inevitable that no Mason is bound by his oath. Nay, still stronger, that every Mason is as much bound to break his oath and get rid of that species of profanity, as he is to leave off the common formulas of blasphemy and profanity that are used in the dram shop and market place.

Profanity under the solemnity of an oath is more awfully wicked and shocking to every moral sense than the common oaths by profane men.

Should we, then, summon in this discussion, for the proof of any statement, the testimony of unimpeachable men who have been under the bonds of any of the fraternities, and who, having seen the evils of the association or the oaths which bound them thereto, have come before the world and renounced all connection with them, let it be borne in mind that this evidence is not to be ruled out by the cries of falsehood and perjury, but it is to have ad-

5

ditional weight, yes, I repeat, additional weight, from the fact that such men have had honesty, piety, and courage enough, in the face of all manner of reproach and insult, and even danger, to divest themselves from all entangling oaths, to publicly confess their evil course, and to unearth the wrongs of those associations with which they had been connected.

But we are at no loss for witnesses. To the number of seceders may be added a long list of most reliable adhering members, who have furnished us with undoubted testimony as to the genuine character of the institution.

But, without entering upon a discussion of the general subject, the aspect of the question to which I ask the attention of this audience to-night is the relation the Christian church should sustain to these institutions and those connected with them.

Should the members of a Masonic Lodge, or any similar secret society, be fellowshipped in the church, or should they not? At the risk of any reproach or antagonism that may be imagined, felt, or expressed by the fellows of the craft, and at the risk of little or much opposition by Christian brethren in the churches, I take the position that the church should not hold fellowship with secret societies.

The general principle the Saviour of the world laid down will have its application here: "He that is not with me is against me." These societies are not with Christ. They refuse to mention His name in their basis of organization. They mutilate their quotations from the Word of God by expunging the Sacred name. Let Daniel Sickles, in his Monitor, testify, on the 51st page, in the charge at the opening of the Royal Arch degree, where ten verses are quoted from the III chapter of II Thessalonians, beginning at the 6th verse. In the authorized version the name of our Lord Jesus Christ is twice mentioned in these ten verses, while in Daniel Sickles' quotation it is not to be found at all; wholly expunged. The authorized version says: "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves," &c. The Masonic version is: "Now we command you, brethren, that ye withdraw yourselves," &c. They exclude the same holy name from the authorized formulas of prayer; and in like manner is it excluded from all their universally received formulas of religious service.

Can the church fellowship an institution that has no Christ? "He that is not with me is against me."

In this, as in every moral question, there is no neutral ground. There is no *punctum indifferens*. Neutrality in Christianity is infidelity; neutrality in morality is immorality.

If secret societies be upon the side of Christ, if they do honor to his name, and advance his kingdom, let the church shield and nourish them; let her take them to her bosom in holiest fellowship. But if they are against Christ, if they be based upon corrupt principles, if they be damaging to Church and State, if they be detrimental to religion, to the timely and eternal interests of immortal souls, as we propose to show, then let the church cut loose from them, and rid herself of all connection with them. The church is too sacred a place to have such organizations in sworn identification.

Let me now, in the first place, ask your attention for a little time to the character of the church, and, after that, to the character of secret organizations. And in the first part of the discussion I must take for granted some features of secret organizations that in the latter part I shall endeavor to substantiate.

The church, then, I observe, is a most sacred institution. Compared to a building, it is set "upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone." "In whom," viz., Jesus Christ, "all the building, fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord." "To whom coming," says another sacred writer, "as unto a living stone, disallowed, indeed, of men, but chosen of God and precious, ye, also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." Sacred in her foundation, sacred in every stone of her building, the last or cope stone shall be laid with shoutings of grace, grace unto it.

Can that, therefore, which is against Christ, and refuses to name His name, be built upon the foundation, that is, Christ? Can that which is enmity to Christ, and of necessity unholy, be built up and cemented together with that which is holy? When righteousness can hold fellowship with unrighteousness, when light can hold communion with darkness, and Christ can have concord with

Belial, then, and only then, can Christ's church extend her fellowship to secret orders that have no Christ.

But, more minutely, the church is an organism, a unity. Nor is it a unity by conventional law, it has an organic oneness, determined by organic law, and constitutes an organic whole. It is not a collection of separate individuals bound together by external force like the grains of sand in a cup, but it has the unity of an organism, it is moulded by an inner law, it grows by development. "Its germ," as Mulford says of the nation, "lies beyond analysis, and in it is enfolded its whole future." "As the days of a tree are the days of my people." With the same unity and identity of structure that pervades the entire tree in its roots, branches, and leaves, the church is pervaded.

