

ANNEX
LIBRARY

B

089964

HS

766

P63

Anney

COR.
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

HS

766

P63



089964

FOULHOUZEISM AND CERNEAUISM.

SCOURGED.

DISSECTION

OF

A MANIFESTO.



Cornell University
Library

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

FOULHOUZEISM AND CERNEAUISM

SCOURGED.

DISSECTION

OF

A MANIFESTO.

"Suo sibi gladio hunc jugulo."

NEW YORK:
PRESS OF J. J. LITTLE & CO.,
10 TO 20 ASTOR PLACE.
1884.

Pike, Albert, 1809-1891.

Annex

H5

766

P63

DISSECTION OF A MANIFESTO.

THIS Scourging of Falsehood and Imposture, is the substance of the "*Dissection* of a manifesto of Jacques Foulhouze," published in New Orleans in 1858.

It was written by Bro.: Albert Pike, with the exception of some passages of a personal character, added by Bro.: Charles Laffon de Ladebat, which, with others having only a personal or local application, are here omitted ; but it has been deemed best to permit the Dissection still to retain the form of a response to propositions, instead of taking that of a treatise or memoir.

It is intended now for the swash-bucklers and braggarts of the so-called "Cerneau" Supreme Councils in New York, whose weapons are drawn from the arsenals of Folger and Foulhouze.

October, 1883.

PREAMBLES AND RESOLUTIONS

Adopted at the Grand Communication of the *soi-disant* Supreme Council of the 33d Degree for the Sovereign and Independent State of Louisiana, on the 24th of July, 1858.

Consideration.

1. "That the RITE known at this day as 'The Ancient and Accepted Rite,' was worked by *different Masonic Bodies*, "established in Europe at the time of the Grand Mastership "of the Count of Clermont, which dates from the 11th of "December, 1743."

2. "That when that Prince was the Supreme Chief "THEREOF, ALL the degrees that we at this day work, "formed a part THEREOF; as appears from the fact that, "in 1758, the Council of Emperors of the East and West "existed at Paris; and that that Council, then composed of "well-informed persons, gave Letters-Capitular for the High "Degrees, and created Inspectors-General for the purpose "of propagating Freemasonry in Europe, and even beyond "the seas."

Mr. Foulhouse cannot say that his meaning was, in these considerations, that all the Degrees of the Rite in question were worked in the middle of the 18th Century, some by one body, and some by another, of the different masonic bodies then established in Europe; which would be a very different thing from what he *does* say. For his language is too precise to allow that charitable construction. *Le Rite*, he says, *ÉTAIT pratiqué par divers corps maçonniques*; "which means clearly that the whole RITE, as a Rite, was practised by *each*. And the word EN, which in two places we translate THEREOF, has no other antecedent noun to be referred to, than "Rite." The phrase "*Les Degrés..... en faisaient partie*," settles that; because *Degrees* cannot form an integral

part of a "title," of a Masonic Body, of Europe, of an Epoch, of a Grand Mastership, of a Count of Clermont, or of the month of December; and these are the only precedent nouns, except the word *Rite*.

A RITE is a regularly arranged *scale* or *series* of Degrees, forming a Hierarchy, in which each lower Degree introduces the neophyte to the one immediately above it. One Rite may differ from another, either in having more or less Degrees, leaving out or adding Degrees, or working the same Degrees differently.

The RITE known at this day as the "Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite," consists of 33 Degrees. Of the origin of many of these Degrees we know nothing whatever. Undoubtedly most of them, as isolated Degrees, or parts of other systems, were worked by different Masonic Bodies in Europe, established near the middle of the 18th century. But when a Masonic writer asserts that a particular "*Rite*" was worked by a particular Body, at a particular time, he must, in order to verify his assertion, and escape the imputation of deliberately falsifying history, prove that it was worked *as a Rite, as a Whole, as a System, as a Unit*. He cannot save himself by saying or even showing that most or even all of its *Degrees* were worked, some by one Body, and some by another.

We admit that if one were to take a Rite consisting of a large number of Degrees, and add or take away one or two Degrees, making no other change, and give it, with that diminution or addition, a new name, it would not in good faith be another or new Rite. But if the change made were *substantial*, if the existing Degrees were re-arranged, and several new ones added, and especially if higher ones were created, and the scale so arranged became consolidated by time, and grew up to be a Power in Masonry, regularly established and administered, it would be simply absurd to deny it the name of a *Rite*.

In 1758, and for many years and always after, the Rite of Perfection, or of Heredom, consisted of 25 Degrees. It began with the three Symbolic Degrees; with the 18th reached the Rose Croix; and with the 25th, the Prince of the Royal

Secret. In 1786, the Grand Orient of France, having till then confined itself to the first three Degrees, added four more, ending with the Rose Croix;—which four Degrees contained the substance of the first 18 of the Rite of Perfection—and it called the seven Degrees, the “French or Modern Rite.” At some time between 1783 and 1801, some one or more persons took the Rite of Perfection, and expanded the seven Degrees above the 18th to fifteen, leaving the first eighteen untouched; and more than doubling the residue, ending with a Degree above the highest of that Rite, created a superior governing Power, and called the new Rite “*The Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite.*” Afterwards, two Brothers, named Bédarride, took some of these 33 Degrees, or, rather, the *titles* of part of them, expanded them to 90 and called *their* new Rite the “Rite of *Misraim.*”

The Rite *de la Vieille Bru* or of the *Faithful Scotsmen*, was established at Toulouse, in France, in 1748, and consisted of the three Symbolic Degrees and six others—9.

The *Philosophical Scottish Rite*, instituted in 1776, at Paris, by Brother Boileau, a physician, and worked until 1826, and in Belgium ever since, consisted of twelve Degrees, in addition to the three Symbolic—15.

The Rite of *Strict Observance* conferred six Degrees, beginning with the three Symbolic—6.

The *Régime Réformé* or *Réctifié*, of Dresden, had seven Degrees, including the three Symbolic—7.

The *Scottish Philosophical Rite*, of the *Scottish Mother Lodge*, which is to be credited to the Body established at Marseilles, prior to 1750, consisted of eighteen Degrees, the first three being the Symbolic Degrees, and the eighteenth the “Knight of the Sun”—18.

The *Adonhiramite Masonry* of the Baron de Tchoudy, consisted of thirteen Degrees, ending with the “Noachite” or “Prussian Knight”—13.

The Rite of *Elect Coëns*, or of *Martinez Paschalis*, consisted of nine Degrees: it, as well as the Adonhiramite, beginning with the three Symbolic Degrees—13.

The *Alchemical Rite* of *Pernety*, consisted of six Degrees,

beginning with the "True Mason," and ending with the "Knight of the Golden Fleece"—6.

The Rite of the *Philalethes*, established in 1773, had the three Symbolic, and nine other Degrees—12.

The *Primitive Scottish Rite*, or Philadelphia, established at Narbonne, in 1780, had TEN DEGREES, of instruction; a *Degree* there meaning a certain amount of instruction; and some of them including several Masonic Degrees—10.

The *Primitive Scottish Rite*, established at Namur, in 1770, consisted of thirty-three Degrees, many of which were different from any in the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite; but are found in the Philosophical Scottish Rite, the Rite of Strict Observance, the Adonhiramite Masonry, the Rite of Pernety, etc.—33.

The Rite of *Martinism*, of the Marquis of St. Martin, a disciple of Martinez Paschalis, was at first composed of ten Degrees; and afterward, as the *Reformed Scotticism of St. Martin*, of seven; each beginning with the three symbolic—10.

The Rite of *The Grand Lodge of the Three Globes*, at Berlin, has ten Degrees; Moreau, in his *Précis sur la Franc-Maçonnerie*, page 17, says it has seventeen—10.

The *Rectified Rite*, adopted in 1782, had five Degrees, including the three Symbolic—5.

The *Swedish Rite*, had twelve Degrees, beginning with the three Symbolic—12.

The Rite of *Benedict Chastanier*, had six Degrees—6.

The Rite of *Brother Henoeh*, had four Degrees—4.

The *Oriental Rite*, or Rite of *Memphis*, has ninety-six Degrees, being a mere modification of the Rite of Misraim—96.

The *Persian Philosophic Rite*, had seven Degrees—7.

The *Clerks of the Relaxed Observance*, had ten, the tenth divided into five parts—10.

The *Architects of Africa*, or *African Brethren*, had eleven—11.

The Rite of *Swedenborg*, had eight, or, according to Clavel, six—8.

The Rite of *Zinnendorf*, in Prussia, had seven—7.

The *Rose Croix Rectified* of *Schræder*, established in 1766, at Marburg, in Hesse-Cassel, had seven Degrees—7.

The Rite of *Schræder* of Hamburg, established after 1800, had three Symbolic Degrees only—3.

The system of *Fessler*, created about 1796, had nine Degrees—9.

The *Eclectic Rite*, followed in Germany and Switzerland, settled in 1783, has the three Symbolic Degrees only—3.

The Rite of the *Elect of Truth*, created about 1779, had fourteen Degrees, in three classes—14.

Of almost every one of these Rites, the three Symbolic Degrees, in one shape or other, form the basis and an integral part of the system. There is no one of them that can say that *none* of its Degrees form part of any other Rite. Many of the Degrees are common to several Rites.

Thory, in his *Acta Latomorum*, mentions 18 different Degrees of Apprentice, 19 of Fellow Craft, 64 of Master Mason, 36 of the Elus, 68 of the Ecossais, 12 of Rose Croix, 27 of the Philosophic Degrees, and 6 of K-H; these eight Degrees alone furnishing 249 Rituals. In all, there have probably been 6 or 8 hundred Degrees in practice. Of course it follows that two Rites might practise *the same* Degrees, in name, and yet the *work* be very different, and they *really* be different and independent Rites. The Rite of Schræder of Hamburg, and the Eclectic Rite of Germany, each with only the three symbolic Degrees, are yet each a wholly different Rite from the other, and each from the English or York Rite.

Thus the word "Rite" has acquired in Masonry a perfectly well-settled technical meaning. Like many single words in the Law, it embodies a definition, and relieves us of the necessity of constant reiteration of a long sentence. When out of the mass of perhaps 200 different Degrees, with their 600 variations, somebody has selected 25, arranged them, made them to some extent harmonize, induced Bodies of Masons to accept and work them, and under that system to establish Masonic government, administration, offices and dignities,—*that is a "Rite."* When another takes those same 25 Degrees, retains the first 18, adds to the last seven eight

others, selected out of the 800 Degrees and variations, *or invented for the occasion*, arranges and harmonizes the 33 thus obtained, provides a governing Body, a rank, office and dignity, *higher than before*, induces Masons to accept this *new system or improved system*, and so sets it going, and it goes on and works, is administered and becomes a substantive and existing organization and power in Masonry,—*that is a "Rite."* The Masonic world calls it A RITE.

Now, when the author of the Manifesto set out by saying that the "Rite" now known as "the Ancient Accepted Scottish Rite" was practised by several Masonic Bodies established while the Count of Clermont was Grand Master, he committed a very grave offence against the proprieties of discussion. For, when a word has obtained a fixed, settled and technical meaning, any writer who employs it must employ it in that sense, unless he explains that he uses it in another and not its technical sense. If one were to say that the Civil Code of Louisiana was the Code of Law for a particular country of Europe at a particular time, it would not relieve him from the charge of falsifying History for him afterwards to endeavor to justify the assertion by saying that the Code of Louisiana was composed of principles not new nor then for the first time invented, but found in all ages, scattered through all Codes. The word "Code" has a technical, settled, fixed meaning—that of a compilation or body of Laws, adopted by a particular people as the rule of their society: and a writer who uses it is held to have used it in that sense, unless he explains, at the time, that he uses it in some other. If he chooses to use it as meaning a house or a cow, he is free to do so, only advising the reader: but he cannot juggle with it and use it without explanation, that the reader may understand it in its technical sense, while he, the writer, with a mental reservation, gives it another meaning. That would be Jesuitism, and a fraud on the reader.

Just so it is with the word "Rite." It has a fixed meaning; as much so as the word "*sect*," or "*creed*." Every Mason of any information knows what it means; and when *Mr. Foulhouse* asserts that the identical *Rite* now known as the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite was worked—*pratiqué*—

by *divers* Masonic Bodies, in the middle of the 18th century, he *must* prove that the identical Rite, *as* a Rite, as a substantive *system*, with its same arrangement of Degrees, and substantially its same Rituals, was then worked.

Well, that he cannot prove. It is not true. Not only was *it* not worked, but no Rite *like* it was worked, none any nearer to it than that of Perfection, in 25 Degrees. There was no Rite in existence until the end of the Century, called by the present name. We have already named nearly all the Rites practised since the beginning of the 18th Century. Those that we have not named, were really not Masonry at all, but other Societies wearing the Masonic mask.

But *Mr. Foulhouze* avers, that when the Count of Clermont was Grand Master, ALL the *Degrees* which WE now work formed part of "the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite." And this he *proves* by the fact that in 1758 there was a Council of the Emperors of the East and West at Paris, and that it granted Letters-Capitular for *the High Degrees*, and created "*Inspectors-General*" to propagatate the Rite. The conclusion is an evident and evidently absurd *non sequitur*. That that Council administered "*the High Degrees*," and even created "*Inspectors-General*," goes a very little way, indeed does not even set out, to prove that the Rite which it worked contained ALL the 33 Degrees of our present scale.

Among the Degrees added to the 25 of the Rite of Perfection, to make up the 33 of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite, *now practised*, were the Chief of the Tabernacle, the Prince of the Tabernacle, the Prince of Mercy, or Scottish Trinitarian, the Knight of the Brazen Serpent, and the Knight Commander of the Temple. *Not one* of these Degrees is included in the scale of Degrees of any one of the Rites which we have mentioned, or of any other Rite of which the French writers give us any information, except that of Misraïm, which took them in the *nineteenth* Century from the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite. We call for the *proof*, the historical *evidence* that *any* of these five Degrees were worked by any Masonic Body whatever, as part of any Rite whatever, in 1743, 1762, or at any time prior to 1801. It will not be found in the works of Thory, Rebold, Béschuet, Vassal,

Ragon, Clavel, Des Etangs, Chemin-Dupontes, Bobrik, Lévesque, Moreau, Boubée, Kauffmann and Cherpin—in *Hermes*, the *Globe*, the *Orient*, *l'Encyclopédie Maçonique*, *l'Univers Maçonique*, les *Annales Maçoniques*, either of the *Revue Maçoniques*, or in the Polemics between the Supreme Council and the Grand Orient of France. In all these writings—and we have compiled from them and other sources extracts concerning the History of Free Masonry in France, sufficient to make a work of at least three volumes,—there is no trace of the existence of either of those Degrees, except that of Knight Commander of the Temple, prior to the year 1801; and not the slightest information as to the time and place of their origin, if they were invented prior to that time. To say that ALL the Degrees of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite were worked in 1758, and afterwards reduced to 25, is simply to make history as you want it. There is nothing in the world to sustain such an allegation. It is a sheer fabrication.

Rebold, a very accurate and reliable writer, in *le Franc-Maçon*, for August, 1857, p. 148, entitles the Masonry introduced into France by Dr. Ramsay, “the Primitive Scottish Rite.” It was composed, Kauffmann and Cherpin say (*Histoire philosophique de la Franc-Maçonnerie*, p. 443), of three Degrees—besides the 3 Blue Degrees,—*Ecossais*, *Novice* and *Knight of the Temple*. Ragon (*Orthodoxie Maçonique*, p. 113) says the same, and that in 1736 those Degrees were increased to seven.

Rebold also says (*Histoire Générale de la Franc-Maçonnerie*, p. 136), that the *Rit Ecossais* of Ramsay, then comprising 7 Degrees, “was adopted by the *English Grand Lodge of France*,” at Paris, in 1736.

In 1743, the Count of Clermont was elected Grand Master; and under his Grand Mastership the Grand Lodge of France was completely organized. In that year the Masons of Lyons invented the *Petit-Elu*, which was afterwards known as the *Kadosh*, and out of which were developed several other *Elu* Degrees. About the same time Philosophism composed several Degrees, and among others the *Knight of the Sun*. The Jesuits, Clavel says (*Histoire Pittoresque de la*

Franc-Maçonnerie, p. 166), composed the Rose Croix, which the Philosophers took possession of, and gave its symbols an astronomical interpretation. Soon after, the Kabalah, Magic, Evocations of Spirits, Divination, Alchemy, Hermeticism, Theosophy, and every sort of empty humbug, were worked up into Degrees and taught in the Lodges. The ineffable stupidity of most of the Rituals was a perfect antidote to the looseness of their doctrines. Taking the rituals in the aggregate, the history of the human race does not present such a scene of shameless imposition, impudence and folly on the part of a few charlatans; and of pitiable stupidity on the part of the many who were gulled.

This multitude of Degrees, Clavel says, "whose rituals cannot be read without disgust, got grouped together in different ways, and were systematized; and thence grew up these *series* of initiations into successive Degrees, which are termed *Rites*; distinguished one from another by having different categories of Degrees, and each category governed by a distinct Body." But the truth is, that the Degrees were not, "*systematized*," but merely *aggregated*. Not being homogeneous, they did not *crystallize*, but merely became *conglomerates*.

When the Count of Clermont was elected Grand Master, France received from England its first Masonic Constitution and Laws. They were little more than an adaptation of Anderson, except the 20th and last article, which declared that certain persons who had assumed the designation of "Scottish Masters" and who demanded peculiar privileges in the Lodges, for which no warrant could be produced, should not be held in higher estimation than the other apprentices and workmen, whose clothing they should wear (*Free Mason's Quarterly Magazine—English—1853*, p. 600, *citing from KLOSS*). And an address published the next year, 1744, in *la Franc-Maçonne*, reciting the evils under which Masonry labored, assigned as the 4th, that, "Ignorance is so common, that the majority of the Masters and Wardens do not know that Masonry consists of seven Degrees; and the *Loge Générale*, in its blindness, *resolved* on the 11th of December, 1743, to regard the Masons of the 4th

Degree, that is to say the *Maîtres Ecossais*, only as common Apprentices and Fellow-Craftsmen."

In 1744, the Count of Clermont left the Lodges to take care of themselves; and appointed first Baure, a banker, and afterwards Lacorne, a dancing-master, his special Deputy, thus putting the whole Order in his hands.—Bésuchet (*Précis Historique de la Franc-Maçonnerie*, vol. I., p. 33).—Disorders of every kind invaded Masonry: charters became merchandise, new Degrees swarmed like flies, Restaurateurs bought Masterships for life, and every body sold Degrees. The followers of Charles Edward Stuart, the son of the Pretender, opened Lodges without authority; and he himself chartered a Chapter of Rose Croix, at Arras, in 1747. The Charter is given in full in *le Globe*, vol. 4, p. 84, and by Ragon (*Orthod. Maçonn.*, p. 121); Clavel (*Hist. Pitt. de la Franc-Maçonnerie*, p. 167); says that this was the first Chapter or centre of administration of the High Degrees in France; and that the second was established at Marseilles, in 1751, by a travelling Scotchman.

In 1748, the Rite *de la Vieille Bru*, or *des Ecossais fidèles*, was established at Toulouse, with 9 Degrees,—the 3 Symbolic, Secret Master, four Elu Degrees, and the ninth of Scientific Masonry.—Ragon, *Orthod. Maç.*, p. 122; Kauffmann and Cherpin., *Hist. Phil.*, p. 447.

In 1750 or 1751, a Lodge styled *Saint Jean d'Ecosse* was established at Marseilles, which afterwards assumed the style of *Scottish Mother Lodge of France*. Its régime finally consisted of 18 Degrees, of which the Scottish Mother Lodge of France, at Paris, afterwards borrowed eight—Lévesque, *Aperçu Général, &c., des principales sectes Maçonn.*, p. 54; Thory, *1 Acta Latomorum*, p. 63; Rebold, *Hist. Gén.* p. 163; Bésuchet, *Précis Hist.*, vol. I., p. 35; Ragon, *Orthod. Maç.* p. 119.

In 1752, a power of the High Degrees was established under the pompous title of "Sovereign Council, Sublime Scottish Mother Lodge of the Grand French Globe." It was afterwards called, or rather called itself, "Sovereign Council Sublime Mother Lodge of the Excellents of the Grand French Globe." The Council of Emperors of the East and West as-

sumed that title also, on the 22d of January, 1780.—Ragon, *Orthod. Maç.*, p. 123 & 135.—What Degrees the former administered we are not informed. We only know that in some Commanderies the Scottish Knight of St. Andrew was worked.

In 1754, the Chevalier de Bonneville established a Chapter of the High Degrees at Paris, styled “the Chapter of Clermont.” In it the Templar system was revived; and the Baron de Hund received the High Degrees there, and thence derived the principles and doctrines of his order of Strict Observance.—Thory, 1 *Acta Lat.*, p. 68; Lévesque, *Aperçu*, p. 54. Ragon, *Orthod. Maç.*, p. 127, says the *régime* of the Chapter of Clermont at first comprised only 3 Degrees, i. e., besides the three Symbolic, Knight of the Eagle, or Master Elect; Illustrious Knight, or Templar; and Illustrious Sublime Knight; but that they soon became more numerous.

The same year, 1754, Martinez Paschalis established his Rite Elus Coëns, with 9 Degrees. He did not carry it to Paris until 1767.—Clavel, *Hist. Pitt.*, p. 170. *Martinism*, in 10 Degrees, grew out of it.

In 1756, the Grand Lodge of France declared its independence, and dropped the word “*Anglaise*” out of its title. It revised its Constitution, and adopted new regulations, *declaring that it would recognize the three Degrees of Apprenticé, Fellow-Craft and Master, ONLY.*—Clavel, *Hist. Pitt.*, p. 119 and 120.

In 1757, M. de St. Gélaire introduced at Paris the order of *Noachites*.—Lévesque, p. 56; Thory, 1 *Acta Lat.*, p. 74; Vidal Fezandié, *Essai, &c.*, by F. V., p. 145.

This is absolutely all that we are told about the High Degrees, so far as their administration is concerned, prior to 1758; the year in which *Mr. Foulhouse* finds the “Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite,” in 33 Deg., precisely as it exists at present, organized and working in the Council of Emperors of the East and West, at Paris.

Lévesque says (*Aperçu, &c.*, p. 56), that in 1758, certain Masons, styling themselves “Sovereign Princes and Grand Officers of the Grand and Sovereign Lodge of St. John of Jerusalem,” founded at Paris a Chapter of “Emperors of the

East and West," in which they conferred on such Masons as were fond of many Degrees, *as many as twenty-five*.

Thory says (1 *Acta Lat.*, p. 74): "During this year—1758—was established at Paris a Chapter styled 'Chapter of the Emperors of the East and West.' Its members entitled themselves 'Sovereign Princes Masons, General Deputies (*Substituts Généraux*) of the Royal Art, Grand Wardens and Officers of the Grand and Sovereign Lodge of St. John of Jerusalem.' *Their Degrees of instruction were composed of twenty-five grades.*"

Vidal Fezandié says (*Essai Hist. sur la Franche Maçonn.*, p. 145), "Three years after" (i. e. after 1754), "profiting by the disorders occasioned by a dangerous and lamentable anarchy, the Rite of the Noachites was introduced into the Capital; and the next year the Chapter of the Emperors of the East and West, which gratified the mania for degrees by the perspective of *its twenty-five degrees.*"

Ragon (*Orthod. Maçonn.*, p. 48) says, after stating the establishment of that Chapter in 1758, and giving the title assumed by its members, as Thory gives them: "a crowd pressed forward to obtain the *twenty-five degrees, of which the pretended instruction of the new régime was composed;*" and, p. 149, after speaking of the Templar system started at Lyon, the Chapter at Arras, and the Chapter at Clermont, he adds: "Then comes the Council of Emperors of the East and West, Sovereign Princes Masons, *with its twenty-five Degrees, eagerly sought after by Master Masons.*"

And he adds, that the century will hardly have elapsed *before EIGHT MORE DEGREES will be added* to these 25, extending the nomenclature to 33.

Again (p. 129), after once more stating the establishment of this Council in 1758, and giving the title of its members, he says: "Their Degrees of instruction *were composed of twenty-five grades, under the title of Heredom;* divided into seven classes, the doctrine whereof has for its basis the Templar system. The Council was divided into Colleges in which these classes were conferred."

Clavel (*Hist. Pitt.*, p. 167) says: "Four years later, in 1758, there was formed from the débris of the Chapter of Cler-

mont, a new Body, which styled itself 'Council of the Emperors of the East and West.' Its degrees of instruction consisted of *twenty-five grades.*" Its system, he says, was the Templar System.

Among the members were *Lacorne*, the dancing master, and a tailor named Pirlet, who afterwards set up a new Body, in 1762, styled "Council of Knights of the East," with a Rite opposed to the Templar System of the Emperors of the East and West, and in 15 Deg. only, ending with the Knight of the East or of the Sword. Most of the rituals were made by the Baron de Tchoudy.—Ragon, *Orthod. Maç.* p. 136. Clavel, *Hist. Pitt.* p. 167.

And finally, for further evidence that the Council of Emperors of the East and West originally worked only 25 Degrees, we refer to Bésuchet, 1 *Précis Hist.* p. 37, and Rebold, *Hist. Gen.* p. 163. No assertion was ever made, by the most unscrupulous partisan, more utterly devoid of any semblance or even shadow of historical authority, and more directly and positively contradicted by the best and all the authority, than this, that the Council in question *originally* administered more than twenty-five Degrees, and that the number was *reduced* by the Constitutions of 1762.

In 1759, this Council established a Council of the Princes of the Royal Secret at Bordeaux.—Thory, 1 *Acta Lat.* p. 76. Ragon, *Orthod. Maç.* p. 171.

In 1761, *Lacorne*, the dancing master, Special Deputy of the Grand Master, and as such, real Head of the Order, enraged because the Grand Lodge refused to recognize him, and its members to sit with him, established a new Grand Lodge. Both Grand Lodges granted Charters, and the Council of Emperors of the East and West constituted at Paris and throughout France Lodges and Chapters. The Old Lodge denounced the "*Faction Lacorne*;" which nevertheless continued to thrive—Lévesque, p. 57. Thory, 1 *Acta Lat.* p. 78. *L'Arche Sainte*, p. 46. In the midst of all this, on the 27th of August, 1761, STEPHEN MORIN was commissioned.

It is somewhat curious, while the Council of Emperors of the East and West is mentioned by different writers, that

we have nowhere in our reading met with any document purporting to emanate from a Council *of that name*. Mr. *Foulhouze* says it created Inspectors-General; but we have nowhere seen any authentic evidence of that alleged fact.

The patent to Stephen Morin, appointing him "Grand-Inspector" for the New World, purports to be granted by the "Deputies-General of the Royal-Art, Grand Wardens and Officers of the Grand and Sovereign Lodge of St. John of Jerusalem, established at the Orient of Paris;"—that is, by the Council of Emperors of the East and West; for, such was the title of the members of that Council; and by "the Sov. Grand Master of the Grand Council" (*of Emperors*) "of the Lodges of France, under the protection of the Sovereign Grand Lodge" of France,—that of LACORNE, Ragon says, and we know that that Council created and constituted Lodges also,—“assembled by order of the Deputy-General, President of the G. Council” (*of Emperors*) “and in consequence of a communication from Lacorne” (one of the MEMBERS of said Council) “Deputy of the Grand Master” (the Count of Clermont), “and Knight and Prince Mason” and it purports to be signed by the Deputy-General of the Order (*of the Emperors*), Chaillon de Joinville, Grand Commander of the White and Black Eagle and Sov. Sublime Prince of the Royal Secret, and Chief of the eminent Degree of the Royal Art; and by others, Grand Inspectors, Subl. Officers of the Grand Council and of the Grand Lodge at Paris; and sealed with the seal of the Grand Master, that of the Grand Lodge, and that of the Grand Council.

It emanated, therefore, from the Council of Emperors of East and West. Two questions, however, will arise: 1st. How could that Council be “under the protection of the Grand Lodge of France,” when we know that the latter recognized and worked the three Blue Degrees *only*, and that the Council of Emperors was acting in competition with and encroaching upon the rights of the Grand Lodge? 1 *Acta Latom.* p. 78.—2d. How could the name and seal of the Grand Master and Grand Lodge of the SYMBOLIC Degrees be used in a patent the object of which was to authorize Morin to propagate the RITE OF PERFECTION—a Rite *not* recognized by the

Grand Lodge?—The patent of Morin mentions no other Rite or Degrees than those of Perfection.

Our answer to these questions would be that Lacorne, the PRIVATE Deputy of a Grand Master who cared but very little, if any, for Masonic affairs, took upon himself, and without any authority whatever, to use the name and seal of the Count of Clermont, and of a Grand Lodge that was in opposition to the genuine Grand Lodge. A proof, however, that, in 1761, the Council of Emperors was not united to the two Grand Lodges, or either of them, is that it was merged, eleven years after, in 1772, into the Grand Orient, by a Concordat. 1 *Précis Hist.* p. 41,—*Report of Le Blanc de Marconnay*, p. 12 & seq. of the English translation.

Mr. Foulhouse knew all this: but his object was to cause his followers to believe, contrary to History, that in 1761, the Council of Emperors formed an integrant part of the Grand Lodge of France, which, according to him, governed both the Symbolic Degrees of English Masonry and the Rite of Perfection, under one and the same Grand Master, the Count of Clermont; and that is the reason why, in quoting from the patent of Morin, he changed “Royal-Art” into “Order;” that is the reason also why he “dropped” intentionally a whole sentence, the purport of which PROVES that the patent of Morin was positively delivered, not by the Grand Lodge of France, OFFICIALLY, but by the Council of Emperors of the East and West, under their title of “Deputies General of the *Royal-Art*, Grand Wardens and Officers of the Grand and Sovereign Lodge of St. John of Jerusalem.”—Ragon, *ibid.* p. 129, 131 & seq.

On the subject of “Grand Inspectors” and “Inspectors General” we shall have more to say when we come to examine the Constitutions or Regulations of 1762; and in the mean time, having exploded the first and second “Considerations,” we pass on.

The 3d “Consideration” is, “that the *Primitive Rite*, established at Narbonne, in 1780, and *subsequently* in Belgium, consisted of 33 Degrees; that it was introduced at Narbonne by the *Superiors General of the Free and Accepted Masons of that Rite*, the classes whereof betoken a knowl-

“edge of most of the Degrees analogous to them in other régimes; and the object whereof was, ‘to occupy themselves with every kind of Masonic, physical and philosophical knowledge, the products whereof could have an influence upon the material and moral well-being of man,’—in a word, ‘to labor to restore the intellectual man to, and reinstate him in, his rank and his primitive rights;’ whereby it is demonstrated that that Rite was no other than the one which we to-day practise, since such is our doctrine and our object.”

RAGON, in his *Orthodoxie Maçonnique*, pp. 164, 165, 166, 167, gives us a pretty full account of the two Primitive Rites, which Mr. FOULHOUSE has mixed up into ONE. We translate the whole text literally :

“PRIMITIVE RITE, OR RITE OF THE PHILADELPHI OF NARBONNE.”
1779.

“This Rite was invented and established at Narbonne on the 19th of April, 1780, by certain pretended *Superiors General, greater and lesser, of the Order of ‘the Free and Accepted Masons’*—such are the terms of the Patent of Constitutions of the Rite.—It was attached to the Lodge *des Philadelphes*, under the title of ‘First Lodge of St. John, working the Primitive Rite, in the country of France,’ and in which Lodge it ranked Masonically from the 27th of December, 1779, the day of its application for annexation. The Lodge *des Philadelphes* printed, in 1790, at the end of the list of its members, a curious fragment, entitled, ‘General notion as to the character and object of the Primitive Rite’—a pamphlet in 8vo, of 51 pp.,—in which are found precise and detailed information in regard to the System of this régime.

“It is formed by THREE CLASSES of Masons, who receive *ten degrees* of instruction. The *classes* or *degrees* do not designate such or such *grades*, but are the generic names of collections which need only to be developed to the utmost degrees of which they are capable, in order to evolve an almost infinite number of Degrees. Thus the six first Degrees indicate the knowledge of the grades analogous to those which they comprise, that is to say :

" 1st Class.	{ 1. Apprentice, 2. Fellow-Craft. 3. Master.	} In all the Rites.
" 2d Class.	{ 4. Under the titles of 5. Under the title of 6. Under the titles of	{ Perfect Master, Elect, Architect. Sublime Ecossais. Knight of the Sword, Knight of the East, Prince of Jerusalem.
" 3d Class.	{ 1st. Chapter of Rose Croix. It possesses those branches of knowledge which in some régimes settle the Masonic worship, and attract the veneration of a great many respectable Brethren. 2d. Chapter of Rose Croix. It is the depository of historical documents, very curious in their kind, connection and variety. 3d. Chapter of Rose Croix. It occupies itself with all that Masonic, physical and philosophical knowledge, whose products can have an influence upon the material and moral well-being of <i>temporal man</i> . 4th and last Chapter, called Chapter of THE BROTHERS ROSE-CROIX OF THE GRAND ROSARY. It assiduously studies the specialities, Ontology,—the science of existence, Psychology, Pneumatology, in a word, all the branches of those sciences which are termed <i>occult</i> or <i>secret</i> <i>their</i> special object being to restore the intellectual man to, and reinstate him in, his rank and his primitive rights."	

It appears that the *Rite Primitif* established at Narbonne, in 1780, did *not* consist of 33 Degrees, nor *resemble* a Rite with 33 specified and distinct Degrees, much more than a horse resembles a herring.

The Classes of that Rite did *not* betoken or indicate—*dé-signaient*—a knowledge of *most of the Degrees* of the other régimes; but Ragon merely means, that as the Rite pretended to teach every thing, an INFINITE number of Degrees might be developed out of it.

Ragon says, at p. 166 :

"The Primitive Rite was united to the Grand Orient, by the Lodge *des Philadelphes*, on a favorable report from the Directory of Rites, in 1806. At the present day, it is no longer practised in France; and it differs from that which, we are told, is professed in Belgium."

—We again inquire whether it was *fair* to assert that the

two Rites were the *same* Rite, in 33 Degrees, in the teeth of what is said by that good Mason and accurate writer, Ragon? Who is it that falsifies History, *Mr. Foulhouze*?—

“The Lodge *la Bonne Amitié*, at Namur, chartered on the 9th of February, 1770, in the *Primitive Scottish Rite of Edinburg*,—where no Rite bears that name,—and re-chartered by the Grand Orient of France on the 24th of June, 1808, professes this *latter* Rite, and has never ceased, it says, to correspond directly with the *Chief Metropolitan and constituent Body of the Order*. We must not confound this *shapeless Rite*, which has *thirty-three Degrees*, with the *philosophically-conceived Rite of Narbonne*.” So again says Ragon.

“We shall add, that in 1818, circular letters announced the organization of a *Primitive Scottish Rite*, which had been introduced at Namur, in 1770, by the Metropolitan Grand Lodge of Edinburg; a Masonic authority often invoked by charlatans, though never having had an existence, or at least never a *legal* one.

“*This* Rite, of modern creation, is composed of thirty-three Degrees, *taken mostly from the Scottish series styled that of Heredom*. Its chief author was the Bro.: *Marchot*, an advocate at Nivelles.

“Its jurisdiction never seems to have extended beyond the walls of Namur, where it was worked, as it seems, by the Lodge ‘*la Bonne Amitié*.’” The Lodge des “*Vrais Amis de l’Union*,” at Brussels, has an Areopagus of the 29th Degree of the Rite.

“Here is the nomenclature of this *bastard régime*, in which, under the veil of *Templarism*, the *Jesuitical Degrees* predominate :

- | | |
|--------------------------|--|
| 1. Apprentice, | 11. Little Architect, |
| 2. Fellowcraft, | 12. Grand Architect, |
| 3. Master, | 13. Sublime Architect, |
| 4. Perfect Master, | 14. Master in Perf. Architecture, |
| 5. Irish Master, | 15. Royal Arch, |
| 6. Elect of the Nine, | 16. Prussian Knight (<i>Noachite</i>), |
| 7. Elect of the Unknown, | 17. Knight of the East, |
| 8. Elect of the Fifteen, | 18. Prince of Jerusalem, |
| 9. Illustrious Master, | 19. Master of Lodges, |
| 10. Perfect Elect, | 20. Knight of the West, |

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 21. Knight of Palestine, | 28. Knight Kadosh, |
| 22. Sov. Prince Rose Croix, | 29. Grand Eleët of the Truth. |
| 23. Sublime Ecossais, | 30. Novice of the Interior, |
| 24. Knight of the Sun, | 31. Knight of the Interior, |
| 25. Grand Ecoss. of St. Andrew, | 32. Præfect of the Interior, |
| 26. Mason of the Secret, | 33. Commander of the Interior." |
| 27. Knight of the Black Eagle, | |

Thus far Ragon. Clavel, *Histoire de la Franc-Maçonnerie*, pp. 64, 65, gives the same nomenclature; and at p. 171, he gives an account of the establishment and nature of the *Rite Primitif* of Narbonne, agreeing with that given by Ragon. The only additions and variances are, that Clavel says that Rite was a modification of that of the Philalethes (or Searchers after the Truth) established at Paris, in 1773, in the Lodge *des Amis-Réunis*; the inventors whereof were Savalette de Langes, the Vicomte de Tavannes, the President d'Héricourt, the Prince of Hesse, the Bro.: de Saint-James, and Court de Gébélín; and in which were twelve classes or Chambers of Instruction, six of *Little* and six of *High Masonry*; the 2d division containing the Rose Croix, the Knights of the Temple, the Unknown Philosophers, the Sublime Philosophers, the Initiates, and the Philalethes or Masters of all Degrées. Clavel adds, that the authors of this Primitive Rite were unknown, but they *pretended* that their Rite came from ENGLAND, whence their use of the English phrase "*Free and Accepted Masons.*" Of its collections or families of dogmas, "whence could be evolved an illimitable number of Degrees," he gives the same account as Ragon, who indeed borrowed much of his language. He says too, that it taught the Mystic Sciences, "whose object was to restore the intellectual man to, and reinstate him in, his rank and primitive rights."

The 4th "Consideration" is "that on the 27th of August, 1761, the Deputies General of the Order delivered, in the name of the Count of Clermont, then GRAND MASTER AND PROTECTOR OF ALL THE LODGES, a patent of G.: M.: Inspector to the Bro.: *Stephen Morin*, authorizing him to establish *Lodges* with the view of multiplying the Royal Order of Masons of all grades in America, and of there consti-

“tuting Inspectors in all places where the grades were not established.”

Besides the printed copies of this Patent, there is one in the Archives of the Supreme Council at Charleston, in the original Register of *Jean Baptiste Marie De la Hogue*, copied by him from the Register of *Hyman Isaac Long*. The Register of the Bro.: De la Hogue is written throughout *manu propria*, and authenticated by his signature and that of *Alexander François Auguste de Grasse-Tilly*, and the seal of the Sublime Grand Council of Princes of the Royal Secret at Charleston. This, the oldest copy within our knowledge extant, agrees substantially with that in Ragon's *Orthodoxie Maçonnique*, p. 132. It commences thus: “At the Grand Orient of France, and by the good pleasure of his Most Serene Highness and the thrice Illustrious Brother Bourbon, Count of Clermont, Prince of the Blood, Grand Master and Protector of all the Regular Lodges;” and it purports to be granted by: “We, the undersigned, Deputies General of the Royal-Art, Grand Wardens and Officers of the Grand and Sovereign Lodge of St. John of Jerusalem, established at the Orient of Paris; and we, Perfect Grand Masters of the Grand Council of the Regular Lodges under the protection of the Grand and Sovereign Lodge;” “assembled by order of the Deputy General, President of the Grand Council:” and upon a petition communicated by “the Respectable Bro.: Lacorne, Deputy of our Th.: Ill.: Grand Master, Knight and Prince-Mason.” It grants to the Bro.: Etienne Morin, Grand Elect, Perfect and Sublime Ancient Master, Knight and “Sublime Prince of all the Orders of the Sublime Masonry of Perfection, member of the Royal Lodge *de la Trinité*, etc.,” who was about to sail for America, power to establish a Lodge of St. John anywhere in the four quarters of the Globe, to be called *Perfect Harmony*, therein to receive candidates and extend the Royal order of *Free Masons*, in all the Perfect and Sublime degrees, taking care that the Statutes and Regulations of the *Grand and Sovereign Lodge in particular* be kept and observed; with power to regulate and govern all the members of such Lodge, and to appoint its Officers. And the Patent

prayed all Masters of regular Lodges, of whatever rank, and enjoined upon them, to recognize the Bro.: Morin, in his character of "Grand Inspector, in all parts of the New World, appointed to enforce the observance of our laws, and as Resp.: Master of the Lodge *La Parfaite Harmonie*," and it added: "and we do by these presents constitute our very dear Bro.: Etienne Morin our *Grand Master Inspector*, and do authorize and empower him to establish in any part of the world the Perfect and Sublime Masonry," etc., etc. It gave him full power to admit to "the Sublime Degrees of High Perfection;" "and to create Inspectors in all places where the Sublime Degrees are not established."

The Patent purports to be "signed by the Deputy-General "of the Order, Grand Commander of the White and Black "Eagle, Sovereign Sublime Prince of the Royal-Secret; and "by us, Grand Inspectors, Sublime Officers of the Grand "Council and Grand Lodge established in this Capital;" and to be sealed "with the great seal of our Illustrious "Grand Master, His Most Serene Highness, and with that "of our Grand Lodge and Sovereign Grand Council;" at Paris, August 27, 1761.

The signatures are: CHAILLON DE JOINVILLE, Deputy-General of the Order, W.: Master of the first Lodge in France, called *Saint Antoine*, Chief of the Eminent Degree, Commander and Sublime Prince of the Royal Secret, etc., etc., etc., the Bro.: Prince DE ROHAN, Master of the Grand Lodge *l'Intelligence*, Sovereign Prince of Masonry.... LACORNE, Deputy of the Grand Master, Respectable Master of the Loge *de la Trinité*, G.: Elect, Perfect Knight, Sublime Prince Mason, etc., etc.,.... MAXIMILIEN DE SAINT-SIMEON, Senior Warden, Grand Elect, Perfect Knight and Prince Mason, etc., etc.,.... SAVALETTE DE BUCKOLY, Grand Keeper of the Seals, Grand Elect, Perfect Knight and Prince Mason, etc., etc.,.... TAUPIN, Grand Ambassador of His Highness, Grand Elect, Perfect Master, Knight, Prince Mason, etc.,.... LE COMTE DE CHOISEUL, W.: Master of the Lodge *des Enfants de la Gloire*, Gr.: Elect, Perfect Master, Knight and Prince Mason, etc.,.... BOUCHER DE LENONCOURT, W.: Master of the Lodge *de la Vertu*, G.: Elect, Perfect Master, Knight and

Prince Mason, &c., BREST DE LA CHAUSSÉE, W.: Master of the Lodge *de l'Exactitude*, Grand Elect, Perfect Master, Knight and Prince Mason *By order of the Grand Lodge* also signed, DAUBANTIN, Grand Elect, Perfect Master, Knight and Prince Mason, W.: Master of the Lodge *Saint Alphonse*, Grand Secretary of the Grand Lodge and Sublime Council of the Princes Masons in France.

The Grand Lodge, as we have seen, worked the three Symbolic Degrees only ; and the Grand Council, or Council of Emperors, worked the 25 of the Rite of Perfection or Heredom, including the same three Symbolic Degrees. The "Consideration" states the substance of the Patent with as much inaccuracy as is usual with *Mr. Foulhouze*. It is *not* correct to say that it was *delivered* by the Deputies-General of the Order, "in the name of the Count of Clermont." It is said in the caption, to be granted "by the good pleasure" of His Most Serene Highness, &c. ; but *the grant of power* is by the Wardens and Officers of the Grand and Sovereign Lodge of St. John of Jerusalem, and the Perfect Grand Master of the Grand *Council* of the regular Lodges under the protection of the Grand and Sov.: Lodge.

The *purpose* in so stating the purport of the Patent, slight as the difference *seems* to be, was unfair and disingenuous. By representing Morin's powers as *delivered* by the *Deputies-General*, in the name of the GRAND MASTER AND PROTECTOR OF ALL THE LODGES ; and putting the words "GRAND MAÎTRE ET PROTECTEUR DE TOUTES LES LOGES" in small capitals, to indicate the importance of the phrase, he meant to lead the reader to the conclusion, that the Count of Clermont was the Grand Master of *all* Lodges and Bodies of *all* Rites in France ; and *as such*, gave Morin powers co-extensive with his own, over *all* Degrees of *all* Rites whatever. The Count of Clermont was Grand Master and Protector of all the *Symbolic* Lodges that owed allegiance to the Grand Lodge of France : that was all.

The "Deputies-General" were, de Joinville representing the Council of Emperors, and Lacorne *assuming* to represent the Grand Lodge. *Mr. Foulhouze* says that *they* delivered the Patent, in the name of the Grand Master ; and so ignores

the Grand Wardens, Officers and Perfect Grand Masters of the Grand Council.

The 5th "Consideration" is: "that the Constitutions of 1762 are more than a year subsequent to the said Patent of Stephen Morin, and consequently could not affect the Powers which he held from the Grand Master of the Order, over all the Degrees; that, besides, these Constitutions, so far as they reduced to twenty-five the number of Degrees to be worked, HAVE NOT BEEN ADMITTED AND SANCTIONED BY PRACTICE OR OTHERWISE, IN ANY COUNTRY; and have, in fact, been considered only as the expression of an idea of improvement in that respect on the part of their authors."

This shows that there was an unfair purpose in suppressing the fact that the Patent to Morin did not run in the name of the Grand Master alone, or, indeed, at all. The intention was to represent it as giving power over all known degrees, "because the Grand Master was Grand Master of all Lodges in France." For that purpose, pains were taken to leave out the important word "*regular*," in giving the title of the Count of Clermont, as Grand Master and Protector "of all the Lodges;" for in the patent the expression is, "*Grand Maître et Protecteur de toutes les loges régulières*;" the last word absolutely excluding all Lodges that did not acknowledge the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of France.

Two Powers, only, granted the Patent. One of these administered the Symbolic Degrees only; the other, these and twenty-two more, making twenty-five in all, and no more.

Lévesque (*Aperçu, &c.*, p. 53) says: "1762—The Council of Emperors of the East and West published a list of the Degrees administered by it, they being 25 in number."

Kauffmann and Cherpin say (*Hist. Phil.* p. 452):—"Some time after its establishment, the Council of Emperors of the East and West instituted a Chapter at Bordeaux, of Princes of the Royal Secret. In that Council the Degrees of the Scottish Rite were examined and arranged, to the number of 25. *Their Titles and Order were never afterwards changed.* The Council of Emperors sent commissioners to the Council at Bordeaux to aid in classifying the Degrees."

Thory (1 *Acta Lat.* p. 79) says: "1762—21 September.—

Commissioners from the Council of Emperors of the East and West of Paris, and from the Council of the Princes of Royal Secret at Bordeaux, settled the Regulations of the Masonry of Perfection in 35 Articles, and determined as follows the high Masonic Degrees of the doctrine of the Council.”