When the tree, by its roots, can absorb the solid granite or the block of iron, and, taking them into its circulatory organs, can deposit them in its development, then may the church take that which is essentially opposed to it, and carry it into its circulation and form a growth.

The Scriptures allude to this organism under the figure of a body. The church is the body of Christ—"a body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth." And like as the hands and feet are necessary parts of the physical body, so the members of the church are essential parts of the body of Christ. Nor do the laws of life in the physical body act with more unvarying certainty than in the body of Christ.

When poison can be injected into the veins of the arm, or into an artery in the leg, and do the physical body no harm, then can that which is Christless be taken into the body of Christ and produce no baneful results. Nor can it be objected here that the church is not perfect, and that all her members have evils connected with them, and the deduction drawn that if one form of imperfection be tolerated so may another.

There is a distinction, wide as infinity, between an imperfection known and confessed and mourned over, and a gross error and a flagrant wrong, believed, loved, advocated, and sworn to defend.

Were the church only an aggregation of individuals, and each one of these had only a personal responsibility to his God, then might one member, on conventional grounds, be in sworn identifi-



caſion with a Chriſtleſs organization and ſtill retain his ſtanding. But when the members are parts of an organiſm formed in and through the body, mutually liable in the organic reſponſibility, then what poisons one member vitiates the whole. If one member ſuffers the whole body ſuffers. A cancer on one limb will tranſuſe its virus into the whole ſyſtem.

If ſecret fraternities be wrong, diſhonoring to Chriſt, and hedged in with unholy oaths, then a man in ſworn league with them, when he comes into the fellowſhip of the church and becomes a part of her organiſm, by that very act tranſmutes a ſhare of the reſponſibility of his ſecret connection to all that portion of the church that receives him and defends the reception of him.

The church can't get rid of a mutual reſponſibility in a known and ſworn evil of any member whom ſhe willingly invites to her communion.

But the church is a Divine organiſm. The eternal God is its maker. On the everlaſting hills of holineſs He has ſet the foundations of it. In the membership of which it is composed, it was redeemed by nothing leſs than the precious blood of Chriſt. Into its pale, nothing known and admitted as unholy and profane can be allowed to enter.

But without its pale, beyond the hallowed precincts of this divine organiſm, is every thing that is Chriſtleſs and Chriſt-diſhonoring. "Without are dogs, and ſorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idoliters, and whoſoever loveth and maketh a lie." The church is the home and reſidence of its Divine Author. "The Lord hath choſen Zion; He hath deſired it for his habitation. This is My reſt forever; here will I dwell, for I have deſired it." And of His character, it is ſaid, "He is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity; He cannot look upon ſin." Shall that one, therefore, be admitted to the churches' moſt ſacred priveleges and to her divineſt fellowſhip who is in ſworn league to diſown the bleſſed name of the churches' Head and Lord?

But this ſame organiſm, in every part of its exiſtence, is ſubjected to Divine authority. Its doctrines muſt be thoſe, and only thoſe, of the Divine Scriptures; its worſhip is of Divine ordination (for God will not be mocked by any ſacrifice that is only human) its diſcipline is preſcribed by Divine law, and its government

is equally Divine. The Tabernacle, in every post, and curtain, and pin, was to be constructed according to the pattern God showed Moses in the mount. And the prophet Ezekiel, portraying in vision the New Testament church, shows us "the form of the house, and the fashion thereof, and the goings out thereof, and the comings in thereof," and he says, "Upon the top of the mountain the whole limit thereof round about is most holy. Behold this is the law of the house."

Can that, therefore, that is Divine in form and fashion, in law and ordinance, in the comings in and goings out, admit with impunity, and welcome to her privilege, the man that by a shocking oath is sworn to set the lodge above the church, and obey Masonic law whether it conflicts or not with the law of God, revealed in and through the church?

But there is the specific statute of the Divine code given to the church with reference to such associations of secrecy. "Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them, for it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of them in secret."

The apostle was advising the converted Ephesians with reference to some pagan associations that met in secret, and that perpetrated deeds of which it was a shame even to speak, and his injunction by inspiration was, "Have no fellowship with them."

The Ephesian converts had been brought forth from heathen darkness into the glorious light of the gospel, and those pagan deeds were done in the dark, and as darkness and light were antagonisms, there could, in the nature of the case, be no fellowship. Neither can modern secret fraternities, that are only skeletons or resurrected bodies of those pagan associations, any more have fellowship with the Divinely organized church.

But again, this organism in the members that enter into it, is under solemn oath of fealty to God. Every ordinance to which it admits the individual, every privilege it extends, is upon the basis of oath-bound obligation.