A copy of the Constitutions and Regulations of 1762 is given in the *Recueil des Actes du Suprême Conseil de France*, printed at Paris in 1832.

But a copy evidently more correct is contained in the Register of the Bro.: DE LA HOGUE, in the Archives of the Sup.: Council at Charleston, made out in 1798, and attested by his signature and that of the Count DE GRASSE, from whom the Supreme Council of France obtained its copy: and there is another copy in the same archives, in a Register made out by the Bro.: JEAN-BAPTISTE AVEILHE, “Deputy Grand Inspector General and Prince Mason,” at Port-au-Prince, in Santo Domingo, on the 10th of December, 1797; being a copy of a copy certified at Charleston in June, 1797, by the Bro.: HYMAN ISAAC LONG.

The title of these Constitutions, in the Bro.: DE LA HOGUE’s Register, is as follows :

“Constitutions and Regulations drawn up by nine Commissioners appointed *ad hoc*, by the Sovereign Grand Sublime Council of the Sublime Princes of the Royal Secret, &c., &c. Orients of Paris and Berlin. Constitutions and Regulations drawn up by nine Commissioners appointed by the Grand Council of the Sovereign Princes of the Royal Secret, at the Grand Orients of Paris and Berlin, by virtue of the resolution of the 5th day of the 3d week of the 7th Month of the Hebrew Era 5762, and of the Christian Era 1762. To be ratified and observed by the Grand Councils of the Sublime Knights and Princes of Masonry, as well as by the particular Councils and Grand Inspectors regularly constituted in the two Hemispheres.”

In Bro.: AVEILHE’s Register it reads thus: “Regulations and Constitutions made by the nine Commissioners appointed by the Sov.: Grand Council of the Sublime Knights of the Royal Secret and Princes of Masonry; at the Grand Orient

of Bordeaux, in consequence of the resolution of the 5th day of the 3d week of the 7th Month of the Hebrew Era 5762, or of the Christian Era 1762, to be observed and ratified by the said Sovereign Grand Council of the Sublime Knights of the Royal Secret, Princes of Masonry, and by all the Particular Councils regularly constituted over the two Hemispheres ; transmitted to our Bro. : Stephen Morin, Grand Inspector of all the Lodges in the New World, &c."

The 2d Article declares, that "The Royal Art, or the Association of Free and Accepted Masons, is regularly divided into 25 Degrees . . . distributed into 7 classes ;" which are there given, beginning with "Apprentice," and ending with "Sublime Prince of the Royal Secret," 25th Degree.

By Art. 3d, the governing Body of the Rite is shown to be "The Sovereign Grand Council of the Sublime Princes of the Royal Secret ; and it is provided that it shall be composed of the Presidents of all the particular Councils at Paris and Bordeaux.

By Art. 6th, the Sov. : Gr. : Council was to elect 17 Officers annually ; ten with different titles, and seven *Inspectors*, who were to meet under the orders of the Sovereign Prince or his Deputy General.

The Regulations, in several of their provisions, define the Powers of the Inspectors, whom they generally style "Grand Inspectors," and of the Deputies whom they were authorized to appoint. They were to represent the Sovereign Grand Council in the Provinces and Foreign Countries, visit, inspect, and preside in subordinate Bodies ; and could within their respective jurisdictions, in foreign countries, create and constitute Lodges and Councils, prohibit, revoke, and exclude, etc. ; and Articles 14, 15 and 16 show that there was *one* Officer called a Grand "Inspector-General," who must have remained at Paris, since all answers to letters, petitions and memorials were to be signed by him or his Deputy, before being signed by the Grand Secretary ; and all regulations were to be signed by him or his Deputy, before being sealed by the Grand Keeper of the Seals. The Inspectors and their Deputies were, by Art. 27, required to conform to "The Secret Constitutions of the Sovereign Grand Council ;"

“in addition to which *Ancient and Secret Constitutions*,” it is declared by the preamble, “of the August Order of the Sublime Princes of Masonry,” these Regulations were adopted.

The *attestation* to them is: “We, Sovereign of the Sovereign Sublime Princes of the Royal Secret, of the Royal and Military Order of the Most Worshipful Fraternity of Free and Accepted Masons, have determined and do resolve, that these present Statutes, Regulations, and Constitutions be observed. And we do order our Grand Inspectors and their Deputies to cause them to be read and received, as well in all particular Councils, Chapters, and Royal Lodges, as in all other Bodies whatsoever. Done at the Grand Orient of Bordeaux, under the Celestial Vault, the day and year above mentioned.”

The Bro.: DE LA HOGUE’s copy is certified by him and the Bro.: De Grasse to be a true copy of a copy deposited by the Bro.: HYMAN ISAAC LONG in the Archives of the Grand Council of Sov.: Princes of the Royal Secret at Charleston; and Bro.: AVEILHE’s copy is a copy of one certified by Bro.: LONG to agree with a copy of the original transmitted to Bro.: MORIN, delivered by him to Bro.: FRANCKEN, Deputy Grand Inspector in the Island of Jamaica; and with that deposited in Charleston by the Bro.: LONG.

The 33d Article formally declared the Degree of Prince of the Royal Secret to be “*The Sublime and last Degree of Masonry*,” and provided that a Grand Council for conferring it should be held but once a year, and then no more than *three* of the oldest knights adepts allowed to receive it.

Of these Regulations, *Mr. Foulhouze* is bold enough to assert: 1st, that they *reduced* the number of Degrees to 25; and second, that they never were accepted *anywhere*, in that respect, by practice or otherwise, as the Law of the Rite, but merely embodied the theoretical notions of improvement of their framers.

No writer speaks of their *reducing* the number of Degrees; but only of their *classifying* and *arranging* them. They do not *purport* to reduce the numbers of Degrees; and *all* the writers speak of the Council of Emperors of the East and

West, as having from its origin worked only 25 Degrees. The Bro.: STÉPHEN MORIN certainly accepted them as the law of the Rite, for he furnished copies of them to his Deputies, and never undertook to change the number, nomenclature or arrangement of the Degrees.

If, indeed, these Constitutions made *any* change, of which we have no proof whatever, in the number of Degrees worked by the Council of Emperors, we should at once be compelled to conclude that they *increased* the number ; for it was formed of the *débris* of the Chapter of Clermont, whose scale, as we have seen, consisted of a far less number ; and, besides, the tendency then was to *increase* and not to *reduce* the Degrees, in making a new Rite or changing an old one. The Chapter of Clermont was established in 1754; and it does not seem very probable that in eight years the scale would have swelled to beyond 25 Degrees, and then been diminished to that number.

The simple truth is, that this assertion about the *reduction* of the number of Degrees is but another instance of the *making* of facts.

Ragon says (*Orthod. Maç.* p. 297)—“The object of the Council” (in commissioning MORIN) “was to propagate beyond seas *its Masonry*, styled that of *Heredom* or *Perfection*, IN TWENTY-FIVE DEGREES. . . . STEPHEN MORIN, in his journeys to Saint Domingo, and over the vast continent of America, communicated *the 25 Degrees of the Rite of Perfection* ; and in his capacity of G.: Master Inspector he created Inspectors, as he had a right to do.”

Bro.: Chemin Dupontès says (*Cours Pratique de Franc-Maçonnerie*, p. 213), “In 1786. . . . Scottish Masonry, which then had but 25 Degrees, affected to call the French Rite, with its 7 Degrees, the *Modern Rite*, and to plume itself more than ever on the title ‘*Ancient and Accepted Rite.*’ Scottish Masonry. . . . seems to have had, at first, only 18 Degrees. By the union of several constituent Bodies, and reciprocal concessions in regard to a startling number of Degrees, its régime was extended to 25, and afterward to 33 Degrees. . . . The Scottish Masonry in 25 Degrees, whether of the Rite of Heredom or Herodome. . . . or of that of Kilwinning. . . . or of

that of Heredom of Kilwinning . . . certainly existed in 1761, and its Statutes were settled at Bordeaux in 1762."

Vidal Fézandié says (*Essai Historique sur la Franche Maçonnerie*, p. 167), "Scottish Masonry, or the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite, was introduced into France in 1721, by persons armed with powers from the Grand Lodge of Edinburgh. It governed itself by the new Regulations settled in the Memorable Superior Council, held at Bordeaux in 1762." He is mistaken both as to the date of its entrance into France, the pretended powers from the Grand Lodge of Edinburgh being forged; and as to its being called the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite; a name that is not met with *anywhere* until 1801.

Before the Grand Orient of France existed, said the Count MURRAIRE, in his pamphlet, entitled "*De l'Indépendance des Rites Maçonniques*," published at Paris, in 1827, and at page 3: "There was in France a Council of Emperors of the East and West, Sovereign Princes Masons, whose Degrees of Instruction were composed of 25 grades, who constituted at Paris and in France Lodges, Chapters, and Councils, which even conferred powers for propagating the Masonry of Perfection beyond sea, and granted Letters Capitular for the High Degrees; and there had been held at Bordeaux, in 1762, that memorable Council of Princes of the Royal Secret, at which were drawn up and settled, in 35 Articles, the General Regulations of High Masonry; and where were fixed and classified the 25 Degrees that THEN composed the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite; Regulations that became the General Law of the Councils and Consistories established both in France and beyond seas; Regulations still existing, which form the primitive Charter of the Organization of the Ancient Rite, and the yet living rule which governs it; saving such modifications and changes as have been effected by the Grand Constitutions of 1786."

And, "whoever" framed the Grand Constitutions of 1786, it is undeniable that they were "adopted" by Scottish Masons as the law of Scottish Masonry; and their very first Article is in these words: "All the Articles of the Constitutions, Statutes and Regulations made in the year 1762, by

the nine Delegates from the Grand Councils of Princes of Masons of the Royal Secret, which are not contrary to these present Ordinances, are 'preserved' in full force, and shall be observed; but such as conflict herewith are 'abrogated,' and to be regarded as expressly *repealed*."

After the Bro.: MORIN came to America, he did not pretend to propagate any other Masonry than that of Perfection, in 25 Degrees. Up to the year 1801 we find no trace, in America, including the West Indies, of any higher Degree than the 25th, or "Sublime Prince of the Royal Secret." We have several Rituals of that Degree "as the 25th," made out about that time. It is true that the rank of Deputy Grand Inspector-General had gradually grown to be regarded and given as a Degree; but Grand Consistories or Councils of Sublime Princes of the Royal Secret were the highest and governing Bodies of the Rite.

In 1769, Bro.: MORIN was in Kingston, Jamaica. In two old Rituals of the 24th Degree (Kadosh) in our possession, is this paragraph, by way of note: "The Grand Inspector, ETIENNE MORIN, founder of the Lodge of Perfection, in a Consistory of Princes of the Royal Secret, held at Kingston, in Jamaica, in January of the Masonic year 5769, informed the Princes Masons that latterly there had been some excitement at Paris, and investigations had been made there, to learn whether what the Masons styled '*Kadosh*' were not in reality the Knights Templar; and that it had in consequence been determined in the Grand Chapter of Communication of Berlin and Paris, that the Degree should for the future be styled 'Knights of the White and Black Eagle,' and that the jewel should be a 'Black Eagle.'" It is so styled in the Regulations of 1762; and this note shows that Bro.: MORIN accepted the determinations of the Body from which he received his powers, as his law.

The Register of Bro.: AVELLHE was made out in 1797, and that of Bro.: DE LA HOGUE in 1798 and 1799, and in neither is there any hint of any higher power in Masonry than a Sublime Grand Council of Sublime Princes of the Royal Secret.

The Register of the Bro.: DE LA HOGUE contains as its

first entry the filiation of the powers of the Bro.: Morin, as Inspector-General. It states that he gave the *Degree* of Grand Deputy Inspector-General, to Bro.: FRANCKEN, at Jamaica; he to Bro.: MOSES M. HAYES, at Boston; he to Bro.: SPITZER, at Charleston; all the Deputies Grand Inspectors, in Sublime Council at Philadelphia, to Bro.: MOSES COHEN; he to Bro.: HYMAN ISAAC LONG; and he at Charleston, to the Bros.: DE LA HOGUE, DE GRASSE, MAGNAN, SAINT PAUL, ROBIN, PETIT and MARIE, to whom on the 12th of November, 1796, he gave a Charter of Constitution establishing "*a Sublime Grand Council of Princes of the Royal Secret,*" at Charleston, South Carolina. There was already such a Council existing at Kingston, Jamaica, which afterwards claimed and exercised the power of control and censure over that at Charleston, and by which the establishment of the latter was recognized and approved.

There is in Bro.: AVEILHE's Register, a copy of the Patent granted by Bro.: MOSES COHEN to Bro.: HYMAN ISAAC LONG, on the 12th of January, 1794.

And in the Register of Bro.: MOSES HOLBROOK, in the Archives of the Supreme Council at Charleston, is the copy of a Patent given by BAREND M. SPITZER, Prince of Masons and Deputy Grand Inspector-General, reciting his own creation as such, at Philadelphia, on the 25th of June, 1781, by a Convention of Inspectors, and certifying that JOHN MITCHELL, of Charleston, had been raised to the Degree of Kadosh, "*and further to the highest Degrees in Masonry;*" and creating him Deputy Inspector-General. This bears date the 2d of April, 1795. Then follows a Patent granted to FREDERICK DALCHO, on the 24th of May, 1801, by "JOHN MITCHELL," K-H., P.:R.:S.:, certifying him to be K-H. and Prince of the Royal Secret; and creating him Deputy Inspector-General.

In the Register of Bro.: DE LA HOGUE is also a copy of the Patents granted on the 12th of November, 1796, by HYMAN ISAAC LONG, to the Bros.: DE LA HOGUE, DE GRASSE, MAGNAN, SAINT PAUL, ROBIN, PETIT and MARIE, creating each "Patriarch Noachite and Sovereign Knight of the Sun and of K-H., Deputy Grand Inspector-General, &c., &c."

There is also in the same Register, a copy of the Charter of Constitution granted on the 12th November, 1796, by the Bro.: LONG to the same Brethren, "to establish a Lodge of K-H. at Charleston on the Continent of South America." In it, the Bro.: LONG thus describes himself: "We, HYMAN ISAAC LONG, Grand Elect, Perfect and Sublime Mason, Knight of the East, Prince of Jerusalem, &c., &c., &c., Patriarch Noachite, Sovereign Knight of the Sun and K-H. and Deputy Grand Inspector-General over all the Lodges, Chapters, Councils and Grand Councils of the Superior Deg.: of Free Masonry, Ancient and Modern, spread over the surface of the two Hemispheres." To this is annexed a certificate, showing that under the Patent, a "Grand Sublime Council of Princes of the Royal Secret" was established and installed at Charleston, South Carolina, on the 13th of January, 1797: and that it was recognized, approved and confirmed by the Grand Council of Princes of the Royal Secret, at Kingston, Jamaica, on the 10th of August, 1798.

On the 26th of May, 1797, "The Grand and Th.: Puissant Council of the Valiant Princes and Sublime Masons of the Royal Secret," at Charleston, granted to Bro.: JEAN BAPTISTE AVEILHE a Patent as Knight of the Sun and K-H., Deputy Grand Inspector-General.

During the same period, LOUIS CLAUDE HENRI DE MONTMAIN was conferring, at Charleston, as a *detached* Degree, the Degree of Grand Commander of the Temple Mason. We have a copy of his Register, made by us from the original in the archives of the Sup.: Council at Charleston, containing the Ritual of the Degree and sundry certificates of its reception by different Masons; among others, one to ALEXANDER FRANÇOIS AUGUSTE DE GRASSE, Master of the Lodge *La Candeur*, at Charleston, dated 21st December, 1798. There are other certificates of the same kind, as late as 3d August, 1799.

It thus appears in the most perfectly conclusive manner, that up to the year 1800, at least, the Rite of *Perfection*, ending with the 25th Degree, and having as its highest governing Bodies, Grand Councils of Princes of the Royal Secret, was the only Scottish Masonry worked in America. We find

as yet no 33d Degree, and no Sovereign Grand Inspectors-General.

The Inspectors, it is true, had assumed importance, and probably usurped powers. Originally, they were subordinate Provincial Officers of the Sovereign Grand Council. In the Provinces of France, they could not constitute subordinate Bodies ; but only receive applications and report upon them. But in foreign countries they had the power of creating and constituting. They were required to report, it is true ; but that was naturally very irregularly done : and they, as naturally, regarded themselves as superior even to the highest Bodies which they created.

In the *Recueil des Actes* of the Supreme Council of France, following the Constitutions of 1762, as if a part of, or sequence to, them, are certain *Institutes, Statutes* and *Regulations* of uncertain dates, certified by "*Adington, Chancellor.*" Who he was, we have not succeeded in discovering ; but as these Institutes, &c., emanate from the Orient of 17° 58' N. Lat., they came from Kingston, Jamaica, of which that is the latitude. They are particularly noticeable for the 1st Article, which declares the Grand Inspectors-General of the Order, and Presidents of the Sublime Councils of Princes of High Masonry, to be by imprescriptible title the Chiefs of High Masonry ; and Art. 4, which declares them to be Life Members of the Grand Consistory. The copy of the Statutes is certified to have been made out on the 9th of April, 1801, by order of the Grand Sovereign Consistory of Princes Metropolitan of Heredom, to be transmitted to the Deputy of the Grand Consistory established at the central point of 18° 47' N. Lat., which is the latitude of Jeremie, in the Island of Santo Domingo. Whatever the two Grand Consistories were, these Statutes at least show that, at that time, Bodies of Princes of the Royal Secret were the highest known in Scottish Masonry ; and that the Grand Inspectors-General were not more than Princes of the Royal Secret and Members of the Consistories.

And thus the fact that "General Inspectors" were created by the Council of Emperors of the East and West, does not prove that the 33d Degrees of the Ancient and Accepted Rite were then worked *as a Rite.*

It is true, as we have said, that prior to 1801 these officials had assumed perhaps a higher rank, and certainly a greater degree of independence than they were entitled to; and looked upon and treated to some extent the rank of Deputy Grand Inspector-General as a *Degree*; and it was no doubt in consequence of this gradual assumption of power and prerogative, that they finally embodied themselves into Supreme Councils, and increased the number of Degrees to thirty-two, besides the presiding Degree, in order to set on foot a new Rite, and enable them by prescription and the assent of the fraternity of the Scottish Masons to consolidate and legalize their power. Such has, in all times, been the origin of most Masonic Powers. They are not formed by constituencies, as they should be, but they form themselves; and gain the consent and ratification of subordinate Bodies and individual Masons afterwards. The Grand Lodge Lacorne, the Grand Orient, the Council of Emperors of the East and West, that of Knights of the East, the Chapter of Clermont, the Scottish Directories, the Power of Misraim, all the governing Bodies of the Templar Rites, and many other Bodies, were so formed.

It is utterly untrue that the Constitutions of 1762 *reduced* the number of degrees worked by the Council of Emperors; and equally untrue that this determination of the number of degrees was never admitted and sanctioned in practice anywhere. They did *not* reduce the number; and they did become the law, the fundamental law, of the Rite of Perfection, and so continued, whoever made and enacted them, for nearly forty years, *everywhere*.

And when, in 1803, the Bro.: GERMAIN HACQUET carried back the Rite of *Heredom* from Santo Domingo to Paris, and established it in the Lodge *des Sept Ecossais*, it was a Rite in *twenty-five* degrees, which the Grand Orient bought of him, and made him, by way of payment, President of the Grand Consistory of Rites.—Ragon, *Orthod. Maç.* p. 307.

As to the 6th "Consideration," it is true that the "VERA INSTITUTA SECRETA ET FUNDAMENTA ORDINIS, &C., ATQUE CONSTITUTIONES MAGNÆ" of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite, bearing date May 1st, 1786, do, in the Preamble of In-

troduction, declare their object to be to restore Masonry "to the unity of its original regimen and of the pristine composition of its organs, as well as of its original discipline." The preamble says, for we prefer to quote its own language: "Wherefore, these reasons, and others of no less weight, impel us to collect together and unite into one Body and Art of Masonry, all the *Rites* of the Scottish regimen, the doctrines whereof are generally acknowledged to be in the main the same as those Ancient Institutions which tend to a common centre; and which, while only the main branches of one and the same tree, *differ so much from one another in their formulas, now widely diffused*; and yet may be so easily reconciled. These Rites are those known under the several names of 'The Ancient;' that of 'Heredom or Hairdom;' that of the 'Orient of Kilwinning;' that of 'St. Andrew;' that of the 'Emperors of the East and West;' that of the 'Princes of the Royal Secret,' or of 'Perfection;' the 'Philosophical Rite;' and that most recent Rite of all, known as the 'Primæval' or 'Primitive.' Wherefore, adopting as the basis of our conservative reformation, the title of the first of these Rites, and the number of Degrees of the hierarchy of the last, we do declare them all to be now and henceforward *united* and *aggregated* into one single *Order*, which, professing the dogma and the pure and undefiled doctrines of the Ancient Art of Masonry, embraces all the *systems* of the Scottish Rite, united together under the title of THE ANCIENT ACCEPTED SCOTTISH RITE."

And it further declared that all the Degrees of all the Rites so united, from the 1st to the 18th inclusive, would be arranged among the Degrees of the Rite of Perfection, each in its proper place and order, and as analogy and similitude required, and would compose the 18 first Degrees: that the 19th and 23d of the Primitive Rite should be the 20th of the *Order*; the 20th and 23d of Perfection, or the 16th and 24th of the Primitive Rite, should be the 21st and 28th of the *Order*; the Princes of the Royal Secret the 32d; and the Sovereign Grand Inspectors-General the 33d; that the 31st Degree should be that of Sovereign Judges Commanders, and the Sovereign Commanders Sov.: Kts.: Kadosh be the

30th ; and that the Chiefs of the Tabernacle, the Princes of the Tabernacle, the Knights of the Brazen Serpent, the Princes of Mercy (or, rather, of *Courtesy*), the Sovereign Commanders of the Temple, and the Sovereign Ecossais of St. Andrew should respectively compose the 23d, 24th, 25th, 26th, 27th and 29th Degrees.

Of so much the 6th "Consideration" gives the substance correctly enough. But there is something else in this preamble to be noted, in order completely to appreciate the *logic*.

The preamble having previously declared that the Ancient Masons had been dispersed over all the earth ; and that this dispersion had "produced systems varying from each other, which still exist and are styled *Rites*, the aggregate whereof composes the Order ;" it proceeds, after the specification and arrangement of Degrees above quoted, to add this :

"All the Sublime Degrees of the said several aggregated Scottish Rites will, according to analogy or identity, be distributed among the corresponding classes of the Degrees of the Order, according to the regimen of the Ancient Accepted Scottish Rite. But never, nor under any pretext whatever, can any one of those Sublime Degrees be assimilated to the 33d and most Sublime Degree of Sovereign Grand Inspector-General, Protector and Conservator of the Order, and last Degree of the same Ancient Accepted Scottish Rite : in no case can any other person enjoy these rights, prerogatives, privileges and powers wherewith we do invest those Inspectors."