The sacrament of the church to which her communicants are admitted gets its signification in the *sacramentum* of the Romans, which was their military oath of allegiance: "*Sine quo, Romanus miles, jure cum hostibus pugnare non poterat.*" The broken bread

and accepted cup to the partaker are the symbols of a solemn oath of fealty, a sworn obligation to be loyal to the churches' King and Lord in every thought and word and action, yea, and minutia of action in life. "Whether, therefore, ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." And this oath, moreover, binds every taker thereof, body, and mind, and conscience, until the day when God shall judge the world by Jesus Christ.

How, therefore, can the church administer this solemn religious oath to one who, in some dark chamber or under some cover of secrecy, has taken another oath to divest the same Lord and Judge of all the glory that belongs to Him? Shall the church, can the church be party to the heaping of such conflicting oaths before a just and holy God? Can the church allow a man to jeopardize his highest and best interests in such a way? Nay, infinitely better that the church close her doors against every man who so dishonors her Saviour and disowns Him, until he see, and feel, and confess his sin in so doing, and then, throw wide her doors to every humble, penitent sinner who is ready and willing to give all honor to the only Redeemer and to him alone, in every act of life.

But only once more as to this organism. It is ordained of God to be a witness for Himself, and against every thing that dishonors Him. Says Jesus to his disciples: "Ye are the light of the world." And in an organized capacity, "A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid. Neither do men light a candle and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light unto all that are in the house." "Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven."

The church is the Reflector of the character of God before the world and the glory of that character; the exhibitor of his truth, and a witness against every thing untrue.

"Now, suppose she admits any known and palpable evil, christens it as a part of herself hugs it to her bosom, and consecrates it to her holiest fellowship, how, after this, can she testify against it?

Will she first, by law, seal and ratify a connection with it, eat and drink the sacramental bread and wine with it, and then attempt to drive it out? Admit it by law, and drive it out by moral suasion? Admit it by solemn rite, and then hurl the curses of God upon it from the pulpit? Were this fair dealing by the church? Were this an honorable and efficient testimony against

evil? It is as when a man would take another by the beard as if to kiss him and thrust the dagger into his heart. The church that admits secret societies believes in them, or ought to, and ought to stand by them.

Nor will evils usually submit quietly to such treatment. After the serpent is warmed in the bosom it is not seldom it thrusts its fangs into the same bosom that warmed it. The evil spirit, for aught we know, entered the demoniac without any demonstrations of violence; but it went out, tearing him till he foamed and raged in his paroxysms.

When the church knowingly and willingly baptizes and communes with any flagrant evil, I know not why she should not let it enjoy in quietness all her other privileges, for the greater always involves the less.

But this let-alone policy of the church to heresies in doctrine, and evils in practice, because, forsooth, she has admitted them, has oft-times rendered her an unfaithful witness to the truth God has committed to her trust, and lent her influence to the protection and propagation, rather than the suppression of such evils.

What, for example, has more bolstered up the unhallowed associations of secrecy than the fact that the church has fellowshipped them? Have they not pointed to the church as their protection? Have they not boldly referred to the names of leading ministers, aye, Doctors of Divinity, in connection with them, and spoken of them as their "Towers of Strength?" Have not Christless associations been exalted to positions of honor by reason of their standing in the church?

Where would these or any other evils have been found had the entire evangelical church pointed her testimony against them? Their insignia of honor would have been flung, as the idols of the heathen before the light of Christianity, to the moles and the bats; and they would have vanished as snow before the sun.

The power of the churches' testimony is incalculable, were it clear, and pointed, and untrammelled by unholy connections with evils. When they could build a breast-work that would stop the coming tide of the ocean, then might inventors of evil hope to arrest the triumphant victories of the churches' united testimony.

When they could check the spreading rays of a rising sun, then might the dark chambers of secrecy hope to set bounds to the ad-

vancing light and truth of the church.

But if the church nourishes and feeds, if she protects and builds up such institutions, she closes her own lips, she puts her light under a bushel, she blunts her arrows of truth, she weakens her strength, and fails in her design to be a reflector of God's truth and character, to be the city set upon a hill, that cannot be hid.

The church is God's organism to reflect the light of heaven upon a dark world, and if her light be darkness, how great is that darkness?

With this hasty sketch of the constitution and character of the church, let us now turn to the Institutions of Secrecy themselves, and see wherein they furnish reasons why they should not be admitted to the sacred privileges of the church. And, as by the fruit, the character of the tree may be known, so, by their fruit, they may be characterized.

Inasmuch, therefore, as they have no Christ, the first denomination we must apply to them is Unchristian or Anti-Christian. Although the assertion is made by some of modern times that Christ is named in the Lodge, and His name is used in prayer; yet standard authorities all agree in an opposite statement.

In Chase's Digest of Masonic Law, we read on page 206, "We now hold as our forefathers held, and as we hope our posterity to hold, that from the votaries of Masonry is expected and required a sincere belief in the existence of a God, the Creator and Governor of the world, and that beyond this great principle of faith it is not lawful to impose any religious test as a requisite for admission to any mysteries." Again, on same page, "We can find no reason for interdicting any otherwise worthy applicant, who firmly believes in the existence of a Supreme Being, nor can we allow of any right to interrogate him further as to his religious belief."

While God has said, "He that hath not the Son," viz., Jesus Christ, "hath not the Father," Masonry says, "We cannot allow any right to interrogate a man as to his religious belief, farther than his belief in God." Same book, p. 208, Blue Lodge, "Masonry has nothing whatever to do with the Bible. It is not founded on the Bible; if it was, it would not be Masonry; it would be something else." Same page, "Freemasonry calls no man to account for his belief of any religion on the Globe." The Jew, who actually crucified the Son of God, may be as good a Mason as the Christian who believes in Him—and so may the Hottentot

Albert G. Mackey, whose *Lexicon of Freemasonry* no intelligent member of the craft will deny as of standard authority, says, page 402, "The religion of Masonry is pure Theism, on which its different members engraft their own peculiar opinions, but they are not permitted to introduce them into the Lodge, or to connect their truth or falsehood with the truth of Masonry." That is, stating it in a different form, if a man should engraft on the Theism of Masonry a Christian opinion, or a belief in Christ, he must not introduce this into the Lodge; or, stated yet again, Christ or Christianity must not be introduced into the Lodge. Is it not, therefore, an Anti-Christian institution?

But this feature further appears in that they indulge a hope of salvation, which they base solely on morality.

Robert Macoy, whose authority is undoubted, says, in his cyclo-pedia: "Let us then, by our practice and conduct in life, show that we carry our emblems worthily and as the children of light, that we have turned our backs on works of darkness, obscurity and drunkenness, hatred and malice, Satan and his dominions, preferring benevolence, justice, temperance, chastity, and brotherly love, as the *acceptable service* on which the great Master of all, from His beatitude, looks down with approbation," &c. That is, oblivious of the fact that there is a Christ, or that he died to atone for sinners, and render them acceptable to God, high Masonic authority makes charity, temperance, justice, &c., "the acceptable service on which God looks down with approbation." In other words, it substitutes Masonic charity, &c., for the crucifixion on Calvary!

Again, Mackey says under the word *acacia*, it is "a term derived from *akakia*, innocence, and signifying a Mason who, by living in strict obedience to the obligations and precepts of the fraternity, is free from sin."

While God says, "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sin," Masonry says by living in strict obedience to the obligations and precepts of the fraternity, there *is freedom from sin*.

Daniel Sickles, in summing up the first three degrees of Entered apprentice, Fellow Craft, and Master Mason, says: "These three degrees thus form a perfect and a harmonious whole; nor can we conceive that any thing can be suggested more which the soul of man requires."

And still farther in proof of this anti-Christian character, the very morality on which they rest the hope, even of salvation, is,

by their own interpretation, of the very lowest kind.

As to their charities, old men, and cripples, and idiots, and women are unprivileged.

Those characters that so often are in very deed the objects of charity, must be wholly and entirely excluded from that charity that is claimed to be so *acceptable* to God and so *salvatory* to the soul. Says Sickles: "The person who desires to be made a Mason, must be a man of sound body and mind, not deformed or dismembered, but hale and sound in his physical conformation, having his right limbs as a man ought to have."

Says Mackey: "No atheist, eunuch or woman can be admitted." "An idiot could not understand the duties and obligations imposed and an atheist would not respect them."

The lame, the halt, and the blind, such that Jesus Christ had compassion upon and healed, Masonic law excludes from its sympathies.

As to the justice of the institution, men are sworn, under the most horrid penalties, to defend their brother craftsman in any crime, to defend him ever and always.

In the Master Mason's degree murder and treason are excepted in this defense, if the candidate elect so to do; but in the Royal Arch degree the candidate swears a most cruel oath to assist a companion in any difficulty, and espouse his cause so far as to extricate him from the same, if in his power, whether he be right or wrong.

Mark the last clause: "whether he be right or wrong." Murder and treason here are *not excepted*, and this is the justice said to be *acceptable to God*.

What can furnish a greater premium on villainy, and a stronger incitement to murder, than to know that a sworn Lodge stands behind the murderer and traitor to shield them from the just penalty of a righteous law?

But as to purity, drunkenness is practically no barrier, provided the drunkard can keep the secret; chastity is a Masonic virtue, *so far as a brother Mason's wife, sister, daughter or mother are concerned*, but farther, there is no law.