Thus the framers of these Constitutions, declaring their intention to be to collect together and unite in one Body all the existing Rites of Scotticism, select certain Degrees from different quarters to form 31 of the Degrees of the New and Aggregated Rite—for they do not specify what shall constitute the 19th and 22d. The 18 Degrees of the Rite of Perfection are taken for the first 18, and the 18 first Degrees of *all* the other Rites are to be arranged among them. Then above the 18th, two Degrees of the Primitive Rite are taken to form one ; and two of the Rite of Perfection and Primitive Rite, to form two more. Then some other Degrees that *had*

been before heard of, are taken—the Kadosh, from the Templar Masonry and other Rites, to make the 30th; the Sov.: Commander of the Temple, which de Montmain was giving as a *detached* degree almost at the close of the century, to make the 27th; and the Scottish Knight of St. Andrew, to make the 29th. The Princes of the Royal Secret make the 32d; and then come five Degrees, not *said* to be taken from *any* Rite, and which are not *found* in the nomenclature of any existing Rite, to make the 23d, 24th, 25th, 26th and 33d. As the first 18 of *all* the Rites were to be grouped round the 18 of the Rite of Perfection, so round the next 14, up to and including the 32d, were to be grouped *all* the other Degrees of all the other Rites. But it was formally declared that the 33d was not *like* any Degree in any existing Rite, but *superior* to all.

Now, an *ordinary* man would at once say that here was a new Rite made, by the aggregation into 32 classes of equivalents, of all existing Degrees; each of the 32 representing all others of equal rank, or analogous to itself; most of the 32 being old Degrees, but four, at least, certainly not belonging to any of the named Rites, nor found in the nomenclature of any Rite whatever; and therefore probably framed at the time, to serve as representative Degrees, the heads of classes of anomalous Degrees from different Rites; and that to complete and perfect the new Rite or Aggregation of all Rites and Degrees, a new Degree was invented and a supreme rank, with which no known Degree was to assimilate as an equivalent.

But *Mr. Foulhouse* does not look at the thing in that light at all. Having set out with the proposition that this identical, aggregated, composite, newly-constructed Ancient and Accepted Rite had been practised long before, by *divers* Masonic Bodies—all the Degrees that now compose it, then also composing it—he marches boldly forward to tell us that he has now proven, not, to be sure, exactly the proposition he set out with, but another, which he treats as if it were of course perfectly the same.

For, he tells us by his 7th “Consideration”: “Consider-
“ing that this avowal on the part of the authors of the

“above-mentioned Institutes, is a proof that *all* these Rites and Degrees were known and practised before 1786; that *consequently* the Count of Clermont was Grand Master *thereof*; and that the right of working and conferring *them* formed a part of the powers given in his name to Stephen Morin.”

A man who can seriously propound such an argument as that, is very much to be pitied.

Because these Constitutions, which—he says—were not made in 1786, and are “a forgery of private signature,” *profess* and pretend to collect together all the different Rites of Scottish Masonry, distinct as they are from one another, and worked and administered by different Bodies; selecting part of their Degrees, some from one Rite and some from another, as the new Scale to be conferred, and grouping the others with them, that is, practically annulling them, and putting an entirely new Degree at the head of all;—this *proves* that all these Rites and Degrees *were* known and practised before 1786; that *proves* that the Count of Clermont was the Grand Master of all of them; and that *proves* that the right of working *all of them* formed part of the powers given in his name to Stephen Morin!

Now, as to this most curious argument, there are several things to be said.

1st. Suppose the pretence or profession or avowal of whomsoever made these Constitutions, *does* prove that all these Rites and Degrees were known and practised prior to 1786,—*what then?* Does that prove that one could not make a new *Rite* by selecting a certain number of such Degrees, some here, some there, and arranging and combining them? Must one *invent new Degrees*, in order to make a new *Rite*? Must one invent new *principles of law*, to make a new *Code*; or new principles of Theosophy to make a new creed? Does it prove that that New Rite, or if you choose to call it so, *combination* of Degrees, was ever before worked, as a whole and as a unit, by any Masonic Body?

2d. If by his patent, Morin did take and become invested

with the power to work and confer *all* and *any* of the Degrees, and in all and any of the named Rites; and if all the Degrees of the New Rite *are* to be found among those Degrees which he was so authorized to work and confer: then each Inspector who succeeded him by filiation of powers, including De Grasse and De la Hogue, and John Mitchell and Doctor Dalcho and Doctor Auld, all and each became invested with the same right and power of working and conferring all of those Degrees, or as many of them as they pleased. None of them were confined to the Rite of Perfection with its 25 Degrees. Then whatever power *any* man ever had, to select certain Degrees out of a huge mass, each of *them* had, and so to form a system with a limited number of Degrees; and whenever that was done, the first superior Body of the new system had the right and power to make or adopt its fundamental law; or else there never was a legitimate Rite, nor any valid Constitutions in any Rite.

3d. If this new hypothesis as to Morin's powers be true, then all the nonsense that has been emitted about "superfœtation of Degrees" by the founders of the Supreme Council at Charleston, or by De Grasse, is to be abandoned. The great argument of the advocates of the Grand Orient always was, that Morin was authorized only to confer the 25 Degrees of the Rite de Perfection; that they were all that he took with him from France; that he never possessed, nor did his deputies or *their* deputies ever possess, legitimately, any higher Degree than that of Prince of the Royal Secret; that either at Charleston or by De Grasse, *new* Degrees, that really amounted to nothing, were, in part, picked up elsewhere, and in part invented, and added to the twenty-five, substantially adding nothing to the Rite, but leaving it essentially what it was before, when it had but 25 Degrees.

They said that the framers of what they called the new Rite merely *supposed* the existence of Degrees, whose Rituals were to be found neither in Europe nor America, and made out of a single Degree of other Rites—the Kadosh—their 30th, 31st, 32d and 33d.

This new discovery changes all that. It turns out that Morin was legally authorized to confer and work, God knows how many Degrees ; and that those who by delegation possessed precisely the same powers as he, selected 33 out of the whole lot, and concluding to work them and no more, made those who attained the highest Degree the governing Body.

When a man announces a new discovery, it ought to be worth something. It is a rather serious objection to a theory, that besides being wholly unfounded, it is also perfectly unimportant and worthless.

Now that is precisely the case with *this* theory. If it were true, then it would simply prove that De Grasse, or Mitchell and Dalcho, or somebody else, fully possessed of the power of working and conferring a huge and undigested mass of conflicting and incoherent Degrees, many of them immoral and more of them stupidly and wretchedly absurd, trivial, childish and barren, had sense enough to go to work and select out of that mass, *without inventing any new Degrees*, thirty-three of the best, arranging and classifying them, forming thereby what *Mr. Foulhouze* claims to be a great philosophic system of Masonry ; which a vast number of Masons have been induced to accept and adopt as a Rite, and to work thereby, and to live by and obey its principles and laws. If they did that, they made a new Rite, or else there is no such thing as making a new Rite.

4th. *Mr. Foulhouze* is too poor a logician to be able to state with clearness his own conceptions. What he seems to have been struggling to express in the shape of an argument is this : That the founders of the Ancient and Accepted Rite, having invented no *new* Degrees, but merely selected a certain number from among the old ones, had no proprietary interest, at least no *exclusive* proprietary interest, in any of the Degrees so selected ; and therefore had, equally, no proprietary interest in the Rite formed by their arrangement and combination ; since, all the *parts* being old, *the whole* was also in reality old : that this being so, the organized Bodies of the Rite can make no reclamation against *any one* who,

having received the Degrees, sees fit to confer them and establish independent organizations thereof within their jurisdictions; because one, before he can impeach the title of another, must first prove his own title sufficient. *Ergo*, *Mr. Foulhouse* had the right to set up a Supreme Council!

We express that argument, we think, clearly, and with its full force. Now let us examine it. It *looks* plausible. *Mr. Foulhouse's arguments seldom get beyond that.* Let us see whether it will hold water.

If it were true that all the Degrees of this new Rite were old Degrees, and a Master Mason had gone to the different Bodies or individuals previously in possession of them, and procured one here and the other there, until he had received them all by initiation or communication, it would certainly be true that he would owe no allegiance to the governing Bodies of the new Rite, nor be bound by any law that they had enacted for it.

If one, not a Mason at all, were to find in some remote or newly discovered country, a Society, older than Masonry, working the three Symbolic Degrees, which those who established Masonry had borrowed from it; and he were there to receive those Degrees, undoubtedly he would owe no allegiance to any *Masonic Power*, so called, but only to the Association or Power from which he received the Degrees; and he would be bound solely by *its* laws, and not by any enacted by the *younger* associations of *Masonry*.

Does *Mr. Bienvenu*, the judge we have chosen, see *why*? Simply because he would not have received the Degrees from a *Masonic Body* or Power, but have obtained them elsewhere. And if *Mr. Foulhouse* had obtained *his* Degrees from different Powers, of older creation than the ruling Bodies of the Ancient and Accepted Rite, then he would, on the same principle, owe no allegiance to those ruling Bodies, but only to those from which he received the Degrees; and the laws enacted by the former would not bind him, but only those enacted by the latter.

Mr. Foulhouse, however, seems to think that to release himself from allegiance to the Powers of the Rite in which

he received the Degrees, and from his obligation to obey the law of that Rite, it only needs for him to show that that law, accepted as it was by the first Bodies of the Rite, and unrepealed as it still remains, was not framed and enacted by the individual, himself without authority to enact, whose name it bears and by whom it purports to have been approved. *Something else* stands in his way besides that law—his *formal* oath, and also the *implied* obligation imposed on him by the very fact that he is a Mason.

Masonry has its own peculiar laws, which are of its essence, and without which it would not be Masonry. When a man goes to an organized Masonic Body, and receives the Degrees which it confers, he becomes either a member or subject of it. He accepts, as imperatively and forever binding on him, if they remain unrepealed and unchanged, the laws, written and unwritten, which have been adopted by that Body, or which result as corollaries from the nature and essence of its organization. If it be one of several Bodies having a common centre of union and administration, or a superior Power of government and administration, he, by the mere fact of so receiving the Degrees, owes fealty and allegiance, which he cannot throw off without *perjury*, to such common centre or superior Power. One law to which he submits, inflexible as Fate, one pledge which he gives *invariably*, in every branch of Masonry, is that he will not confer the Degree so received, will not reveal the secrets thereof, except when legally authorized so to do; that is to say, except in accordance with and by virtue of the law of the Body from which he receives them, or of its acknowledged superior. And his oath of allegiance, or tacit obligation of allegiance as strong and binding as a formal oath, by the very nature of Masonry, includes and involves in itself this pledge, that he will not set up a rival power against that under which he received the Degrees, or against another in amity with it, of the same Rite; nor in any way defy, disregard or attempt to weaken it, by schism or dissension. No man ever took a Masonic Degree, in any organized Body, without assuming those solemn obligations. No man ever violated them without committing what Masonry regards

and defines as perjury, and what *is* perjury as much as if the law of the land declared it so and punished it.

Those obligations cannot be evaded, or the party released from them, upon the pretence that *other* Bodies and organizations, and *older* Bodies and organizations, could have been found by him elsewhere, from which he could have obtained the same Degrees. That has nothing to do with the matter. If it could release from allegiance, or dispense from obligation, Masonry would be at once overturned from top to bottom.

A Master Mason goes to a Royal Arch Chapter, and there applies for and obtains the four Degrees which it confers. Can he, after he has so obtained them, *and taken the obligations*, turn upon the Chapter and say: "I discover that when your Chapter system was established some fifty years since, you merely selected four old Degrees, and made a new Rite of them. The Mark Master—then called Master Mark Mason—was conferred many years ago by Lodges under the jurisdiction of the Grand Council of Princes of Jerusalem of South Carolina. I could have obtained that Degree there, without coming to you, if those Bodies were still in existence, or had continued to exist. You have no exclusive right to that Degree; and I am not bound by the laws you made for it. I will confer it, therefore, when, where and on whom I please, and create Mark Master Lodges within your jurisdiction?"

The simple answer would be: "You did *not* get the Degree elsewhere. You came to *us* and obtained it, as part of our Rite. Remember your oath! If you do as you say you will, you are perjured."

A Royal Arch Mason goes to a Council of Royal and Select Masters, holding a Charter from a Grand Council which is to it the Supreme Power; and there receives those Degrees. Can he say: "I could have obtained these Degrees from the Supreme Council of the 33d Degree of Charleston. They were originally detached Degrees, given by the Deputy Inspectors-General. You have no exclusive proprietorship. I will confer them in your jurisdiction, and set up Councils and a Grand Council there of my own?"

A Profane goes to a Blue Lodge, and receives the three Symbolic Degrees. Can he turn upon the Lodge which gave him the Degrees, and upon the Grand Lodge of the State, and say: "I have discovered that these Degrees are not original with you. They are older than Masonry, as it is now organized. The old Egyptian Hierophants invented them. They were the Degrees of the old Mysteries. You have no exclusive title to them. You did not invent them. I owe you no allegiance, and am not bound by the law you have enacted. I will make Masons as I please, organize Lodges, and set up a Grand Lodge here in your jurisdiction?" And would he strengthen then his position by adding: "Nor is your *Law* authentic. The first governing Body of your Rite framed it, indeed, but it concealed the fact of its authorship, and to give it a higher sanction, pretended that Solomon wrote it down and enacted it as the law. True, you adopted it, but it was a forgery; and therefore I am not bound by it?"

The first known Body of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite, after the one at Berlin, in 1786, which made the Grand Constitutions, was the Supreme Council at Charleston, or one at Geneva, of whose history we have scarce any information. Whichever was first, it adopted the Constitutions with the date 1786 as the Law of the Rite. That law so adopted, prescribed the number of Supreme Councils, and limited the powers of those who should attain the 33d Degree. To each country in Europe but one Supreme Council was allowed; to North America two. So far from disregarding this provision was the Grand Orient of France, that it contended for near forty years, that the Supreme Council for France had by the Concordat of 1804 merged in itself, and could not, without *its* consent, withdraw from that compact; that, therefore, the Supreme Council in its own bosom was the only true Supreme Council of France; and that the other, the Supreme Council of France by that name, was illegal and irregular. True, it attempted to fortify its position by claiming *other* titles also to the Degrees of the Rite; but these claims, if valid, *could* extend only to *part* of those Degrees. It has always insisted on the principle

that there could be but one legitimate Masonic Centre in France.

The Members of the Grand Orient obtained the Degrees, mediately or immediately, from the Supreme Council of France, created by de Grasse, who received his Degrees at Charleston. *Mr. Foulhouse* obtained his Degrees from the Grand Orient. Could he turn upon the governing Bodies of the Rite and say: "Your Degrees are old Degrees, all of them. You have invented no new ones. I could have gone to this power and that, and obtained part of the Degrees from one, and part from another, until I had got them all. You have no *exclusive title* to any of them. Therefore, I owe no allegiance to any of you. I am not bound by the law you have adopted. I will confer the Degrees and create inferior Bodies and a Supreme Council within the jurisdiction of one of you; and in so doing I will offend no law of Masonry?" The simple answer would be: "*You did NOT get the Degrees elsewhere.*" And if he added that the Grand Orient of France now repudiated the Grand Constitutions, the equally prompt and decisive answer would be, that admitting her power to do so, that had no force or effect beyond the limits of France; and that *no other* Supreme Body of the Rite had assented to that repudiation.

And then steps in that great fundamental unwritten and international law of Masonry, which the necessity for peace and the permanent interests of the fraternity have made a law inflexible, general, and omnipotent: that within the jurisdiction of one organized Body of any Rite, when that jurisdiction is defined by agreement with other Powers, or by claim long asserted and acquiesced in, no other Masonic Power of the same Rite, and still less no individual, can interfere with the prerogatives of such Body, or do any act that it belongs to itself to do, against its consent. It is the doctrine of *possession, claim, and prescription.*

This doctrine, the doctrine of peace, the doctrine of prescription on which all title is founded, would even forbid those who have received the same Degrees in another association, from violating the Sovereignty of a Masonic Power by conferring the Degrees it administers, and creating

Bodies to work such Degrees, within the limits of its jurisdiction. A Royal and Select Master who has obtained those Degrees from the Supreme Council at Charleston, cannot go into a State where there is a Grand Council, and there confer the Degrees and create Councils. True, he owes that Grand Council no allegiance; but his action would be against the General Masonic Law. True, he received them as detached Degrees, and not as a Rite or part of a Rite, with an organic law of its own; but the great fact remains, that they *do* form a Rite, and *do* possess an organic law, in the State where he attempts to confer them; and that they are there under the government of a regularly organized body, with whose prerogatives, therefore, the General Masonic law forbids *him* to intermeddle.

If *Mr. Foulhouze* had received his Degrees, some from the Scottish Directories, some from the Chapter of Arras, some from the Mother-Lodge of the Philosophic Rite, some from the Strict Observance, some from the Primitive Rite at Namur, and *none* from *any* Body of the Ancient and Accepted Rite, still the general Masonic law would peremptorily forbid his invading the jurisdiction of a Sup.: Council and setting up there another standard of the Rite: of course, he *could* do it, if he chose. He could not be *enjoined* and *prevented*. But it would be the duty of every legitimate Masonic Power in the world to place the seal of its condemnation on this unmasonic and anti-masonic action, by at once expelling him from every branch of Masonry to which he had belonged, and prohibiting all Masonic communications with him or his followers.

And, as he has *not* obtained the Degrees elsewhere, but from a Body of the Rite, he must respect the Law of the Rite; and when he violates it, he is guilty of perjury in addition. The Supreme Council at Charleston had, since 1804, at least, persistently claimed Louisiana as within its jurisdiction. It had over and again *exercised* that jurisdiction. No Masonic Power contested it, except the first Grand Consistory of Louisiana, which had ceased to exist, and the Supreme Council created in 1839. Of that Supreme Council *Mr. Foulhouze* was a subject. It was Supreme over the Rite

in Louisiana, or it was nothing. If it was nothing, there was *no* Power in conflict with that at Charleston. Being supreme, its action bound all its subordinates and subjects. It conceded the justice of the claim of the Supreme Council at Charleston, submitted to its authority, and, by a formal Treaty, surrendered its powers. After that, the claim of the Sup.: Council at Charleston was undisputed by any Power competent to dispute it. The only Power that *had* done so had yielded. *Mr. Foulhouse*, being within the jurisdiction of the Supreme Council at Charleston, was, by the general Masonic Law, its Masonic subject, bound by its laws and owing it allegiance: and if he even owed it no allegiance, if he remained an independent Sov.: G.: Inspector-General, he was equally powerless to confer the Degrees and create Bodies within its jurisdiction which now no Masonic Power disputed with it. But in truth, an Inspector-General is within the general law as to jurisdiction and amenability, as much as an Apprentice Mason is. He is under the jurisdiction of that Supreme Council, within the limits of whose jurisdiction he resides. When *Mr. Foulhouse* resigned his membership in the Supreme Council at New Orleans, he became its subject. When it ceased to exist, he was the subject either of the Supreme Council at Charleston, or of the Grand Orient. In the former case, he is a rebel; in the latter, an invader of the territory of a friendly Power; in either case, a disturber of the Masonic peace, doing injury to the Institution, and worse injury to those whom he deludes by sophistry and inexcusable outrages upon historical truth.

5th. *Mr. Foulhouse* has here shifted his ground, or rather has endeavored to *hedge* against what he had averred as historical truth in the first and second "Considerations;" to wit, that one identical Ancient and Accepted Rite, *as* a Rite, and with all its present 33 Degrees, was worked as a whole and a unit, in the time of the Grand Mastership of the Count of Clermont, by divers Masonic Bodies. We hold him to that averment. He cannot escape from it. Now he claims only to have proven that all these Rites and Degrees

were known and practised prior to 1786. That is a very different thing. What it would amount to, if it were true, we have already seen.

But the truth is, that even this is not true. All these Degrees did not exist in France prior to 1786, nor until 1804. The 33d did not. There was never any such Degree known there, until 1804, as that of Sovereign Grand Inspector-General, superior to Prince of the Royal Secret. And it is perfectly well known to all Masons who have at all examined the subject, that no such Degrees as Chief of the Tabernacle, Prince of the Tabernacle, Knight of the Brazen Serpent, and Prince of Mercy, are to be found in the nomenclature of any of the old Degrees, existing prior to 1804. *Le Tuilleur* of *de l'Aulnay* says—as lately as 1840: “These four Degrees, the 23d, 24th, 25th, and 26th, are not found in France. Accordingly the Scottish Masons regard them as the Holy Ark.” Has *Mr. Foulhouse* any Ritual of either of those Degrees, of any antiquity, that contains anything like a ceremonial of reception? Has he *any* ceremonial of reception in either, that has not been made up out of Vassal? How many Rituals, of how many of the Degrees above the 18th did he find in the Archives of the Grand Orient, in 1845; which of those Degrees, other than the 30th and 33d were *conferred* on him, and what was the amount of instruction he received in the 23d, 24th, 25th, 26th and 27th? We have some information to give on these points, by and by.

6th. So far from the “*aveu*” of the authors of the Grand Constitutions proving that all these Rites and *Degrees* were known and practised before 1786, they not only do *not* prove that with regard to four of the Degrees, the Chief of the Tabernacle, Prince of the Tabernacle, Knight of the Brazen Serpent, and Prince of Mercy, but they prove absolutely and positively *the contrary* as to the 33d Degree, by declaring it in the clearest terms, not to be, nor to be like, *any* Degree of *any* of the Rites named. As to the other four, it is well known that there never were any Rituals of either of them, the *cahiers* merely giving the decorations of the room, the clothing, jewels, words, signs, tokens, etc. Of ceremonial

they give nothing. Vassal, it is true, undertakes to do it, but the ceremonial which he gives for each is his own invention. Other writers admit that there never was in France a genuine Ritual of either of those Degrees. And the 33d, if the Preamble is to be relied on at all, was originally a rank and authority belonging to Frederic *only*, as Head of the Rite, and devolved by him on certain persons as his successors. And even if that is all a fable, yet it none the less proves that the Degree was a new invention.

7th. The "*aveu*" of the authors in question *cannot* be said to *prove* that any Rites or Degrees *in particular* were known and practised prior to 1786. It is but the statement of one, two, or more persons as to that, and only a portion of the evidence on the point. It might be true, or it might be false. We know from other sources that some of the Rites named *were* practised, and perhaps in one sense, *all*. These authors were not particularly accurate in the nomenclature of the Rites which they proposed to combine into one. They name *eight* Rites, but there never was any such *Rite* as that of *St. Andrew*; nor as that of *the Emperors of the East and West*, by that name, nor as contradistinguished from that of *Perfection*; nor as that of *Kilwinning* as contradistinguished from that of "*Heredom, Herodom or Hairdom, ordinarily called the Rite of Heredom of Kilwinning.*"

Nor were they more accurate in regard to the *Degrees* of the different Rites. They provide that the first 18 of *each* Rite shall be arranged with the first 18 of the Rite of Perfection; but the *Ancient* Rite had but the three Symbolic Degrees; the *Philosophical Scottish Rite* of Paris had but 15; the *Philosophical Scottish Rite of the Scottish Mother Lodge*, originated at Marseilles, had but 18 in all, the 18th being the Kt.: of the Sun; and of the 33 Degrees of the *Primitive Rite* of Namur, the 18th was only the Prince of Jerusalem. To make their arrangement correct, they should have assigned to the first 18 Degrees the first 22 of the Primitive Rite, and only the first 6 of one Philosophical Rite, and the first 8 of the other; the 6th of one and the 8th of the other being the Rose Croix.

Besides this, they omitted to mention some of the most important Rites; as for example, the *Eclectic*, in Germany, and the *Reformed*, of Dresden, practised by the four Scottish Directories in France.

8th. If, as *Mr. Foulhouze* and his adherents are never weary of repeating, the Constitutions of 1786 are a bold forgery, “*un faux en écriture privée,*” and to be assigned to a date much later than 1786, how do they *prove* that “all these Rites and Degrees were known and practised *before* 1786?”

9th. Suppose that fact proven, by them or otherwise, how does it follow that the Count of Clermont “*EN était le Grand Maître*—was the Grand Master *thereof*”—of all those Rites and Degrees? This is another “*fact,*” the proprietorship of which belongs wholly to *Mr. Foulhouze*, by the right of first discovery. The Count of Clermont was elected Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of France, when it was the *English* Grand Lodge, holding and working under a Charter from the Grand Lodge of *England*. It was exclusively a *Symbolic* Grand Lodge. Under that Charter and by that name it worked from 1743 to 1756. Then it declared itself independent, as the “Grand Lodge of France.” When it first received its Charter from England, it adopted Regulations which denounced and disowned *all* the Scottish Degrees. It did not change these regulations when it became independent. When the Grand Lodge of *Lacorne* was united with it, it seems for a time to have admitted the superiority of the Scottish Degrees, and *administered* or *worked* them; and in 1766, on the 2d of October, it refused to establish Chambers of those Degrees within itself.—Thory, 1 *Acta Lxt.* p. 88.—The simple truth is, that it was always a *Symbolic* Grand Lodge; and the Count of Clermont was Grand Master of the *regular* Lodges, and *Symbolic* Masons of France, ONLY. He may also have been at the head of the Council of Emperors of the East and West, or the Grand Council; but that was certainly only a nominal dignity; and at any rate it was not a part of his prerogative as Grand Master.

And the truth also is that the different Powers that

granted Letters of Constitution for Bodies to work in the Scottish Degrees, were perfectly independent of the Grand Lodge. In 1766, it undertook to suppress them ; but did not succeed.—Thory, 1 *Acta Lat.* p. 87.—You cannot open a Masonic work that treats of the Masonry of those times, without finding ample evidence of their entire independence. The Council of Emperors, the Chapter of Clermont, the Chapter of Arras, the Council at Bordeaux, the Philosophic Mother Lodges, the Scottish Directories, all were *rival Powers* of the Grand Lodge.

10th. A curious idea has long obtained about jurisdiction over Degrees. Every little while we find it said: the Grand Lodge of France, or the Grand Orient, has jurisdiction over such and such a Rite, or such and such Degrees, by *transfer* from the governing Body of the same. The idea is perfect nonsense. An individual *has* such Degrees as he has *invented*, or lawfully *received*, assuming the obligations of the same. A Body, composed of *such* individuals, can work such Degrees. No other Body can. If the Grand Chapter of Royal Arch Masons of Louisiana were to transfer its Powers to the Grand Lodge, it would amount to nothing. The members of the Grand Lodge, not having regularly received the Chapter Degrees, the Body could not work them, could have nothing to do with them. The Count of Clermont could only be Grand Master as to such Degrees as he had regularly received. He was an absolute stranger to all that he had not received. The Grand Lodge was composed of representatives of the Blue Lodges. Some of them had the high Degrees, and more had not. Of course the *Body*, as a Body, had no jurisdiction over them, or concern with them. We do not know that the Count of Clermont had ever received *any* of the Scottish Degrees. There is not the least reason to suppose that, if he had, he had ever gone beyond those of the Rite of Perfection. Probably not one man in France had received all, or even half of the Degrees which every Body was then manufacturing: and of course no one Body could have jurisdiction over all, nor any one Grand Master be at the head of all.

11th. But the 7th "Consideration" goes still further, and claims that, *consequently*, again, Morin's Patent gave him *the right* to work and confer *every* Degree of all the Rites. His Patent, or a thousand Patents, could give him the right to work and confer no other Degrees than he had himself regularly received or should invent; and as he never pretended to go outside of the 25 Degrees of Perfection, the presumption is that he was in possession of no other; and, on the other hand, if he *were* in possession of five hundred, his Patent from the Grand Lodge and Grand Council of France could give him no power to work or confer any other Degrees than belonged to their own systems. These are ideas so perfectly simple and fundamental, and so undeniably true, that one would be surprised to find them controverted, if that were done by any other person than a logician, who can crowd as many errors into a paragraph of six lines as there are words in it.

It would be difficult to decide whether the 7th "Consideration," which we have now dissected, offends most against historical truth, the very elementary principles of logic, or against common sense.

The 8th "Consideration" refers to the statement, in a note to *Oliver's Landmarks*—Am. Ed. vol. 2, p. 38, note 43, and London Ed., vol. 2, p. 52, note 45—that, "in 1763, Moses M. Hayes proceeded to Rhode Island, where he established a Council of the 33d and conferred the Degrees on several persons, etc.;" as a "fact" demonstrating the correctness and force of the 7th "Consideration."

The Bro.: Oliver further says that among the persons on whom he conferred the Degrees, was Moses Seixas, who was afterwards Master of the Grand Lodge of Rhode Island, and to whom he gave authority to confer all the higher Degrees; which he held until his death in 1801, *and then the Brethren placed themselves under the Grand Consistory of New York*. He gives no authority for this statement; and into his "Historical Landmarks," he puts everything that he has ever met with, whether reliable or not; as when in note 3 at page 258 of the same volume, he follows Clavel in making Col. Mitchell and Dr. Dalcho to have been Jews; and fixes 1797

as the date when they created the 33d Degree. The statement of Dr. Oliver is simply a ludicrous mistake.

We have already shown that neither the Brother Spitzer, Cohen or Long, or any Deputy Inspector after them, deriving title from Morin, ever claimed prior to 1801, to be any thing else or more than a "Deputy Grand Inspector-General," Prince of the Royal Secret, and of the 25th Degree. They invariably styled themselves "Deputy Grand Inspector-General," or "Deputy Inspector," or "Grand Deputy Inspector," with the addition of "Prince Mason, etc." The figures "33" never appear until 1801.

The filiation of Powers from Morin states that he communicated the Degree of Deputy Inspector to the Bro.: Francken, at Jamaica; he to the Bro.: Moses Michael Hayes, at Boston; and he to the Bro.: Barend M. Spitzer. If it were true that the Bro.: Hayes claimed to be a 33d, and created a Supreme Council of the 33d, it is very curious that the Bro.: Spitzer did not take the same title, and that among the number of Deputy Grand Inspectors appointed afterwards, no one ever assumed the title of 33d, nor created a Supreme Council of that Degree.

At the Convention of Deputy Inspectors at Philadelphia, in 1781, the following were present: Solomon Bush, for Pennsylvania; Isaac da Costa, for the West Indies and North America; Simon Nathan, for North Carolina; Samuel Myers, for the Leeward Islands; Barend M. Spitzer, for Georgia; and Thomas Randal, for New Jersey; and not one of them claimed any higher rank than that of Prince of the Royal Secret and Deputy Inspector-General; and as such only, Solomon Bush addressed the following letter to Frederic the Great, on the 2d November, 1785, which may be seen in the Philadelphia Mirror & Keystone of July 5th, 1854, p. 212:

MOST SUBLIME AND POWERFUL SOVEREIGN!

Illustrious Chief of the Grand Council of Masons!!

In the dignified and exalted rank which you have done us the honor to maintain, in your generous *Presidency* over the

two hemispheres at the Great East of Berlin, allow me to approach your Royal Presence on a subject of the first moment to ourselves—and on a subject which I would fain hope will not sound unpleasant in the ears of our Great Thrice Puissant and Grand Commander whom I take the liberty to address.

But with what language or sentiment shall I presume to introduce myself to so Splendid and Illustrious a Sovereign, whom we have reason to consider as the best, the bravest, and brightest of mankind? In what manner or in what language shall I address myself to the glorious and renowned Frederic the *Third*, Sovereign of all Sovereigns, and mighty Prince of Princes, whose massive fame has resounded through the universe, as far as winds have blown or waters rolled? The power of words can scarcely convey the distinguished feelings we entertain in your favor, and my humble pen, as conscious of its own inabilities, on such a topic, flows in a gentle and trembling style.

Possessing, however, every respectful and grateful idea which reverence can dictate and brotherly love inspire—pleased above every consideration with your *Sovereign guidance of the Grand Council* of the spacious Hemisphere of *Knights and Princes*—I feel myself called upon, as well from duty as inclination—as well from a desire to advance and propagate the interests of the *Royal Secrets*, as from a conformity to the *regulations* and establishments of the Grand Council—and a compliance with the particular desires and partialities of the Sublime Grand Chapter over which I preside, to acquaint our worthy and much beloved Brethren in Council convened, at the Great East in Berlin, that under the smiles of Heaven and the direction of the Almighty Architect of all things, I, Solomon Bush, Grand Elect, Perfect and Sublime Knight of the East and Prince of Jerusalem, Sovereign Knight of the Sun, and of the Black and White Eagle, *Prince of the Royal Secret* and *Deputy Inspector-General*, and Grand Master over all Lodges, Chapters, and Grand Councils of the Superior Degrees in North America, within the State of Pennsylvania, by Letters Patent from the Sovereign Grand Council of *Princes* under

their hands and seals regularly established by the Sublime Grand Council of *Princes*—to whom we look with unspeakable reverence and adoration—pursuant to the Powers in me vested, have made, created, constituted and established a Sublime Lodge at the Great East of Philadelphia, in Pennsylvania, and North America aforesaid, and on the 20th day of September, 1785, in the presence of a great and numerous assembly of the Fraternity, publicly consecrated the same and set it apart for the purposes of Sublime Masonry forever.

Considering our infant situation, in a young and rising empire, distant and remote as we are from the Great East of Berlin, we feel ourselves peculiarly anxious uniformly to comply with and pay a strict adherence to those salutary rules and wise *regulations*, which have been *framed and concerted for our better government*, and not undeservedly have rose Masonry, Sublime Masonry, to a commanding eminence which may be envied but cannot be overreached.

For this purpose we most humbly solicit your Masonic intercourse and correspondence, to direct us in such a manner that we may not abuse the *old Landmarks*—or deviate from that regard which is so justly due to the will of our Sovereigns, and the measures they lay down for our regulations. As these intercourses are essentially necessary to promote the grand ends of every Masonic Union, so we venture to hope, without presumption, that the great light of Berlin will condescend to shine upon us, and dispel the mists of darkness which, from distance of situation and local circumstances, may otherwise surround us.

Agreeably to *the Rules of the Grand Councils*, I now enclose you a list of the members of our Lodge in the *prescribed* form. We wish the Grand Council every success and prosperity in their illustrious pursuits for the honor and stability of the Royal Secrets—and wishing you, most respected Sovereign, that serene happiness and felicity which should adorn the remainder of your venerable days and gild the future prospects of our welfare, I remain, with the most sincere respect, love, and esteem, your very humble and most affectionate Brother,

SOLOMON BUSH.

The proceedings of the Grand Lodge of Perfection of Pennsylvania, at pages 196, 204, 212, 221, et 228 of the "Mirror and Keystone" for 1854, afford, on the point we are now discussing, some interesting information. The foregoing letter of the Bro.: Bush to King Frederic proves certainly that the latter was considered, to say the least, to be the HEAD of the Rite of Perfection in 1785. Frederic II. is sometimes called the *third*, on account of King *Frederic-William I.* being called by some authors Frederic II.

On the Tableau of the Sublime Grand Lodge of Perfection at Charleston, for 1802, "Moses Michael Hayes, of Boston, Rose †.:, K-H., P. R. S." is borne as an Honorary Member ; but he is not described as a 33d.

If the Body established in Rhode Island, and which continued until 1801, was a Council of the 33d Degree, how could the Members then have "placed themselves under the Grand Consistory of New York," which, if there was any such Body in 1801, was only of the 32d Degree?

The truth is that the note in Oliver's book was taken by him from some apocryphal writer, and inserted without inquiry or examination. All the writers agree that the earliest organized Body of Scottish Masonry in the United States, was a Grand Lodge of Perfection established at Albany by the Bro.: Francken, in 1767. And there never was, at any time, in Rhode Island, a Supreme Council of the 33d Degree, nor did the Bro.: Hayes ever claim to possess any such Degree.

In the 9th "Consideration," *Mr. Foulhouse* refers to the fact that in the treaty of Union of 1834, between the Supreme Councils of France and Brazil, and the United Supreme Council of Hicks at New York, the first of these Bodies, that of France, claims to have been installed and recognized on the 21st of September, 1762 ; as proving that "our 33 Degrees" were known and practised before that date ; and that the Bro.: Hayes founded his Council of the 33d in Rhode Island by virtue of power emanating from the authority that administered them—that is to say from the Count de Clermont.

It is a little surprising that men who profess such a hor-

ror of *forgery* in Masonic documents, and are so hypercritical in regard to the Constitutions of 1786, should so unblushingly repeat a statement which all the world knows to be false, and merely one of those "pious frauds" that have been used so often in Masonry as well as elsewhere.

What would be thought of a *historian*, who, in his zeal to establish a controverted point, should go to unreliable sources, and pick up and repeat, without believing them to be true, the most absurd assertions of interested parties, to sustain the theory of which he was the advocate? The business of the historian is to apply his critical acumen to all that purports to be historical, and by careful scrutiny and weighing of evidence and even of probabilities, to *sift* the mass, and determine what is true and what is false. Even in an argument, one is not at liberty, by the rule of any known code of ethics, to quote and rely upon authorities which he has no reason to believe true.

This pretension of the Supreme Council of France was put forward solely to rebut the claims of the Grand Orient to the ownership of the Ancient and Accepted Rite; and *Mr. Foulhouze* would be one of the first to resist a claim, which, if true, would demonstrate that the Body which made him a 33d, never could have had any title to the Degree or Rite.

The time of the establishment of the Supreme Council of France is as perfectly well known as any other fact in history. It was established by the Bro.: Count DE GRASSE-TILLY; who had been made Sov.: Grand Inspector-General at Charleston, and was appointed by the Supreme Council at that place Sov.: Commander for the Windward and Leeward French Islands of America, and its Representative there, on the 21st of February, 1802, by a Patent, an authentic copy whereof is in the Archives at Charleston; and by which also he was made Deputy Inspector of that Supreme Council *for the two Hemispheres*. Prior to June, 1802, he went to Santo Domingo, and there established a Supreme Council, which on the 21st of February, 1803, consisted of himself, as Sovereign, the Bro.: DE LA HOGUE as Lieutenant, and the Bros.: LOUIS HERO, JEAN LOUIS MICHEL DALET, ARMAND CAIGNET,

ANTOINE BIDEAUD, and PIERRE GERVAIS NICOLAS TOUTAIN. We have the irrefutable evidence of this in the Register of Bro.: BIDEAUD, in our possession. From Santo Domingo he went to France, and there established a Supreme Council on the 22d of September, 1804, by which a Scottish Grand Lodge was established on the 22d of October, 1804.—*Thory*, 1 *Acta Lat.* p. 220, 222.—Clavel, Ragon, and Bésuchet confuse the dates of the establishment of the two Bodies. See *Discourse* of Bro.: *De Haupt* before the Mother-Lodge *St. Alexandre d'Ecosse*, on the 24th of January, 1805.

The pretence of the Supreme Council of France to an older existence first appeared in its proceedings in 1838. Annexed to its proceedings of 24th June of that year is a *tableau*, which contains, among other things, a list of Sov.: Gr.: Insp.: Gen.: and one of Grand Commanders of the Supreme Council of France, “*from its primitive foundation in 1786,*” it says, to 1838; to which this *note* is added: The asterisk* designates the Brethren who founded the Supreme Council of France in 1786, and those who were active members of it, until it became dormant or was extinguished during the Revolution.” These names are . . . Louis Philippe Joseph de Bourbon, Duke of Orleans, Prince of the Blood—better known as Philippe Egalité—who died in 1793 . . . The Marquis de Bercy . . . Taillepie de Bondy—Stanislas, Count de Clermont-Tonnerre . . . d’Amboise, Marquis de Crussol . . . Déodat-Gay-Sylvain-Tancrède, Marquis de Dolomieu . . . J. J. Duval d’Epremenil . . . Count d’Esterno, Ambassador of France to the Court of Berlin . . . Benigne Joseph du Troussel d’Hericourt . . . Chaillon de Joinville . . . Armand Marc, Count de Montmorin . . . Savalette de Langes, and Charles Alexis Count de Genlis, Marquis de Sillery; all of whom are ranked in the *tableau* as Sovereign Grand Inspectors-General.

Nothing whatever is said in support of this pretence. It was put there, without explanation or evidence, to gain authority or credence by time.

It is easy to prove the whole claim to an origin earlier than 1804, to be a mere impudent and baseless pretence; and we proceed to do so.

1st. In 1834 the Supreme Council claims to have existed since the 21st of September, 1762 ; and in 1838 it explicitly reduces its claim, and pretends to have been founded in 1786. As both cannot be true, we are warranted in denying both.

2d. If the Tableau of 1838 states the truth, Taillepiéd de Bondy was a Sov. : Insp. : Gen. : and member of the Supreme Council of the 33d Degree in 1786. Now, in 1812, the Sov. : Chapter *Ecossais*, of the Ancient and Accepted Rite *du Père de Famille*, at Angers, published a discourse by one of its members, and a decree founded upon it, in which it denied the legal existence of *any* Supreme Council in France, averred that there never were but 25 Degrees in the Ancient and Accepted Rite ; and said that the 33d Degree was not known in that Rite ; referring to the Regulations of 1762 as the only law of the Rite, and absolutely denying the authenticity of the Constitutions of 1786. The Charter of this Sov. : Chapter was granted by the *Grand Orient* in November, 1805 ; and it claimed that the Grand Orient had the power over the Rite, *not* by the Concordat of 1804, but by the merger in itself of the old Grand Lodge and the Chapter of Clermont. TAILLEPIÉD DE BONDY *signed these proceedings*. It is unnecessary to say that he *could* not have been a 33d and member of the *Supreme Council* in 1786, and then make such assertions as these.—See the Discourse cited, in 1 *Hermes*, p. 296 ; and statement of the discourse and decree, 1 *Précis Hist.* by Bésuchet, p. 367.

3d. In 1775 and 1776, *Savalette de Langes*, who is also said to have been an original member in 1786 of a Supreme Council of the 33d, was Junior Warden of the Chamber of the Provinces of the Grand Orient ; and he was also one of the Committee who concluded the Treaty of 1776 with the three Scottish Directories, at Lyon, Bordeaux and Strasbourg.—Thory, 2 *Acta Lat.*, p. 207. Now the tale told the Bro. : Dr. Beugnot, only a year or two since, by the Count de *Saint-Laurent*, a member of the Supreme Council of France, was, that some time after the Constitutions of 1786

were made, the Count *d'Esterno*—whose name is signed to them—then Ambassador of France to the Court of Berlin, took a copy of them to France, and there the *Grand Lodge* of France organized itself as the first Supreme Council, with the Duke of Orleans as its first Grand Commander. Savallete de Langes was a member of the Grand Orient, and not of the Grand Lodge ; and so the stories do not agree.

4th. If this historical figment had not been apocryphal, and a mere myth, it would have been used by the Supreme Council of France in its controversies with the Grand Orient as to the *title* to the High Degrees. Now in all those controversies, from 1805 to 1838, it was never mentioned. We have a volume of some 300 pages, consisting of polemical pamphlets by the advocates of the Grand Orient, in which every fact is used which industry could discover ; and every argument which ingenuity could supply ; and nowhere in these, and as little in three volumes of proceedings of the Supreme Council also in our possession, is there one word, except the single tableau which we have mentioned, *hinting* even at such a claim.

5th. The claim to an existence prior to 1804 was formally and expressly *contradicted* by the most distinguished advocates of the Supreme Council, at the very time when, if it had been true, it was the most important to prefer it.

In 1827, when the controversy between the Grand Orient and the Supreme Council of France was at its height, the Count *Muraire*, then Lt. Gr.: Commander, and afterwards Sovereign of the Supreme Council, published a pamphlet, entitled, “ *De l'Indépendance des Rites Maçonniques, ou Réfutation des Prétentions du G.: O.: de France sur le Rite Ecossais Ancien et Accepté.*” At p. 24 of this pamphlet, he said : “ The new organization of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite, in accordance with the Constitutions of 1786, *was unknown in France prior to 1804* : but long before then there had been established at Charleston, in the United States of America, a Sup.: Council of the 33d Degree, which, on the 21st of February, 1802, gave the Count de Grasse-Tilly the power of

initiating Masons to that Degree, of inspecting Free Masonry, Ancient and Modern, and of constituting Lodges, Chapters, Councils and Consistories of the Ancient Rite over the two Hemispheres. The Count de Grasse, so authorized, established a Supreme Council of the 33d Degree in the Island of San Domingo; but soon after, in consequence of the troubles which came upon that Island, he and several illustrious members of his Council took refuge in France, and there united with other Scottish Masons . . . and there, by authority of the Gr.: Insp.: Gen.: of the Sup.: Council of the 33d Degree, which was established on the 22d September, 1804, at Paris," etc., etc.

In 1813 the persons claiming to compose the Supreme Council for *America*, in France, addressed a remonstrance to the Supreme Council of France, in which, among other things, they claimed that *they*, coming from San Domingo, created the Supreme Council, and were the founders in France of the Scottish Rite. The Committee of the Supreme Council of France answered, that many of the remonstrants had never been in San Domingo at all, and had yet to prove that they had received their Degrees from the Supreme Council for America, at a time when it yet met in the country for which it was established; and, as to the creation of the Supreme Council of France, the Committee said: "*That creation is due to the Illustrious Bro.: de Grasse-Tilly alone: the Supreme Council has never separated from him, and independently of his character as Sov.: Gr.: Commander for the French Islands, it has always placed his name at the head of those of its Honorary Members.*" *Recueil des Actes du Sup.: Cons.: de France*, p. 151.

And, as late as 1841, the Ill.: Bro.: Escodeca, 33d, published a pamphlet, entitled, "*Défense du Rite Ecossais Ancien-Accepté, ou Réfutation de la Circulaire du G.: O.: de France, en date du 19 Octobre, 1840,*" in which he particularly denied the allegation of the Grand Orient, that Scottish Masonry as practised by the Supreme Council, was carried by Stephen Morin from France to America, and only brought back again by the Bro.: de Grasse; and in which also he insisted on the validity of the titles of de Grasse, and of the regularity

of the Supreme Council at Charleston: and in the whole argument he does not even *hint* at the existence of a Supreme Council prior to 1804. Indeed, such a position would have been wholly inconsistent with and destructive of his positions.

6th. All the writers concur in fixing the first appearance of the Ancient and Accepted Rite in France, and the first creation of a Supreme Council there, in 1804. So say Clavel,—1 *Hist. Pit.* p. 207, 241 ;—Bésuchet—*Précis Hist.* ;—Thory,—1 *Acta Lat.* p. 220 ;—Chemin Dupontès,—1 *Encyclopédie Maç.* vol. 1, p. 236 ;—Lévêque,—*Aperçu*, p. 87 ;—Bou-bée,—p. 110 to 115 ;—Ragon—*Orthod. Maç.* p. 289 ;—Vidal Fézandié,—*Essai Hist.* p. 169.—So said Bro.: Langlois de Chalangé before the Supreme Council for America, in 1817 ; and so the Supreme Council of America then declared. So said the Count de Grasse himself, in 1818, before his Supreme Council ; and so the Baron de Marguerittes, on the trial of the Bro.: Count de Grasse. And Bro.: Vassal has particularly demonstrated that the Ancient and Accepted Rite in 33 Degrees had no existence anywhere prior to 1802, in his Essay upon the institution of the Scottish Rite, quoted by Bro.: Bésuchet in his *Précis Hist.* vol. 1, pp. 274 to 276.

This pretence of the Supreme Council is therefore unfounded and an impudent fraud upon History ; and therefore the falsehood embodied in the Treaty of 1834 does not prove that “our thirty-three Degrees” were known and practised prior to 1762, nor that the Count of Clermont administered them ; nor that from him power descended to Moses M. Hayes to open a Council of 33ds in Rhode Island—a Council that never existed except in imagination.