A man may lie ten thousand times to keep the secret, but lies innumerable, *in* keeping the secret, will not detract from the grade on the Masonic scale.

What must be the verdict of genuine truth and purity upon such morality as this? Is it not a misnomer? Is it not an undermining of the foundations of Christian morality? A substitution

for it, of grossest immorality? fundamentally antagonistic to Christ and all the principles of His religion?

But once more as to the anti-Christian character of these institutions. They are essentially, as well as formally, pagan. Cast in the mold of ancient pagan secret societies.

Masonry asserts the claim to be both ancient and honorable. In Rebold's History of Freemasonry in Europe we are told that Symbolic Masonry originated at Apple Tree tavern, in London, June 24th, 1717. And yet we readily grant, that in their spirit and essence, in their cast and mould, their constitution and rules of government, they may rightfully count kinship with more ancient institutions, formed in the darkness of heathenism; societies that perpetuated in the dark, deeds of which it was a shame even to speak.

Come with me, and let us look for a moment at a vision we find recorded in one of the books of former inspiration. God's Ancient Israel had lapsed into Idolatry, until the storm cloud of His wrath seemed ready to burst with destructive fury upon them; when the prophet Ezekiel was permitted in vision to enter into one of their secret societies, and portray what he saw in their chambers of imagery.

The description is graphic, the analogy is complete, and the illustration most striking. But let us read: "And he brought me to the door of the court, and when I looked, behold a hole in the wall." This hole was only an outer mark directing to inner discoveries. "Then said he unto me, son of man dig now in the wall. And when I had digged in the wall, behold a door." The door was hidden from view—it was behind the wall.

The door of the Lodge must be effectually barred and guarded by Tyler and sword so that no Cowan shall be admitted, to prevent all old men in their dotage, and young men in their nonage, idiots and women from entering into it.

"And he said unto me, go in, and behold the wicked abominations that they do here;" descriptive of the ceremonies of initiation into the Lodge room, the administration and reception of most shocking oaths, the formulas of Christless worship, and especially the prostitution of the most sacred ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper. "So I went in and saw; and behold every form of creeping things, and abominable beasts, and all the idols of the house of Israel, portrayed upon the wall round about." A figure of Symbolic Masonry with the symbols taken from the civilization of christianity. The lamb must be killed, that the skin of it an



the form of a little apron, may remind the wearer of that purity of life so essentially necessary to his gaining admission into the Celestial Lodge above, where the Supreme Architect of the Universe presides.—*Sickles' Monitor*.

The single slipper is symbolic of the testimony in Israel, when a man plucked off his shoe and gave it unto his neighbor.

The Mosaic pavement an emblem of human life, checkered with good and evil.

The Square, of mortality; the Level, of equality; and the Plumb, of rectitude of conduct.

The compasses pointing to the naked breast, the pot of incense, the sword pointing to the naked heart, the anchor and the ark are all symbols. The latter an emblem of that Divine Ark which safely wafts us over this tempestuous sea of troubles, and next last, of that Anchor which shall safely moor us in a peaceful harbor, "where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary shall find rest."

Ezekiel tells of the symbols used in that day, Sickles, and others, inform us of the symbols used to-day.

But the record proceeds, "And there stood before them seventy men of the ancients of the house of Israel, and in the midst of them stood Jaazania, the son of Shaphan, with every man his censor in his hand; and a thick cloud of incense went up."

Those ancients if designated now, would be Master, Most Worshipful Master, Past Grand Commander, Most Puissant Grand Commander, *ad infinitum*.

But Ezekiel informs us they were busy praying in their Lodge room, till the incense was dense, and went up in a thick cloud; nor is modern Masonry without abundance of prayers.

The prophet was now questioned as to their works: "Son of man, hast thou seen what the ancients of the house of Israel do in the dark, every man in the chambers of his imagery? for they say the Lord seeth us not, the Lord hath forsaken the earth."

How characteristic! Their service was all in the dark, every man, in the chambers of his imagery, doing such things as they knew the Lord would not approve, and, in their atheism and folly, they said, "The Lord sees us not, He has forsaken the earth."

But there were degrees in those heathen societies as well as now. "He said also unto me: Turn thee yet again, and thou shalt see greater abominations that they do. Then he brought me to the door of the gate of the Lord's house, which was toward the north, and behold, there sat women, weeping for Lammuz."

The service of this degree is, without any blush or hesitation, adopted in the ceremonies of Modern Masonry; thereby unmistakably identifying it with those Heathen societies.