The 10th Consideration is : “That the Grand Orient of France, in its quality of heir or successor of all the ancient Scottish Bodies and Powers above named, resisted the pretensions of the speculators who went from America to Paris with what they pretended was a new Rite ; victoriously demonstrated that they carried to France no Rite or Degree which had not been known and practised there before

“1761, and of which it was not the sole and only owner; and
 “was able, by the laudable energy of *the lofty Imperialist In-*
 “*tellec*t^s that then administered it, to assert and establish its
 “rights to the Scottish Rite.”

Mr. Foulhouse is more and more unfortunate the further he goes. The Grand Orient, it is true, claimed to be the heir and successor of the different Bodies that had, previous to 1804, administered the different Rites of Scottish Masonry in France; but that was a claim which she was never able to establish. The discussion of that question would require more space than the limits of this response afford; since it was debated at great length between the two Bodies, the Grand Orient and Supreme Council, for many years. We can only pause here to say, as we have before said about the Grand Lodge, that the Grand Orient *could* not become entitled to administer any Degrees of any Rite, which her members had not legally *received*.

On the 27th December, 1773, the “National Grand Lodge”—the title at that time worn by the Grand Orient—declared that it would thenceforward work in Symbolic Masonry alone; and forbade the Lodges to go beyond the third Degree in their labors. Thory—1 *Acta Lat.* p. 108,—speaking of the Grand Orient, says, under this date: “Suppression of the New National Grand Lodge. . . . Appointment of a Committee to revise the High Degrees. Messrs. Bacon de la Chevallerie, the Count de Stroganoff, and the Baron de Toussaint are appointed the Committee. The Lodges are requested to suspend all labour in the High Degrees, as the Grand Orient itself did.” “It enjoined on the Lodges not to occupy themselves with the High Degrees, and to work only in the first three Symbolic Degrees, as,” it added, “it was itself doing.”—Thory, *Fond. du G.: O.:* p. 44.

In 1781 or 1782, it created within itself a Chamber of the High Degrees, which laboured at a revision of them; and in 1786 reported *four*, Elu, Ecossais, Kt. of the East and Rose Croix. These were adopted by the Grand Orient, to be worked in addition to the three Symbolic Degrees; and it thereupon decreed that no others should be worked in the Lodges or Chapters under its jurisdiction.—Thory, 1 *Acta*

Lat. p. 170.—Lévesque, *Aperçu*, p. 74.—Bésuchet, *Précis Hist.* vol. 1, p. 79.—The seven Degrees thus arranged have since been practised by the Grand Orient, and are known all over the world as the French or Modern Rite. Those who allege that the addition of seven Degrees, four of them entirely new, to the Rite of Perfection, and of another still, as the presiding and governing Degree, or Degree of Administration, did *not* make a new and distinct Rite, will perhaps be kind enough to tell us how the Grand Orient managed to make one, by picking out four old, well known and long worked Degrees, over which other Bodies in France had at the time an *acknowledged* jurisdiction independent of her, and adding them to the four Symbolic Degrees.

Vidal Fézandié says—*Essai, etc.*, by V. F., p. 152:—"It is enough for us to repeat, that the Grand Lodge, which was replaced by the Grand Orient, never *knew* any other than the three first Symbolic Degrees, and that its only jurisdiction was over Blue or Adonhiramite Masonry. So that it was not possible that the higher Degrees, and consequently the Bodies that practised them, could be under its control."

And the Bro.: Bègue-Clavel, in the "*Revue Hist., etc., de la Fr. Maç.* p. 17, in answer to a circular of the Grand Orient of 30th November, 1829, claiming that, "the G.: O.:, and before it the Grand Lodge, to which it succeeded, had practised Scottish Masonry from the time of its introduction into France," said:—"It is a great mistake to assert that the Grand Orient and Grand Lodge of France ever practised Scottish Masonry. The Grand Lodge never recognized any other Degrees than the three Symbolic ones; as its continual quarrels with the Chapter of the High Degrees prove. The Grand Orient at first confined itself to the same Degrees, and did not adopt any others until 1786; and what it did then adopt, was not what is properly called Scottish Masonry, which is composed of 33 Degrees, and is a *reform* that originated at Charleston, in South Carolina, about the commencement of the present century."

The Circular of the Grand Orient itself, of 31st July, 1819—reviewed by Bro.: Chemin Dupontès, in *l'Encyc. Maç.*, vol. 1, p. 318, etc.—admitted that in 1773, the Grand Orient sus-

pended the working of the High Degrees, and that "the hand of time effaced the remembrance of them in France." Consequently the G.: O.: had RENOUNCED them for more than *thirty* years, when the Bro.: de Grasse established the Sup. Council of France. Certainly, in 1786, it expressly rejected all above the 18th. "It was thus," said the Circular, "that the hand of time effaced in France the memory of those Degrees which had gone forth from its bosom, and even that of some that were exclusively French; and that they were brought back thither as *strangers*, AND NONE CLAIMED TITLE TO THEM."—2 *Hermes*, p. 107, etc.

THAT IS THE ADMISSION OF THE GRAND ORIENT ITSELF. After that, what superlative nonsense it is to talk about the Grand Orient having still retained or obtained a *title* to those Degrees, by *transfers*, by purchase or descent, from other Bodies, some of them mere remnants composed of vagabonds: as if Masonic Degrees, the right to administer them, the right to *govern* men and Masons, to demand their allegiance, to make one Body the oblige of their oaths taken to another, could be bought and sold in the market, like a cow or horse. One loses all patience in listening to such arrant stupidities. The right to administer Masonic Degrees is not obtained nor obtainable in that way. The whole idea is a humbug, to which no other Masonic Body than the Grand Orient of France has ever given countenance; and which *it* never succeeded in making a *respectable* humbug.

So matters stood until 1804. A good many of the Lodges under the Grand Orient refused to have anything to do with the four additional Degrees. The Scottish Directories, which by the Treaty of 1776 with the Grand Orient, had the exclusive working and administration of the Reformed Rite, still continued to work. The Mother Lodge of the Philosophic Scottish Rite, the Chapter at Arras, and several other Bodies were also independent. The Count de Grasse appeared, introduced his Rite into Paris, created a Supreme Council, and that created a Scottish Grand Lodge. The Grand Orient, seeing the Rite at once become popular, took the alarm; and Roettiers de Montaleau, Representative of the Grand Master, and the real Chief and most influential

person of the Grand Orient, set on foot negotiations to effect a union of the two Bodies.

The evidence is ample that this union was sought, not by the Supreme Council or any of its members, but by the Bro.: de Montaleau, Grand Venerable of the Grand Orient. We simply refer to these authorities : Bésuchet, a staunch adherent of the Grand Orient, says in his *Précis Hist.*, vol. 1, under the date of 1803, that Roettiers de Montaleau, the Grand Venerable, always solicitous for the peace of the Order, *interposed between these Brethren and the Grand Orient ;*” Thory,—1 *Acta Lat.*, p. 221,—says that the Grand Orient was disquieted, many of its Lodges wishing to join the new organization, and that the Bros.: de Montaleau and Pyron conferred together, to concert measures for uniting the two Bodies ; Lévesque,—*Aperçu*, p. 78,—says, that it was stated in the assembly, when the Concordat was made, that the Bro.: de Montaleau, after having conferred with the Bro.: Pyron, had himself advocated the Act of Union of the two Rites ; Boubée,—Master of a Lodge under the Grand Orient, and a vigorous opponent of the High Degrees—says—*Etudes sur la Maçon.*, p. 113,—that some members of the G.: O.: thought that Scottish Masonry was becoming too firmly established, and that a Union with it would be an act of prudence ; that the subject was introduced into the Grand O.: and the Union forcibly advocated and strongly opposed ; until, after a long discussion, those opposed to it had to yield to the current ; and Vassal, a member of the Grand Orient, and for years the most prominent person in it, *apologizes* (*Essay on the Institution of the Scottish Rite, quoted by Bésuchet, in his Précis Hist.*, vol. 1, pp. 291 to 303) for the anxiety of the Grand Orient, to effect a Union, on the ground that the *Philosophical Degrees* had not for many years been conferred in France ; the works of the G.: O.: had been suspended ; and the disordered condition of its Archives made it impracticable for it to establish its title to rule the Scottish Rite, or to prove that the Rite of de Grasse, with its 33 Degrees, was in substance the same as that of Perfection in 25. So, he says, many officers thought it for the interest of the Order to make concessions in order to effect a fusion.

But let us see *what the Grand Orient itself said, at the time, about* its “resisting the pretensions of the speculators from America,” and “victoriously demonstrating” its “heirship and right of succession” to *all the Ancient Scottish Powers and Bodies.*

The *Etat du Grand Orient*, part 4, of 1804, p. 304, gives a long and apologetic account of the causes that led it to make the Concordat with the Supreme Council. When it made the Treaty with the Scottish Directories, in 1776, it had been pretty sharply censured and irreverentially attacked; and it anticipated severer censure for *yielding* to the Supreme Council; i. e., not for giving up its own claims to the Scottish Degrees, but for *tolerating* them.

“The Columns of the Grand Orient,” it said, “were threatened with a great loss of Members, for so much the more reason, because the Brethren who had the control of the new Rite, and were enlisting proselytes, had secured the concurrence and support of certain Brethren”—*lofty Imperialist Intellectuals*, perhaps—“whose official rank and virtues invested them with great personal consideration.”

So, it said, the Grand Orient first published a list of its Grand Officers; that is, it filled out its lists of Honorary Officers and *Officiers d'Honneur*, with all the great names of the new Empire, in hopes to overpower the Supreme Council with the array. What happened? “It learned,” says the *Etat*, “from the mouths of some among them, that they had also been elected to functions quite as important in another Grand Orient, of a certain *Scottish Rite*.”

“These worthy Brethren,” it says, “as prudent and wise as illustrious, felt the necessity of nipping in the bud a germ of division in the Masonic Order in France. They communicated their views to the Deputies of the Grand Orient, by whom they were readily adopted. Immediately the Grand Orient appointed a Committee, which met with an equal number of Deputies of the Ancient and Accepted Rite.”

“After a severe storm,” it said, “the wise mariner repairs his rigging, puts himself as far as possible in a condition to sail tranquilly, and neglects none of the means that prudence points out, for avoiding the breakers and giving satisfaction to the owners.”

One of the most potent motives that determined it to this course, it said, “was the positive hopes held out to it, and “guaranteed by the Resp.: Bro.: Marshal Kellermann, that “from the present operation would infallibly result a general union with the Grand Orient of France, of all the “Lodges that in the Empire style themselves ‘Grand “Lodge,’ ‘Mother-Lodge,’ or simply ‘Scottish Lodge;’ ‘and “which’—mark, Mr. Bienvenu!—‘are now neither united in “correspondence with the Grand Orient nor with the Orient “of the Ancient and Accepted Rite.’”

The result was the Concordat or Act of Union, signed and sworn to on the 5th of December, 1804; the Scottish Grand Lodge repairing for that purpose to the Hall of the Grand Orient.

This Concordat may be found in the *Recueil des Actes du Suprême Conseil*, as also may the minutes of the meeting at which it was so ratified; and at which the Bro.: de Grasse-Tilly and the Bro.: Roettiers de Montaleau reciprocally took the oath to keep it, between each other’s hands.

This Concordat defines the composition and names and enumerates the Officers of the Grand Orient, and their and its own powers and attributes. It recognizes the Supreme Council as an existing Body, and assumes its continuance as a distinct Body, as being a matter of course, with varied and important powers, and all its inherent undefined functions besides. Whoever wishes to understand the Concordat must study it attentively in all its parts. Every Lodge and Chapter in France was to have a representative, and those representatives constituted the Masonic Diet called the Grand Orient; but there were *also*, 7 first Grand Dignitaries for life, and 148 other Officers, *en exercice*, who, after serving nine years, became Honorary Officers.

The government was composed of a Symbolic General Grand Lodge, and a General Grand Chapter [of the four Degrees of the *Rite Moderne*], each composed of 81 members, serving for different periods, of from 3 to 9 years.

There was also a Grand Council of 27 Officers, with appellate powers.

There was also a Grand Lodge of general administration, composed of 21 members.

The General Grand Chapter issued Letters Capitular, and Briefs for the four High Degrees. An appeal lay from its decisions *to the Grand Council of 27, or to the Sublime Council of the 33d Degree.*

The particular provisions as to the 32d and 33d Degrees were these :

“The Grand Orient of France *possesses, in the General Grand Chapter, the Grand Council of the 32d Degree, and the Sublime Council of the 33d Degree.*

“The prerogatives of the 33d Degree, *besides those that appertain to its functions*”—*i. e.*, besides those *inherent* in it, and which it has *as a Supreme Council*—“are to occupy itself with the highest mystic knowledge, and regulate the works thereof.”

“*It decides all questions involving the point of honor—sur tout ce qui tient au point d'honneur;—it can remove from office a Grand Officer of the Grand Orient of France, upon complaint and accusation, which it alone can entertain, from that one of the Bodies*”—the Symbolic Gr.: Lodge, the Gen.: Gr.: Chapter, and the Gr.: Lodge of Administration—“to which the officer accused belongs, in the Masonic form.”

“*The Supreme Council of the 33d can alone correct or revoke its own decisions.*”

The first 14 Degrees *only* could be conferred in subordinate Chapters : the 15th to the 18th inclusive, only in the General Grand Chapter : *the 33d Degree belongs exclusively to the Sublime Grand Council of that Degree, which alone can confer it.*”

In prescribing the order in which the members should sit, a particular place was assigned those members of the Sublime Council of the 33d Degree, who might not be Dignitaries,—next to the 7 Grand Dignitaries, the Representatives of the Grand Master, and the Grand Administrators.

The Bros.: Roettiers de Montaleau and De Grasse-Tilly, Particular Representatives of the Grand Master, were made such for life, in consideration of their services to the Order.

The Bros.: Marshal Kellermann, De Grasse-Tilly and Pyron, all members of the Scottish Grand Lodge, were made

honorary members of all the Lodges and Chapters of France ; as well as the Bros. : de Montaleau, Challan and Bacon de la Chevalerie, “as first co-operators in the present organization.”

And the Bros. : Lacépède, Hacquet, Godefroi de Latour d’Auvergne, de Trogoff, Thory and Baillache, of the Scottish Gr. : Lodge, were made free affiliates of all the Lodges and Chapters of France.

On the 29th of December, 1804, forty members of the Grand Orient received from the Supreme Council, some the 18th Degree, some the 32d, and some the 33d, and signed the requisite oaths of allegiance, in the Book of Gold of the Bro. : de Grasse ; thus :

“We the undersigned do declare, *that we have gratefully accepted and received* the Eminent Degree of Grand Inspector General of the 33d and last Degree from the Th. : Puissant and Th. : Ill. : Bro. : Alexandre François Auguste de Grasse-Tilly, Grand Commander *ad vitam* for France, President of the Supreme Council of the 33d Degree, the Grand Council being in session.

“We do *solemnly swear, upon our words of honor, and upon all our engagements and oaths, pronounced in the presence of the Grand Architect of the Universe, and to the Grand Council of Sov. : Gr. : Inspectors General of the 33d Degree, TO OBEY THE SAID SUPREME COUNCIL, to cause its decrees to be respected, and to conduct ourselves in the duties of our charge as Sov. : Grand Inspectors General of the 33d Degree, in such manner as to make cherished and respected the Royal and Military Order of Free Masonry, and to conform in all respects to the Letters of Credence that have been granted us.*

“In faith whereof we have, of our own free will and accord, signed the present oath.”—See *l’Encycl. Mag. vol. 1, p. 338. De l’Indépendance des Rites Maçonniques, par le Comte Muraire, p. 31. Extract from the Book of Gold of the Supreme Council, printed in 1817, pp. 5, 6, 7.*

Who took this oath? ROETTIERS DE MONTALEAU, the head of the Grand Orient, who had kept its archives through the Revolution, and to whom a grateful Order offered the Grand

Mastership, which he refused, but accepted the power, with the more modest title of Grand Venerable. Who else? BACON DE LA CHEVALLERIE, CHALLAN, BURARD, the Count DE VALENCE. VASSAL signed a like oath for the 32d Degree, as did *Legerde-Bressè*, *Bressaud*, and *Petricony*, *Gabriac*, *Dusouchet* and *Bernadon*; and thirty-two others, whose names were legible many years after, besides many whose names were not so, signed a like oath for the 18th Degree.

All this was done *twenty-four days after the Concordat was executed*. Did or did not the Supreme Council remain in existence, as the head of the Ancient and Accepted Rite? Did or did not the Grand Orient recognize it as such head?

Remark, also, that while the Concordat makes the Supreme Council an appellate Tribunal, higher than the General Grand Chapter, and to which an appeal lies from that Body; while it secures to it alone the power to confer the 33d Degree, and the exclusive title to it; while it gives its Chapters no power over any Degree above the 14th; and even its General Grand Chapter no power over any above the 18th; while it gives no power to any Body or Officer to revise or correct the decisions of the Supreme Council, but declares that it alone can do so; while it secures to the Grand Council of the 32d the control over the Degrees from the 18th to the 32d; while it continues all the *inherent* powers of the Supreme Council; it adds no member to it, makes no change in it, leaves it permanent and its members to hold for life, and in no way provides how it or the Grand Council of the 32d shall be composed, or vacancies in either filled, or what or who its Officers shall be, or how elected and appointed.

Nobody ever denied that this Concordat was made, or that this oath was taken or signed. Who violated the Concordat?

On the 21st of July, 1805, the Grand Orient enacted a Decretal, by which they professed to *carry out* the Concordat. By it they created a "Grand Directory of Rites," to govern *all* the united Rites, and be composed of as many Sections as there were Rites; each Section to be composed of not less than three, nor more than five members. This Directory was to take cognizance of everything concerning

the dogma of each Rite, and to it the correspondence of all subordinate Bodies was to be addressed, when relating to dogma.

Boubée (*Etudes sur la F. Maç.*, p. 114), tells us concisely in what the difference consisted, that ended in annulling the Concordat. The Grand Orient claimed "that the Union of all the Degrees in one simple sphere of Masonic light, of which IT was the centre, gave IT, the Grand Orient, alone, the right to rule the Scottish Rite, concurrently with the French Rite; and consequently *the sole right* to confer Degrees and grant Charters of Constitution. In other words, its claim was that it could annul the Supreme Council, and merge it in itself, by depriving it of all its powers and functions, and transferring them to a Directory of Rites. The Supreme Council contended that, by the very terms of the Concordat, the Grand Orient had nothing to do with the Degrees beyond the 18th; those alone having ceased to be the property of the Supreme Council; and that the two Bodies, though meeting in unison in the same place, were separately to administer, each its own Degrees.

As the Grand Orient insisted on regarding the whole Scottish Rite as merged in itself, the members of that Rite met, to the number of 81, in General Assembly, at the Hotel of Marshal Kellermann, on the 6th of September, 1805, and decreed that if, by the 15th of that month, the Treaty were not restored to its integrity and completely executed, it would be regarded as null and void. This was notified to the Grand Orient, and Conferences ensued; but no good result followed. On the 16th, at the last Conference, the Grand Orient insisted that the Supreme Council should *not* have jurisdiction to decide questions touching the point of honor, nor the power to remove an Officer of the Grand Orient on charges preferred and proven; nor should it or the Council of the 32d any longer sit in the General Grand Chapter. *Notice Hist. sur l'Origine du Gr.: O.: de France, etc.*, 1835, p. 16.

Consequently, on the 24th of September, the Supreme Council, treating the Concordat as annulled, organized a Grand Consistory of Princes of the 32d Degree, and on the

1st of October it made a decree concerning the exercise of its dogmatic power.

Thory (*Hist. de la Fond. du G.: O.: de France, App. No. 5*, p. 149), sums up the result in a few words, thus: "The Constitution of 1804 was not carried into effect, in consequence of difficulties that then arose; so that now the Supreme Council forms a Body distinct and separate from the Grand Orient of France."

And in his *Acta Latomorum*, vol. 1, p. 225, he states what was in fact the reason why the Concordat was annulled or abandoned. "The Concordat of 1804," he says, "is not executed by the Grand Orient, which refuses to put in operation the new general Constitution of the Order." The Grand Orient really took no step at all to execute the Concordat. Roettiers de Montaleau continued to govern, with the same title of Grand Venerable, and used it in the published statement of April, 1805.

It was agreed at last, Thory says, on the 16th of September, 1805, that the Supreme Council should have an existence independent of and separate from the Grand Orient, which should take no cognizance of the Ancient and Accepted Rite, and grant no Charters to Lodges desiring to adopt that Régime, for anything beyond the 18th Degree; the conferring of the Degrees above that, and the Constitution of Chapters of the higher Degrees, being exclusively reserved to the Supreme Council, or to the Masonic authorities of the Ancient and Accepted Rite, whom it might concern. 1 *Acta Lat.*, p. 227; Kauffmann & Cherpín, *Hist. Phil.*, p. 474, state the same fact.

The Regulations of the Grand Orient, published in 1806, show that this agreement was assented to by it; for they show in the clearest and most formal manner, that it then exercised the powers of administration over no other Bodies than those working the Degrees from Apprentice to Rose-Croix.

Rebold, *Hist. Gén.*, p. 168, also states this agreement; and Ragon, the bitter enemy of the Scottish Rite, says, *Orthod. Maç.*, p. 312, "On the 6th of September, the Grand Orient declares the Concordat broken; and on the 16th of the same

month, the Commissioners of the Grand Orient, and those of the Grand Scottish Lodge signed a convention, declaring the Act of Union annulled in fact and law."

Clavel, *Hist. Pitt.*, p. 245, gives a detailed account of the causes that led to the rupture of the Concordat; and particularly as to the difficulties between the Bro.: Pyron and the Grand Orient; in the course of which that Body disregarded the provision giving the Supreme Council power to remove an Officer; and which ended in striking Bro.: Pyron from the roll of Officers. "These difficulties," Clavel says, "cancelled in fact, if not in law, the Concordat": and he admits that the Grand Orient wholly failed to execute it, its organization undergoing *none* of the changes required by the Treaty. And he states that the majority of the Grand Orient, foreseeing that the pretensions of the Scottish Masons would be an eternal source of discord, were willing to let them retire, if they could so arrange with them that the Masonic peace should not be disturbed. "To this end," he says, "Conferences were had; and on the 16th of September it was by common consent decreed, that the Supreme Council of the 33d Degree should thereafter have an independent existence, with the power of granting Charters and Diplomas for the Degrees above the 18th; and that the Scottish Bodies, working the Degrees below the 19th, should remain under the jurisdiction of the Grand Orient. The Philosophical Scottish Rite, the Rite of Heredom, and in general all the Masonic Bodies that had by virtue of the Concordat been united to the Grand Orient, equally resumed their independence. Only, in order that the Masonic Unity, broken by the new order of things, might as far as possible be re-established, the Prince Cambacérès officially informed the authorities which thus separated from the Grand Orient, that he was disposed to accept the functions of Grand Master over each of them. Most of them agreed to this arrangement, and the Prince thus became the Chief of almost all the systems practised in France."

The Count de Grasse resigned, in his favor, his office of Grand Commander of the Ancient and Accepted Rite, on the 10th of July, 1806, and established, by the side of the Su-

preme Council for France, the skeleton of a Council for the French Possessions in America, in expectation of at some time transporting his Council to those Possessions.