On the authority of Jerome and others of the Fathers, the word Lammuz was the Hebrew name for Adonis, a Syrian idol, of which Mackey says: "The mysteries of Adonis were at one time introduced into Judea, when the Hebrew women were accustomed to hold an annual lamentation for him under the name of Lammuz, of which Ezekiel speaks, viii: 14, 'behold there sat women weeping for Lammuz.'"

He further says, "The cultivation of the mysteries of Adonis was propagated from Phoenicia into Assyria, Babylonia, Persia, Greece, and Sicily." Quoting from one of the Fathers, Julius Firmicus, Mackey interprets the ceremonies of Adonis:

"On a certain night an image is laid out upon a bed, and bewailed in mournful strains. At length, when they are satiated with their fictitious lamentation, light is introduced, and the priest, having first annointed the mouths of those who had been weeping, whispers with a gentle murmur, 'Trust ye, initiates,' for the God being saved, out of pains salvation shall arise to us." Hence says he, "the ceremonies were a representation of the death and resurrection of Adonis in the person of the aspirant."

But there is another degree in the Lodge Ezekiel saw by vision: "Then said he unto me, Hast thou seen this, O Son of Man? turn thee yet again and thou shalt see greater abominations than these. And he brought me into the inner court of the Lord's house, and behold, at the door of the Lord, between the porch and the altar, were about five and twenty men, with their backs toward the temple of the Lord, and their faces toward the east, and they worshipped the sun toward the east." Strikingly illustrative of the Entered Apprentice when, blindfolded and half naked, he is led around and around the Lodge room; at length he is brought to the Worshipful Master in the east, when it is demanded, whence came he? and whither is he traveling? and is made to answer, a poor, blind candidate, traveling from the west to the east in search of light. With his back on the temple of God, he has gone to worship the lights of Masonry.

After this vision is ended, hear the awful verdict by Jehovah: "Is it a light thing to the house of Judah that they commit the abominations which they commit here, for they have filled the land with violence, and have returned to provoke me to anger, and lo they put the branch to their nose. Therefore will I also deal in

fury, mine eye shall not spare, neither will I have pity, and though they cry in mine ears with a loud voice, yet will I not hear them."

What now shall be said about holding fellowship or identifying with such fraternities? Can that institution so undoubtedly anti-Christian, so unmistakably immoral, so purely heathen, be hugged to the bosom of the church? Can it sit down at that holy table, and join in that sacramental oath that binds the communicants in a holy brotherhood, and pledges them to like holy and consistent walk before God? Can it at one hour receive the sacrament Divinely authorized in the church, and at another be found administering or taking, in a most blasphemous and impious manner the same symbols in a lodge room? When Christ can fellowship Belial, then may such be taken into the church. But until holiness and sin are the same thing, until light and darkness agree, and pure religion and heathenism become twin sisters, let the church hear the imperative injunction, "Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them."

"Another argument why the church should not fellowship them is that they are injurious to her success. For example, they injure her growth by deluding men with a vain show of religion. It is the smaller portion of the Masonic fraternity that ever has been admitted to the church, or had any desire towards it; and for at least a very natural reason, that the institution of itself claims to be a religion. Every where its manifestoes, laws and by-laws crops out the idea that to be a true Mason is to be truly religious.

President Finney, quoting from standard Masonic authority, says, "The principles of Freemasonry have the same coeternal and unshaken foundations, contain and inculcate the same truths in substance, and propose the same ultimate end as the doctrines of Christianity."

In advancing to the Fourth degree it says, "He has a name which no man knoweth save him that receiveth it." "If, therefore, he be rejected and cast forth among the rubbish of the world, he knows full well that the Great Master builder of the universe, having chosen and prepared him a lively stone in that spiritual building in the heavens, will bring him forth in triumph, while shouting grace, grace to the Divine Redeemer. And when he opens the Fourth degree, he discovers his election to, and his glorified station in the kingdom of his Father."

For what end, then, are the religious services of baptism and the Lord's supper? Why such loud and oft repeated boastings that the Bible is the main book in the Lodge? Why so many

prayers, and so much pretension of religion?

The design is manifestly to substitute Masonry for the church, to lead men to feel, as thousands of them express, "that Masonry is all the religion we want."

The effect of all this is to prevent men from coming to the church, to satisfy them in being out of the church, thereby preventing the growth of the church, thwarting her aim to convert the world, and damaging her most vital interests.

These secret societies have too often proved but the recruiting offices of the great enemy set over against the gates of Zion.

Shall the church admit such as conspire against her?

But suppose the member of the fraternity joins in holy communion with God's people on the Sabbath. Is not the direction to such as have received Christ to walk in Him; to avoid all appearance of evil, to walk worthy of the high vocation wherewith they are called?