Prince Cambacérès thus became, in a few years, not only Deputy Grand Master of the Grand Orient, and thus its real head,—because Joseph Napoleon, the Grand Master, was never initiated a Mason at all, it is alleged; and if he was, neither he, nor Murat, the other Deputy, ever showed himself in the Grand Orient,—not only Sov.: Commander of the Supreme Council of France, but also Honorary Grand Master of the Rite of Herodom of Kilwinning, sitting at Rouen,—1806;—and of the Mother-Lodge of the Philosophic Rite—1807;—Grand Master of the Primitive Rite—1808; Grand Master of the Rite of Beneficent Kts.: of the Holy City,—*Rectified Regime*,—a title offered him by the Directory of Auvergne; Grand Master of the Regime of the Directory of Septimanie at Montpellier—1809;—and finally, Honorary Grand Master of all the Masonic Bodies that were of any importance and composed of persons of rank.—Bésuchet, 1 *Préc. Hist.*, p. 111, 112; Rebold, p. 168.

Marshal Kellermann was elected President of the Consistory of the 32d.

It will be seen by the number of Independent Bodies which elected the Bro.: Prince Cambacérès their Chief, that the Grand Orient never pretended to possess all power over the Scottish Rite, as “heir and successor of all the Ancient Scottish Bodies and Powers.”

Let any one read over the Concordat of 1804, article by article, the oath of allegiance taken by the members of the Grand Orient who received the Degrees from the Bro.: de Grasse in the presence of the Supreme Council, and the terms of the agreement made when the Concordat was annulled, and which were faithfully observed by both parties, until the fall of the Empire in 1814; and then tell us *where* in all this he finds the *proof* that the Grand Orient “resisted the pretensions” of the founders of the Supreme Council: *when* it formally recognized that Body as the head of the Rite, made a Treaty with it, and accepted the Degrees from it, and after the Concordat was broken, agreed to share them

with it, itself content with the 18 lower Degrees, and leaving its rival the 15 higher ones:—*where* in all this he finds the proof that it “victoriously demonstrated” that De Grasse brought back to France no new Degree,—none not known and practised since before 1761;—none, of which it was not sole and only master:—*where* in all this he finds the proof that the Grand Orient, “by the praiseworthy energy of the lofty Imperialist Intellects that then administered it, knew how to reclaim its *rights* over the Scottish Regime”?

When he has done this, let him tell us *what* lofty Imperialist Intellects then *administered* the Grand Orient; what were their names, and where is the *evidence*, book and page, to show that they ever went near that Body, and especially that they aided to *administer* it; and *more* especially, that they ever took any part in the controversy with the Supreme Council.

And then, whether, after the rupture of the Concordat, there were not found among the active members of the Supreme Council for France, a *few* “lofty Imperialist Intellects,” such as, for example, Prince CAMBACÈRES, Arch-Chancellor of the Empire, Duc DE PARMA, Grand Eagle, Grand Officer of the Legion of Honour, etc.; Timbrune, Comte DE VALENCE, General of Division, member of the Conservative Senate, Officer of the Legion of Honour, Grand Cross of the Order of Saint Henry of Saxony; KELLERMANN, Marshal Duc DE VALMY, member of the Grand Council, Grand Eagle of the Legion of Honour, Commander of the Iron Crown, etc.; the Comte DE LACÉPÈDE, Grand Chancellor and Grand Eagle of the Legion of Honour, Minister of State, and member of the Institute of France; MASSENA, Marshal the Duc DE RIVOLI, Prince d’ESSLING, Grand Eagle and Grand Officer of the Legion of Honour, etc.; CLÉMENT DE RIS, Comte DE MAUNI, Prêteur of the Senate, Commander of the Legion of Honour; PIERRE RIEL, Comte DE BEURNONVILLE, Grand Officer of the Legion of Honour, afterwards Marshal of France; GODEFROI DE LA TOUR D’AUVERGNE, Colonel of the Regiment of that name; Marshal PERIGNON, Comte of the Empire, Grand Eagle and Grand Officer of the Legion of Honour, Grand Dignitary of the Order of the two

Sicilies and Governor of Naples ; BERNARD D'ALES D'ANDUZE, ancient Comte DE VIENNE and Grand Vicar of Arras ; and MURAIRE, Comte of the Empire, Counsellor of State, First President of the Court of Cassation, Grand Officer of the Legion of Honour ?

And if in January, 1811, there were not added, LE PELLETTIER D'AULNAY, Comte of the Empire ; LEFEBVRE, Marshal the Duke DE DANTZICK ; CHASSET, Comte of the Empire ; DE SEGUR, Comte of the Empire, Grand Eagle and Grand Officer of the Legion of Honour ; RAMPON, Comte of the Empire, General of Division, Grand Officer of the Legion of Honour ; FRETEAU DE PENY, Baron of the Empire, Advocate-General of the Imperial Court at Paris, and ROUYER, General of Brigade, one of the Treasurers of the Legion of Honour ?

In 1817, also, the Duc DE SAINT-AIGNAN and OUDINOT, Marshal Duc DE REGGIO, were members of the Supreme Council.

Peace reigned in French Masonry from 1805 until the downfall of the Great Emperor. The compact made in 1805 was observed both by the Grand Orient and Supreme Council. Indeed, Prince Cambacérès enforced the performance of it. In the Constitutions of the Supreme Council, published in January, 1811, and which may be found entire in the *Hist. de la Fond. du G. O. of Thory*, p. 154, and *Recueil des Actes du Sup. Cons.*, p. 105, it was expressly admitted, that up to the 18th Degree, the power resided in the Grand Orient, and the Constitution itself provides for the government of the Degrees above the 18th, only ; and we have already seen that the Grand Orient formally and explicitly ratified and carried out this arrangement. We shall find the same arrangement made in Italy ; and the Grand Orient of France in formal alliance there with a Supreme Council established by the Bro. DE GRASSE.

We have seen that the highest "Imperialist Intellectuals" supported the Banner of the Supreme Council ; and *who* those intellects were. The Imperial government particularly favored *Scottish* Masonry—Clavel, *Hist. Pitt.*, p. 253.—Its autocratic form of administration was more to Napoleon's taste than the simple Democracy of the Blue Lodges, or the emasculated Democracy of the Grand Orient.

But with the fall of Napoleon everything was changed. The Grand Orient, on the 24th June, 1814, at the feast of St. John, knelt to the *rising* Sun; and the orators in their addresses enlarged “on the joy which the whole Masonic Community felt, at seeing at length their *legitimate* king, surrounded by his august family.”—*G.: O.: St. Jean d’Été*, 1814, pp. 3 and 8.

With indecent haste, it declared the Grand Mastership, held by Joseph Bonaparte *for life*, to be vacant. In Paris, the Lodges under the Gr.: Orient, fraternized *enthusiastically* with the English, Russians, Wurtembergers, Saxons, Prussians, Austrians, &c., and initiated many of them; and at Marseilles, the first public procession of Free Masons that ever appeared in France, *carried about the bust of Louis XVIII.*, and *inaugurated it* in their temple; and now, when the great men who had protected the Scottish Rite and the dignity and rights of the Supreme Council, were dead or in exile, the Grand Orient decreed, that by virtue of the Concordats, made in 1773, with the Chapter of Clermont, in 1787 with the General Grand Chapter, and in 1804, with the Scottish Grand Lodge, it *re-took* or rather *continued*, but in a *more special manner*, the exercise of the powers that appertained to it over *all* the Rites. The Supreme Council resisted this usurpation, and an angry polemic and constant quarrel was kept up, until on the 6th day of November, 1841, on the report and recommendation of the Bro.: Desanlis, the Grand Orient formally recognized all the Bodies of *every* Degree, from the 1st to the 32d, created by the Supreme Council, as legal Bodies, and authorized Masons under its own jurisdiction to visit them, and to open their temples to all Brethren under the jurisdiction of the Supreme Council. The war was never again revived.

Such was the course of the Grand Orient, and such the result. *Such* was the mode in which, *not* the “lofty Imperialist Intellects” of the Grand Orient, but the “*meneurs*” of that Body, when it became the sycophant of Louis XVII., and *not before*, “revendicated its *rights* over the Scottish Rite;” when the Supreme Council was almost annihilated by the death or exile of the lofty Imperialist Intellects that

had composed it—when that constellation whose bright particular luminaries we have named, was reduced to a few dismayed and obscured Stars. *Then* the Grand Orient could kneel and crouch at the feet, first of Louis XVIII. and then of Charles X., and beg each for a Prince of the Blood as Grand Master, and be contemptuously repelled. *Then* it could bravely declare the Grand Mastership vacant, while Joseph Napoleon still lived and did not resign. *Then* it could ignore Cambacères and Murat, and fawn upon Macdonald, who always found an excuse for never attending its meetings.

The claim of the Grand Orient to control the Degrees above the 18th, was not urged under the Empire, or by any “Lofty Imperialist Intellects ;” but only after the Restoration, while Paris was occupied by English, Russian, Austrian, Prussian and Cossack, and the Grand Orient sang hymns of joy over the destruction of the Empire and the re-establishment of legitimacy ; and when all meetings of Masons were prohibited by the King of Bavaria, by Victor Emanuel, King of Sardinia, by Cardinal Gonsalvi at Rome, by the Provisional Regency at Milan, and by Ferdinand of Spain, while he re-established the Inquisition ; and while Louis the Eighteenth looked coldly at it, and barely *tolerated* it in France.

The claim was not urged by any “Lofty Imperialist Intellects ;” but by the *small* men, the “*meneurs*” of the Grand Orient, who controlled everything, under the shelter of the great names whose owners deemed Masonry too unimportant for their attention ; by men like *Godefroi de Beaumont*, who having a little while before lauded Napoleon, now lavished fulsome eulogies on the Bourbons, “that august family which, during so many centuries, governed France with as much grandeur as generosity.”—*Kauffmann and Cherpin, Hist. Phil.*, p. 345 ;—at that Feast of the Order of the Grand Orient, on the 24th of June, 1814, which Kauffmann and Cherpin truly term, “a sad monument of that deplorable epoch ;” while they ask pardon of their readers for quoting the adulation of which we ask pardon for quoting but a line. It was urged by men like the other Orators who

distinguished themselves by similar adulation on the same occasion. It was a fitting time for a fitting act; when its subordinates ceasing their labors in despair, and a Lodge at Lyon burning its furniture and altar, could not shame it out of its fawning servility, that it should undertake to plunder of its rights that illustrious Body which the Empire had protected.

And the claim, when urged, was at once resisted, both by the Supreme Council, and by the Mother-Lodge of the Philosophic Rite; and ended, as we have said, in the recognition of the right of the Supreme Council to administer the Scottish Rite, in *all* its Degrees, at least concurrently with the Grand Orient, in 1841.

It only occurs to us to say further, as to this 10th Consideration, that the Grand Orient never “victoriously demonstrated,” nor even *contended*, that the Count de Grasse did not bring to France any Rite *or Degree* not known and practised there before 1761. What the Grand Orient *did* claim, will be best ascertained by inquiring of itself.

In its Circular of 31st July, 1819, prepared for the very purpose of setting out and substantiating its claim to the possession and control of the Ancient and Accepted Rite; and sent to all its subordinates,—and which may be found in *Hermes*, vol. 2, pp. 107 to 120,—it did insist that “in 1804, “some Masons who had returned from America, or fled from “our colonies, brought back to Paris *the Degrees* which the “same Orient had sent thither in 5761, by the intervention “of Bro.: Stephen Morin;” and that those Degrees had not left France; but “the Grand Council established in the “bosom of the National Grand Lodge, after it, the General “Grand Chapter of France, and after 1787, the Metropolitan “Sovereign Chapter of the Grand Orient of France always “possessed them.”

Then, after stating the *reduction* of the number of *working* Degrees, by the Grand Orient, it said: “*It was thus that the “hand of time effaced in France the memory of those Degrees “which had gone forth from its bosom, and even that of some “that were exclusively French; and that they were brought “back thither as strangers, and none claimed title to them.*”

“It is true that the passage of these Degrees from ours to a foreign language, a different classification, new names, *and some additions*, dexterously metamorphosed these Degrees, the aggregate whereof, thus combined, received the supposed title of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite.”

The principal polemic in favor of the Grand Orient was that of Vassal, entitled: “*An Essay upon the Institution of the Scottish Rite*,” extracts from which are quoted by Bro.: Bésuchet, in his *Précis Hist.*, vol. 1, pp. 274 to 276; 291 to 304. He contends that the Grand Lodge of France possessed the Scottish Rite before it was known in the New World; and that the Scottish Rite brought into France by the Bro.: de Grasse, *arbitrarily and abusively remodelled*, is the same as that which the Grand Lodge had possessed for forty years. He sums up as follows:

... “2d. That the Ancient and Accepted Rite is the same as that which the Grand Lodge of France possessed. 3d. That the *important* Degrees of the Ancient and Accepted Rite, are the same that were carried to the United States by Stephen Morin. 4th. THAT MOST OF THE INTERCALATED DEGREES ARE FOREIGN TO SCOTTISH MASONRY, HAVING BEEN BORROWED FROM OTHER RITES.”—He had already said: “*that which furnished the greater number of Degrees was the Templar Rite, the 33d itself being but a Templar Degree.*”

That is what the Grand Orient claimed; *not* that de Grasse carried back to France no Degree that Morin had not taken from there; but that he carried back what was *virtually* the same Rite; because the old Degrees were merely transposed, and eight others added; and that this “superfœtation of Degrees,” most of them not Scottish Masonry, but Templar Degrees, did not make it a new or distinct Rite. This was merely preposterous; and far from “victoriously demonstrating” the identity of the Rite of Perfection and the Ancient and Accepted Rite, the Grand Orient signally failed. To state its proposition is to confute it.

VASSAL explicitly says that the most of the intercalated Degrees are foreign to Scottish Masonry: and thus at once overturns what these Considerations have toiled and labored

to establish, with the much wear and tear of historical conscience—that *all* the Degrees of our present Rite always were a part of Scottish Masonry; and that the Rite, just as it is, was worked by divers Bodies in France, prior to 1761.

The 11th and 12th “Considerations” are: “Considering, that notwithstanding the revolt of some intriguers who separated from its authority in 1806, the Grand Orient none the less remained Master of the Rite in France, and established *several* Supreme Councils, among others that of *Naples*, of which the unfortunate JOACHIM MURAT was the Grand Commander (*Acta Lat.*, vol. 1, p. 254), and proved that, both as Scottish Mason and King, he adhered to the principles of the Grand Orient, whereof he had been the first Grand Warden of Honor in 1807, that is to say, at the very period of this absurd revolt.

“Considering, that in so doing, the Hero-King sanctioned the principle that each State has its Masonic rights as well as its political rights, and that every Sovereign and Independent State, whatever its form of government, should imitate his example, even in presence of the most afflicting desertions.”

Compassion almost compels us to withhold the exposure which the truth of History requires of us in regard to this flourish of trumpets. We have shown that there was no *revolt* at all. The Concordat was not kept by the Grand Orient. It formally violated it; and the Supreme Council, maintained in full life with its original organization, by that Concordat, peacefully separated from the Grand Orient, and resumed its independent action. It never was a *subject* of the Grand Orient, but its *Peer*, and therefore could not *revolt*.

2d. Nor did the Grand Orient remain “Master of the Rite in France.” It was content to remain Master of only the first 18 Degrees of it. It conceded the mastery over the residue, to the Supreme Council, by the Concordat; and it conceded it again, by the agreement of September, 1805, when the Concordat was rescinded.

3d. *Mr. Foulhouse* cannot even be persuaded to give a date correctly. The Concordat was finally rescinded, and the new arrangement made, on the 16th of September, 1805; not in 1806, and still less in 1807. In 1806 and 1807 the two Bodies were entirely at peace.

4th. "Some intriguers" did not "separate from the Grand Orient." Eighty-one members of the Scottish Grand Lodge determined that the Concordat should be either carried out or rescinded; and among them were such men as Kellermann, the Count de Valence, Muraire and Latour d'Auvergne, whom it is childish folly to term "intriguers."

5th. Though Murat was named first Grand Warden of Honour of the Grand Orient, in 1807, as he has been named Grand Conservator-General in 1804, he never was in the Grand Orient in his life.—*Clavel*, p. 243.

6th. The single fact that Prince Cambacérès, Deputy Grand Master, and real head of the Grand Orient, accepted and retained the office of Grand Commander of the Supreme Council, proves what a reckless disregard of historical truth, as well as of good sense, is exhibited in talking about "intriguers" and a "revolt."

7th. Nor did the Grand Orient establish "several Supreme Councils," at *any* time, nor any at all, we think, prior to 1815, *if ever*. How could it establish Supreme Councils, when it administered no Degrees above the 18th?

In 1805, the Bro.: de Grasse-Tilly, then Grand Commander of the Supreme Council of France, conferred power on a Bro.: *Vidal* and other Scottish Masons to institute a Supreme Council at *Milan*. That Body was established in the same year and put itself at the head of Italian Masonry. Prince Eugène, a "Lofty Imperialist Intellect," became, soon after, its Grand Commander.—*Clavel, Hist. Pitt.*, p. 251.

Not only was this *Supreme Council* thus established, on the 5th of March, 1805, but on the 20th of June the *Grand Orient* of Italy was established, under the Regime of the Ancient

and Accepted Rite, at Milan, by the same *Supreme Council* of the 33d Degree for Italy. And moreover, there being at Naples a Grand Orient called that of the Military Division of the Kingdom of Italy, of which Gen. *Lecchi* was Grand Master, and M. Balathier, Deputy Gr.: Master, it united itself with the Grand Orient of Milan on the 22d of June, and Prince Eugène accepted the dignity of Grand Master of the Italian Lodges, and that of Sovereign Grand Commander of the *Supreme Council* of the 33d Degree. (*Thory*, 1 *Acta Lat.*, p. 228–9.) And on the 12th July, 1808, the Grand Orient of France affiliated with and entered into correspondence with this identical Grand Orient of Italy, thus created by its rival. —*Id.*, p. 237.

On the 11th of June, 1809, a *Supreme Council* of the 33d Degree was established at *Naples*. “His Majesty Prince Joachim, Grand Duke of Berg, having been proclaimed King of Naples on the 1st of August, 1808, consents to the establishment of a Grand Orient for his Kingdom, and condescends to accept the title of Sov.: Grand Commander of the Sup.: Council of the 33d Degree at Naples.”—*Id.*, p. 254; which is the authority referred to by *Mr. Foulhouze*, and does not prove what he says.

For *Thory* does *not* tell us that the Grand Orient of France established this *Supreme Council* at Naples. He does not say by *what* Power it was done. Was it then by the Grand Orient? Let us hear *CLAVEL*. “In 1809, the *Supreme Council of Italy, at Milan*, installed a *Supreme Council* at Naples, where there was already a Grand Orient with Joseph Napoleon for Grand Master.”—*Hist. Pitt.*, p. 251.

So that it was *not* the Grand Orient of France, but the *Supreme Council of France*, which derived its Powers from Charleston, that established the *Supreme Council* at Naples. And between this *Supreme Council* so established, and the Grand Orient of Naples, a Concordat was made on the 3d of May, 1811 (*Thory*, 1 *Acta Lat.*, p. 250), by which the Grand Orient agreed to confine itself to governing and constituting Lodges and Chapters up to the 18th Degree, leaving the Higher Degrees to be administered exclusively by the *Supreme Council*. Murat accepted the *Supreme Com-*

mand of *both* Bodies, just as Cambacérès had done in France.

In the Manifesto of the Count de Grasse, dated 18th of August, 1818, creating a new Supreme Council, he styled himself "Creator of the Supreme Councils in the Kingdoms of France, Italy, NAPLES, Spain, the Low Countries, etc., etc., etc." Thory simply tells us that a Supreme Council was established at Naples, without informing us by whom: but even in Thory there is something more. For example, at p. 250, that on the 3d of May, 1811, a Concordat was effected between the Supreme Council of the 33d Degree at Naples and the Grand Orient of that Kingdom, relative to the attributions of each; by which it was arranged that the Grand Orient should govern and constitute Lodges and Chapters to the 18th Degree inclusive, and the Supreme Council administer the Ancient Rite for the Superior Degrees. This might have led one to suspect that the Supreme Council was created by some other power than the Grand Orient of France. The Grand Orient of Naples was installed on the 24th of June, 1809, with King Joachim Murat as Grand Master. Thory, 1 *Acta Lat.*, p. 243-4:—and in October, 1812, he accepted the office of Sov.: Grand Commander of the Supreme Council.—*Id.*, p. 254.

We do not particularly see how the "Hero-King," in accepting this office, sanctioned the principle suggested by *Mr. Foulhouze*. The Supreme Council at Naples was created in strict conformity to the Constitutions of 1786, which provided that each Kingdom in Europe should have one. For his action to have been a precedent for that of *Mr. Foulhouze*, he must have established a Supreme Council for his realm of Naples, by a simple act of his own royal authority, without allowing any Supreme Council of any other country to interfere.

Did the "Hero-King," in accepting the office of Sovereign Grand Commander of a Supreme Council created by that at Milan, which was created by de Grasse under his powers from Charleston (who said, in 1818, "I received in the other world the Masonic Degrees, powers, rights, and dignities which I possess"),—did the Hero-King, by that act, "adhere

to the principles of the Grand Orient, both as Scottish Mason and King?" And did he "sanction the principle" that "every Sovereign and Independent State ought to imitate his example?" Or did he thereby acknowledge the supremacy of Charleston, and so add another to the "painful defections" of which the 12th "Consideration" speaks?

As to *other* Supreme Councils, the Bro.: de Grasse-Tilly established one at Madrid, in Spain, on the 4th of July, 1811 (Thory, 1 *Acta Lat.*, p. 250); where the first Lodge of the Rite had been inaugurated in 1809, by the same authority; and the Grand Consistory in 1810.—Clavel, *Hist. Pitt.*, p. 251.

In Belgium, Gen. Rouyer, a member of the Old Supreme Council of France, established a Supreme Council on the 15th of January, 1817; and on the 1st of April in the same year, the Count de Grasse, Sov.: Gr.: Commander of the Sup.: Council for America, just then revived, established a second. The two were united on the 16th of December of the same year.—Clavel, *Hist. Pitt.*, p. 252.

The Supreme Council of Ireland was established by that at Charleston:—Clavel, *Hist. Pitt.*, p. 253;—and yet *Le Globe*, vol. 4, p. 224, said in 1842: "Le Grand Orient qui entretient avec le Suprême Conseil d'Irlande *la correspondance la plus active, et les relations les plus intimes, vient de recevoir de cette puissance Maçonnique des communications intéressantes, etc.* :—*the Grand Orient, which maintains the most active correspondence, and the most intimate relations, with the Supreme Council of Ireland, has just received from that Masonic Power interesting communications, etc.*"

Meanwhile, we hope that the Grand Orient of France will not consider itself entirely ruined and lost beyond all redemption, because in 1808 it *affiliated with the Grand Orient of Italy*, created by the Supreme Council of Italy, which itself was created by the Bro.: de Grasse-Tilly; and because it has always maintained amicable relations with the Supreme Council of Ireland: and that no one will treat the memory of the "Hero-King" as the Kamschatkans do their idols when storms are prolonged, because he recognized the

power of the Supreme Council at Charleston to administer the Scottish Rite, and create other Supreme Councils ; and consented to be the head of one created by its agent.—1 *Acta Lat.*, p. 237.

To the 13th Consideration, which undertakes to prove the Constitutions of 1786 a forgery, we have only to say : “ If they are, what then ? ” Except as a mere matter of curiosity, the question is not worth examination. If we *knew* them to be genuine, we should not regard them as binding on us because Frederic sanctioned them. He had no power to make laws for all the Scottish Masons in the world. Masonic laws are not binding on us because such and such a person made them ; but, if at all, because when we became a Mason, or received a Degree, we *accepted* them as the law of the Rite or Degree, and swore to observe them. We shall not just now delve into antiquity to see how many patents and documents are forged, or how many legends are fables.