But into what does the Lodge lead him? Who are his companions there? The Monitor tells us: "The distant Chinese, the wild Arab, and the American savage will embrace a brother Briton, and know that, beside the common ties of humanity, there is still a stronger obligation to induce him to kind and friendly offices! Aye, with blasphemers, drunkards, and men who will dishonor and deny the very name over which he ate sacramental bread yesterday."

With men of this character he must be a companion, aye, bound to them by oaths most fearful.

Can it otherwise than injure the church when it thus traduces the life and walk of her members?

Does it not bring stigma upon the church, give occasion to the infidel and the unbeliever to scoff at religion, repudiate and despise the church?

Shall the church, then, so weaken her power, so counteract her influence, so forestall her testimony for Christ and holiness of life, as to swear into her communion one already sworn and re-sworn to companionship with Chinese, wild Arabs, Savages, Jews, and Heathen, and Infidels of every kind?

But these fraternities, when admitted to the church, cripple her energies.

In her courts and conferences, her synods and presbyteries, they become partisans. Their league with one another binds them, when in the church, in the face of all the administration of healthy discipline, or the proper execution of the ecclesiastical law.

They are sworn to band together in each other's defense, whether right or wrong; if they do not, the horrid penalties of their oaths are hanging over their heads. And what is this, but undermining the very foundations of the church?

The Masonic minister, whether pastor of a congregation, or a member of a conference or synod, swears to be true to his fellow craftsman in any case pending between him and an uninitiated brother. So the Masonic witness, called to give testimony, if either of the parties on trial be a craftsman, is under the heaviest penalties to defend him, whether right or wrong.

That is, all these members of fraternities, while in the church, must be in subordination to a higher and more worthy relation in the lodge; or in other words, the church, as to her law and order and discipline, must bow at the nod, and surrender at the dicta of members of a heathen institution!

Can the church fellowship that which undermines her foundations, impedes her growth, disgraces her membership, and clogs the wheels of her entire machinery?

The unvarying demand of the church, of all those linked with these fraternities, who come to her for admission, should be, "Come out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you."

I have just one more general argument why the church should not fellowship these societies, and that is, Because they are enemies to the public welfare.

The mission of the church is to benefit society, to ameliorate the condition of mankind, and to promote all the interests of a common humanity.

Her character for impartial benevolence will be compromised by admitting that which is a misnomer for benevolence.

Her generosity that is unrestricted, her charity that suffers long and is kind, will be counteracted by an affiliation with that which in so many ways is an enemy to the public good.

These fraternities are intensely selfish. They would monopolize all the privileges of society for their own aggrandizement.

They *profess* benevolence, they *practice* unalloyed selfishness.

They combine to further each others interests. If a Mason be a mechanic or a business man he is patronized by Masons.

A minister taking charge of a congregation, is often made to understand that Masonry is the door of access to the hearts of the people, that his success depends on it; he yields and is initiated, and the craft is sworn to stand beside him.

The physician gets practice by it. And thus, those social privileges guaranteed to all men equally, are so often and so flagrantly abused by the intense selfishness of secret societies.

But they wrong the public in oft-times defeating the ends of justice. I wait not to furnish examples, though many well attested are on record, and fresh in the minds of living men.

If true to their oaths they must defeat justice. They are sworn to conceal and never reveal any secret crime of a brother, to espouse the cause of a companion when involved in any difficulty, and extricate him from the same, whether he be right or wrong, murder and treason not excepted.

Mackey lays down the principle. Says he: "Treason and rebellion also, because they are altogether political offenses, cannot be inquired into by a lodge, and although a Mason may be convicted of either of these acts in the courts of his country, he cannot be Masonically punished. Notwithstanding his treason or rebellion, his relation to the Lodge, to use the language of the old charges, remains indefeasible."

What can the practical effect of such a principle be but to overthrow a government, and screen men from the just punishment of their crimes? These fraternities, in declaring their sovereignty, make no exception of the authority of civil courts or the sovereignty of States.

The Lodge acknowledges no sovereignty above itself. It assumes the prerogative of the State in administering oaths. It far transcends the State in its penalties; for while the violation of State law subjects to fines and imprisonments, and for capital crimes, the gallows, Masonry attaches for the violation of the Masonic law, the horrid penalties of having the throat cut from ear to ear, the tongue torn out by the roots, the heart and bowels cut out, and the body buried in the rough sands of the sea.

The death penalty by the State is for but one, and that the greatest crime known among men, namely, the shedding of man's blood; but the shocking, cruel, and barbarous death-penalty by Masonic law, is for the revelation of a secret, a foolish and unwarranted secret.

The government of secret societies is a conspiracy against State government; it would overthrow and destroy the State to perpetuate itself.

Can the church fold to her bosom that which so wrongs society? Is the church an enemy to good government? To all the highest and best interests of humanity? Can she bolster up a machinery

available to bad men for the very worst of purposes? Can she gear a wheel of it to her divine machinery, and thus furnish a portion of its power for evil?

That institution, the church, that God has put on this earth to bless it, to take part with every thing that blesses mankind, to clothe the naked, feed the poor, and ameliorate the condition of mankind in every rank of life, can she take into sworn alliance and holiest fellowship a man that is in sworn league with another institution that wrongs society, interferes with justice, and undermines the very foundations of lawful government?

When Christ and anti-Christ can covenant together, and join in holy communion, then can Christ's church, holy as himself in her organization, worship, discipline, and government, join in fellowship with that which is Christless, immoral and heathenish, with that which would strike down the church and overthrow society.

President Finney says, in concluding his admirable work: "These individuals and churches who have had the best means of information, owe it to other branches of the church, and to the whole world, to take action and pronounce upon the unchristian character of Freemasonry, as the most influential means within their reach of arousing the whole church and the world to an examination of the character and claims of Freemasonry.

"If churches who are known to have examined the subject withhold their testimony, if they continue to receive persistent and intelligent Freemasons, if they leave the public to infer that they see nothing in Freemasonry inconsistent with a creditable profession of the Christian religion, it will be justly inferred by other branches of the church, and by the world, that there is nothing in it so bad, so dangerous and unchristian as to call for their examination, action or testimony."

He informs us that before the publication of Morgan's book the Baptist church especially, and many ministers and members of other branches of the church, had fallen into the snare, and were asleep upon the subject when the murder of Morgan and the consequent revelations "burst upon them like a clap of thunder from the clear sky."

The astounding facts thereby brought to light led to both the renouncing and denouncing of the institution.

"The churches almost universally passed resolutions disfellowshipping adhering Masons." And further he says, "it is worthy of all consideration and remembrance that God set the seal of His

approbation upon the action taken by those churches at that time by pouring out His spirit upon them."

Great revivals immediately follow over that whole region, one after another, until in 1880 "the greatest revival took place that had ever been known in this or any other country." Nor are such results strange, or to be unlooked for. God always blessed His church in putting away her idols, and separating herself from all unhallowed associations.

The brightest epochs in the history of the church were those Reformation periods, when she cut in sunder those fetters of superstition that had long fastened her as in the stocks; threw off the shackles of ignorance, and emancipated herself from the thralldom of anti-Christian entanglements.

Although she trod through the fires of persecution, took shelter in the rocks and fastnesses of the mountains, was hunted by blood thirsty dragoons, felt the torture of the thumb screw and the rack, sealed her testimony beneath the guillotine and amid the stake fires, yet "God was her refuge and her strength in those troublous times."

God walked with her through the fire and the flood. He dwelt in the midst of her so that nothing could move her from her fidelity; "He proved a helper to her, and that right early."

To those Reformation eras we look back with becoming pride, as to the birth day of the civil and religious liberty we have, and the birth place of many a glorious institution we now possess.

Did God bless a Luther, a Calvin, a Knox, Wesley and Whitfield in bursting asunder the bonds of anti-Christian tyranny—cutting loose from every pagan connection, and coming out from all the flagrant and gross immoralities, and shall He not to-day set His seal of approbation upon like fidelity?

Should all the branches of the evangelical church unite to-day in a firm, unyielding, uncompromising covenant contract to have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, to put away every thing Christless and Christ dishonoring and swear anew their loyalty to Jesus Christ, the King and Head of Zion, one grand feature of such a covenanted unity would be, that God, from His holy habitation, would look down in love upon His church, and pour out His spirit like rain on mown grass, or showers that water the earth.

Another glorious result would be that all these Christless organizations would be swept from the earth before the tremendous power of a united church, like the floating spar is swept before the resistless tide of the mighty ocean.



And another sublime feature of such a united covenant would be, the forecasting of a brighter period in the future, the harbinger of a better day, the dawn of that era when all men every where, renouncing every thing that dishonors or fails to honor the Lord Jesus Christ, shall write, "Holiness to the Lord," upon their bodies, and spirits, their names and estates, their time and talents, and all they are and hope to be.

Then, and then only, shall men be blessed in the Lord Jesus Christ, and all the nations of the earth shall call Him blessed. Then shall be verified those sublime strains of Cowper:

"One song employs all nations, and all cry,  
Worthy is the Lamb, for He was slain for us;  
The dwellers in the vales, and in the rocks  
Shout to each other, and the mountain tops,  
From distant mountains catch the flying joy,  
Till, nation after nation taught the strain,  
Earth rolls the rapturous Hosanna round."