The true question is this : The Supreme Council at Charleston had always claimed, and part of the time, for fifty and more years, exercised, jurisdiction over Louisiana. No *foreign* Masonic Power contested that jurisdiction with her. The only Body in *Louisiana* that contested it, deliberately determined that the claim of Charleston was valid, and formally surrendered up its Powers and merged in the Supreme Council at Charleston. After that a regular Consistory of the 32d occupied Louisiana, under that Supreme Council. *James Foulhouze*, an Inspector-General made by the Grand Orient of France, a power in amity and alliance with the Supreme Council at Charleston, with one or two other isolated 33ds, determined to make more 33ds and erect a new Supreme Council in this *occupied* jurisdiction. The Constitutions out of the question, this is contrary to Masonic law, because contrary to Masonic peace. The whole Scoto-Masonic Fraternity of Louisiana have not selected *him* to represent them. By what commission does *he* pretend to make a Supreme Council *for the State*,—he and a handful of discontented in New Orleans, who had either resigned their membership in, or been stricken from the rolls of the ex-Supreme Council ? If *he* can do it, every *other* Inspector in

Louisiana can do the same, and there may be forty Supreme Councils instead of one—one in every Parish.

As to the Constitutions of 1786, we do not know nor care when or by whom they were framed. They are not on any of the Registers at Charleston ; where, if they had been made *there*, they would have been. We imagine they were made at Geneva or in France. [We are *now* satisfied, in 1872, that they *were* made at Berlin, at the time of their date, and approved by Frederic.] Wherever made, the Supreme Councils of America and France accepted them, and we have sworn to observe them. We do not imagine that they cannot be changed and modified in many respects, and we do not deny, but on the contrary claim, that in some respects, as in regard to the number of Supreme Councils in the United States, and to the number of members in each, they may be changed. North America may at some time have forty Republics or Kingdoms in it. Those changes, however, must be made by the lawful governing Bodies. The only other power of change is the revolutionary one ; and that remedy is only justifiable when oppression and denial of a clear right or of a measure demanded by the vital interests of the fraternity require its application. The Scottish Masons of Louisiana might, under certain circumstances, we admit, establish a Supreme Council ; but they will only be justifiable in doing so in an extreme case, and when, in their own demand for it, they approach unanimity. It is the right of *revolution*, better *understood* than *defined*. No such case exists at present.

With the notions that *Mr. Foulhouse* entertains, the Constitutions of 1786 being a forgery, and, therefore, mere nullities—things *that never were*,—what business has he with the title of “*Sovereign Grand Inspector-General of the 33d and last Degree*,” which they alone create ? What business has he with a *Supreme Council of the 33d Degree* ? If they did not warrant the establishment at Charleston of the *first* Supreme Council, and if, because *they* were a forgery, *that* was null, what gives *his* Council vitality ?

What *is* his Rite ? Those Constitutions create *the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite*. They *alone* do it. He first

called his rickety bantling by that name ; then the "Rite of Perfection," and now it has got back to "The Ancient Scottish Rite." If he *will* have a Rite in 33 Degrees, why does he not fall back on the Primeval Rite, produce its Constitutions, and call and proclaim himself, "Commander of the Interior" ? With his notions about the possession of Degrees, he is quite as much entitled to wear one title of Masonic nobility as another. Why insist on coming among the Scottish Masons of the United States, who recognize these Constitutions as their law ? Why take our titles and jewels, usurp our authority, wear the very titles and jewels created and prescribed by these Constitutions, and keep crying out that they are forged ? One claiming to be possessed of a particular title of nobility would present himself in a fine attitude, if he were to assert that the original patent which conferred on his ancestor the title, was forged ; *and still adhere to the title*. If the Constitutions of 1786 are not binding on you, why do you adopt all their provisions which suit your convenience ? If no legal and sufficient authority, as you assert, ever created a rank higher than Prince of the Royal Secret, why do you claim such rank ? We, and all the other Supreme Councils in the world, are consistent. We do not care *who* made the Constitutions. Whoever made them,—Frederic or Pyron, de Grasse, or some Scrivener or Monk at Geneva,—he was merely the draughtsman. Those who have gone before us *accepted* them, and *made* them the law of the Rite. We, in our turn, have accepted them ; and so accepting them, we feel entitled to wear the insignia which they prescribe, to exercise the powers *for life*, and to claim the title which they create. *You*, repudiating the Constitutions and clinging to the powers and title, are more inconsistent and irrational than an old man in his dotage.

Somebody, in the "Delta Maçonique," has imagined that he could triumphantly settle this question, by asking, "if a man were, under a forged patent, to sell us the right of making a machine ; and if without paying the price, we should make the machine, could he compel us to pay, or prevent us from using it ; though we should prove, first, that

his patent was forged, and second, that the machine was invented before he was born?"

That is something *like* an argument, at any rate. It is not fair nor profound, but it is ingenious. It deserves an answer; and it shall have one.

The comparison of the Constitutions of 1786 to a patent under the patent-laws, will not hold, for the most conclusive of all reasons. It assumes the whole question. A forged patent is like a counterfeit note. It is a mere nullity. No act of any Body can give it vitality. It is mere blank paper. Now the position which this lawyer was attempting to answer, was that the Constitutions, even if forged, became the law by the acceptance and adoption thereof by the first Body of the Rite. In order to compare them to a patent under the patent-laws, he had, first of all, to assume that they were absolutely void, and could not become the law. That was assuming the whole question.

A patent is the act of the government, or nothing. No second party can give it force. If you forge the signatures and seal to a patent, you forge that whereon its whole validity depends. But the validity and effect of these Constitutions did *not* depend on their emanating from Frederic. On the contrary, he had no power to make any such laws. Their force and effect as law, depended on their adoption as such by the first Body of the Rite. The analogy therefore does not hold.

It does not hold in another respect. A machine, when made, is the product of labor and skill applied to the raw material. The patent does not make it, create it, or enable you to make it. It, on the contrary, simply *restrains* you from making it, unless you first pay the patentee a certain sum. It is in the nature of an injunction. If it is forged, the result is simply that there never was any prohibition. You do not hold your right to the machine, *under* the patent, at all, even when it is valid. A Sovereign G.: Inspector-General *does* hold his title as such and rank as such, under these Constitutions, or not at all. If they are not the law of the Rite—not, if they are forged; for though forged, they may have otherwise become the law—if they are not the

fundamental law of the Rite—if *any* provision in them is null, all is null, and the title and rank fall with it. They are not like a forged patent-right, which *restrains*, but like a patent of nobility, which *creates* and *enables*. Destroy the creator, you annihilate the creature. Not so with a forged patent-right, and the machine made in violation of its prohibition. The patent, forged or valid, did not make the machine, nor confer the right to make it.

It needs no grant or right to make a machine. If it did, and the patent were forged, then, as that, *being* forged, could give no right, the maker had *no* right from any source to make it. The right is a natural right, not lying in grant. But a right to confer a Masonic Degree does lie in grant, unless you have yourself invented it. That right is given, if at all, by the law governing, and enacted by, the Body from which you received the Degree. If you prove this law to be null for forgery, there is nothing to give you a right to confer the Degree. Your obligation of secrecy becomes absolute. No law defines now how you are to confer the Degree and promulgate the Rite.

Under whatever law you receive a Degree, that law binds you forever, until the law-making power releases you by changing the law. For you to tell that power that the law was a forgery, which it was not bound to adopt or consent to be governed by, would be a legitimate argument to urge why *it* should repeal or repudiate it, but gives *you* no right to refuse obedience. The first Supreme Council had a right to adopt a law purporting to have been made by Frederic, even if they knew that he never saw it. The forgery was immaterial, when they approved and adopted the law. And even if they themselves did the act, thinking the name of Frederic would add authority to what they were themselves enacting, still, they had themselves made the Rite, and the law of the Rite, and that law, whatever their notion about it was, derived its force from them; for if Frederic never made any law at all, they had the right to enact the provisions to which his name is affixed; and whether they accepted them as his, or enacted them themselves, with or without his name, in either case they were

their act, and from them alone received vitality and validity.

Mr. Foulhouze has made no machine which a forged patent prohibited him from making until he should have paid the patentee a certain sum. Is a Degree, the 33d, for example, like a machine, the product of human labor and skill applied to wood and iron? Not more than *law*, the law of a Rite, is like a patent right. What is involved in the word "Degree" in Masonry? What does the 33d Degree *give*? It gives certain knowledge, the knowledge of certain secrets, of certain words and signs, by which one may obtain assistance and enforce obedience. It gives power, substantial power; and it gives title and rank. That is a Degree. Now the question is whether a man can take and hold *that*, and refuse to obey the law which from the beginning has defined the conditions on which alone that knowledge could be imparted, has imposed the limitations on the exercise of that power, and defined its extent and the mode of its exercise; and has declared for what offences that rank and that title shall be forfeited.

If one refuses to be governed by the law, he has obtained the knowledge under false pretences, has no right to exercise the power, has no right to claim the rank or wear the title. A Masonic Degree and the law of the Degree are inseparable; and after fifty years it is too late to inquire into the origin of the law. It is folly to talk about machines and patent-rights. There is no analogy in the comparison. And even at the beginning, suppose one made a 33d by the Supreme Council at Charleston, had gone to it and said: "This law that you have adopted and promulgated as the organic law, was never enacted by Frederic: I am ready to prove it," and they had answered, "we know that: but it is a good law, and if necessary we should re-enact it. It was accepted by us as the law, when we fixed the number of members of our Council at nine, in accordance with its provisions. Under them we hold for life and fill our own vacancies. By them, and them alone, *you* have your prerogatives, your rank, title, powers. Without them you are nothing, and your rank and title are thin air. They are our

Charter. What matter whence they came? If we tell you that *we* framed them, and appended the name of Frederic, what then? Does that lessen their force? Will you say that you would not have accepted them as the law, if you had not supposed Frederic to be the author? You did not seek to know. You swore to obey our laws, without knowing what they were. You swore to obey those we shall hereafter enact. How will you avoid obedience to these? Frederic *could not enact* them. He had no power. It is we alone who give them validity and the effect of law. Our adoption of them is their enactment." What answer would he make? Suppose he were to say, "I will use the machine, because your patent-right was forged?"

The 14th "Consideration" holds "that the Grand Orient of France cannot recognize as its equal, and still less as its author, the Supreme Council of France, without contradicting its glorious past, without abjuring its own origin, without casting to the winds its own rights, without failing in its duty to those Masonic Bodies that have confided in its honor and uniformly supported its cause."

And the 15th expresses the decided opinion, that in case those who now govern the Grand Orient should consent to commit an act that would make the heroes of the first French Empire *shudder* in their tombs; they, says *Mr. Foulhouze*, "who fought victoriously for the principle that we sustain; they and King Murat who so nobly maintained them;" why, in that case, Messrs. *Foulhouze* and Company would have nothing left them to do, but "to be scandalized and groan."

While *Mr. Foulhouze* is preparing to disturb in their graves, and set to shuddering there, the heroes of the first French Empire, will he be kind enough to leave alone and quiet the Hero-King Murat, on the ground that as to him he made a small mistake, and that probably, having in his lifetime fully recognized the Supreme Council of France, he would not shudder at all, even if he *were* waked up? Perhaps, too, he will pass by Kellermann, and Cambacérés, and de Valence, and Massena, Lefebvre, de Segur, Pérignon, Beurnonville, Rampon, La Tour d'Auvergne, Oudinot—in fact, there is no knowing *whom* it would be safe to wake.

If the recognition by the Grand Orient of France of the Supreme Council of France as its equal, could produce such a commotion, the harm was done long ago. It recognized it as such in the Concordat of 1804. It recognized it as such a dozen times between 1821 and 1841, by treating with it as an equal, and attempting to effect a union with it: and finally, when on the 6th of November, 1841, it adopted this single Resolution: "The Bodies under the jurisdiction of the Grand Orient of France may receive as visitors the *Brethren* of the Bodies under the Supreme Council. Masons under the jurisdiction of the Grand Orient of France may equally visit the Bodies under the Supreme Council."—*Le Globe*, vol. 3, p. 427 :—and when on the 24th and 27th of December, 1841—*Le Globe*, vol. 4, pp. 37 to 44, 134 to 141,—the two Bodies mutually received each other: when, "a few days after the Scottish Acacia had covered with the pride of its branches the members of the Grand Orient," who came into the Temple of the Supreme Council to visit it, headed by the Bro. Desanlis, President of the Chamber of the Supreme Council of Rites,—a few days after that, we say, the Grand Orient received with the honors due an equal, and with a perfectly *fraternal* welcome, the Supreme Council of France, in the persons of its most distinguished members, the Duc Decazes, the Comte de Fernig, Viennet, Philippe Dupin, Baron Petit, Baron Saint Clair, General Comte Dutailis, Jules Barbier, de Montlouis and others; when the French and Scottish double battery resounded, and the banners of the two Bodies flew side by side, and not one *in advance* of the other. "The Heroes of the first French Empire" remained perfectly quiet in their graves, notwithstanding.

Whatever were the original rights of the Grand Orient of France to the administration of the Ancient and Accepted Rite, Time, the Great Arbitrer, has settled the question between it and the Supreme Council. Each has exercised the power for half a century; and the interests of those, the Masonic people, who work under each, require that each be held lawfully possessed of the power, by prescription. They are, as to the Scottish Rite, Peers, each Sovereign. The

Masonic World holds them so, and they must hold each other so, even if all the dead of France should "shudder in their graves."

The 16th "Consideration" is :

"That it is a matter of public notoriety that the Supreme Council at Charleston has, until of late, affected to hold no correspondence with the Supreme Council of the Grand Orient, and has invariably sustained the claims of the Supreme Council of France, which, it says, is its creature (Albert Pike's lecture of February, 1858, before the Grand Lodge of Louisiana, p. 59, *et seq.*); that that Supreme Council at Charleston cannot, *consequently*, now seek to obtain that correspondence without becoming guilty of an odious duplicity; that through its avowed champion in Louisiana, Mr. Albert Pike, it has again lately bitterly criticised the opposition of the Grand Orient to the Supreme Council of France and accused said Grand Orient to be as ridiculous as impertinent in its pretensions (*Ibid.*), and that at the very moment that diatribe against the Grand Orient was circulated in all the parts of the American Union, the trustees of the Supreme Council at Charleston, in Louisiana, were, through their agent at Paris, professing a great devotion to the Grand Orient, and preparing themselves, according to circumstances, either to *damn* the Grand Orient and our Supreme Council, or to extol the former and take advantage against us of his correspondence with it."

It is *not* "a matter of public notoriety, that the Supreme Council at Charleston has until of late affected to hold no correspondence with the Supreme Council of the Grand Orient, and *invariably* sustained the pretensions of the Supreme Council of France, which it claims to be its creature."

In 1834, the Supreme Council of France entered into a Treaty of Alliance with the irregular Hicks "United Supreme Council for the Western Hemisphere," at New York, the creation of Joseph Cerneau and the myrionomous Comte de Saint Laurent; and maintained a regular correspondence with it, or rather recognized the Comte de Saint Laurent as its Representative for many years. It thus placed itself in

hostility with the Supreme Council at Charleston, by becoming the Ally of a Power denounced by Charleston as spurious and irregular. We have three volumes of the proceedings of the Sup.: Council of France from 1817 to 1843, and we find no mention, on the tableaux or at the banquets, of any allied Supreme Council in the United States, or any Representative from any, until, after the Treaty of 1834, the Comte de Saint Laurent appears as Representative from the Hicks-St. Laurent United Council at New York. *La Revue Hist., etc., de la Fr. Maç.*, in 1832, p. 149, says that, on the proposition of St. Laurent, that Council broke the affiliation which united it to the Grand Orient, and made a Concordat with the Supreme Council of France, appointing Gen. Lafayette its Representative. On the Tableau of March, 1842, Saint Laurent still stood as its accredited Representative; so he did in January, 1851; and he may, for aught that we know, stand so yet.*

On the other hand, at the Feast of the Order of the Grand Orient, in June, 1839, the health of "the Supreme Councils of Grand Inspectors-General, 33d and last Degree, of New York"—the *Gourgas* Council, created by that at Charleston—"of Charleston, and of Dublin" was drunk; as of Bodies "*avec lesquels le Grand Orient de France est en relation.*"—*Le Globe*, vol. 1, p. 268; and the Bro.: *de Tournay* responded for them.—*Id.*, 269. The same thing took place at the Feast of the Order of the Grand Orient, in June, 1840—*Le Globe*, vol. 2, p. 289; and at that of June, 1841—*Le Globe*, vol. 3, p. 449. And while, on the 24th of December, 1841, at the Feast of the Order of the *Supreme Council*, the health of the *United* Supreme Council was drunk, and responded to by the Comte de Saint Laurent—*Le Globe*, vol. 4, p. 13—three days afterwards, at the *Fête de l'Ordre of the Grand Orient*, the health of the foreign Bodies *en relations d'amitié* with the G.: Orient being drunk, the Bro.: *de Tournay*, *garant d'amitié* for them 'near the Grand Orient, responded for the Supreme Councils of Charleston and New

* He was a member of the Supreme Council of France, until he died, not long before 1860.

York, and expressed their sentiments of amity and fraternity for the Grand Orient:—*Le Globe*, vol. 4, p. 42; and he again “received the testimonials of amity” of those Councils at the *Fête de l’Ordre of the Grand Orient*, in June, 1842—*Id.*, p. 233.

As early as the 28th of January, 1827, the Supreme Council at Charleston addressed a letter to the Supreme Council in the bosom of the Grand Orient of France. If *Mr. Foulhouze* is curious to see it, he may find it in *vol. 1*, at *page 338*, of the *Précis Historique* of the Bro.: *Bésuchet*. In it the Supreme Council at Charleston expressed its regret at the vexatious circumstances, beyond its control, that had for so long a time deprived it of a regular correspondence with the Grand Orient; and sought a renewal and continuance of that correspondence.

We are not aware that the Supreme Council at Charleston ever undertook to sustain, by argument or otherwise, the claims of either the Grand Orient or the Supreme Council of France. We do not think it ever intervened in that polemic. What is evident, is that since 1829, at least, its relations have been with the Grand Orient, and that it has *never* maintained any with the Supreme Council of France, since its revival in 1821. It was itself inactive for a long time, maintaining its organization, to be sure, and administering the Rite at home, but very indolently, and not keeping up its correspondence with foreign Bodies; and it never took the trouble to examine into the questions discussed between the Grand Orient and Supreme Council; and when it did take sides, it did so simply by allying itself with the Grand Orient.

The Supreme Council at Charleston, we presume, adopts the doctrine that whatever may originally have been the merits of the question between the Grand Orient and Supreme Council of France, it has been settled by time. Each has been engaged, the one for fifty-four and the other for forty-three years, in conferring the High Degrees and creating Inspectors-General. It is impossible, after such a lapse of time, to deny the legality of the acts of either. That legality rests on the same foundation as all other prescriptions; and each must be regarded as a legal governing

Body of the Ancient and Accepted Rite. They have been compelled so to acknowledge each other : and the Supreme Council at Charleston will consider itself not at all precluded by its alliance with the Grand Orient, from contracting a like alliance with the Supreme Council of France. That, at any rate, is *our* view of Masonic law ; and in it we hope our Supreme Council will concur.

Mr. Foulhouze tells us that "the Rite" is this, and the Rite is that. He tells others, that they have no idea of its principles, but are "wandering amidst a mass of Charlestonian liturgies and recently manufactured Rituals ;" as if he alone had the genuine Rituals, and were the great High Priest of the Rite ;—*he*, made a 33d in 1845 by that Grand Orient of France which, in 1841, had, *by the official report of its Librarian*, only 113 Cahiers of different Degrees, in all the five Rites which it pretended to administer ; "forming together *nine* incomplete collections, and those only imperfect copies of originals that had disappeared ; and for which there existed no archetype to which one could recur in case of mistake or difficulty ;" "there being Rites admitted and recognized by the Grand Orient, for the Cahiers whereof one would search in vain : " and it appearing in the discussion that ensued, *that there were no Rituals AT ALL* of the Rite of *Kilwinning* and the *Rectified Regime*, in the Archives ; and that a part of the *Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite* was wanting :—*Le Globe*, vol. 3, pp. 102 to 105 ;—*he*—made by that Grand Orient, in 1845, which in 1840 could supply the Council of *Kadosh* of *la Clément Amitié* at Paris, with *twelve* Cahiers only, and delivered no more to any of its subordinates ; *eight* of which related exclusively to the Degree of *Kadosh*, *three* exclusively to the Grand Knight of the Sun, numbered in them as the 29th Degree, and *one* was the part of Grand Introducer to the Degree of *Kadosh* ; in which were found also some words relating to the admission to the Prince of Libanus, 22d Degree ; and could furnish *not one word* as to the 19th, 20th, 21st, 23d, 24th, 25th, 26th, 27th and 28th Degrees.—*Le Globe*, vol. 3, p. 88.

CHEMIN DUPONTÉS of the Lodge *Isis-Monthyon*.—*Cours pratique de la Franc-Maçonnerie*, p. 289,—says, speaking of the

Grand Orient: "Subsequently charging itself with the Administration of the whole of Ecossism, it preserved all the Degrees; but it made notable changes in the *Cahiers*, particularly in the Higher Degrees, the 30th among others, which has been surnamed *Philosophical*, to distinguish it from other forms of the Degree that are contrary, some to the spirit of our age, and some to Masonry itself. That is what we call Scottish Masonry Frenchified" (*l'Ecossisme francisé*), "in contradiction to that which we term in this course *genuine* Scottish Masonry, as being the *Primitive Rite*, itself the child of a medley of old Degrees that may be counted by hundreds. The Grand Orient was right in modifying the old Scottish Masonry; but those to whom it entrusted that work, did it with too little care; for, as to most of the High Degrees, they cut away largely with the scissors, without putting anything in the place of what they cut out."

What does Des Etangs say of the Rituals? He says (*La Maç.: rendue à ses vrais principes; Avis ij*), that the Rituals are an incoherent medley of all sorts of practices and ceremonies, taken from the old religions of India, of Egypt, from the Jewish and Christian books; which might, *perhaps*, in other times, have sufficed to preserve some truths; but which are far from meeting the wants of the age in which we live."

Vassal, *Mr. Foulhouze* says, is the "standard book on Scottish Freemasonry." We were aware it was *his* "standard," because his analysis of the instruction of the Degrees is but a re-hash of Vassal.

Vassal, then (*Cours Complet de Maçonnerie*), says that the reasons given in the 5th Degree, for its institution, are "miserable and immoral" (p. 267); that those who made the Degree knew very little; that the questions and answers are mostly insignificant, and that he did not succeed in finding in them anything instructive.—*Id.* 269. The 6th is merely political, and he would have passed it by in silence, if he had not promised to examine every one separately.—*Id.* 278. He declares that the authors of the 7th Degree have committed a grave error, in saying that Solomon employed the five Orders of Architecture, and says, "It is by the commis-

sion of anachronisms like this that educated men have been deterred and discouraged, who have desired to engage in explaining more or less profoundly the system of initiation ; and our antagonists have availed themselves of them to turn us into ridicule, because they have found in our *Cahiers* more ignorance than information. It must be admitted that the historical portion of most of the Degrees is unintelligible ; almost all are mutilated, erroneous, incomplete.”—*Id.* 289.

The 8th Degree, he says, was unnecessary and useless, unless it was created in *Iceland*, by the Priests of the Goddess *Hertha*.—*Id.* 297–8. The *Cahiers swarm*, he says, with anachronisms and improbability, as is evident by examining the 8th. “The incoherence and disorder which reign in the classification of the different Degrees of Scottish Masonry, are above all remarkable in the 8th.”—*Id.* 302. The history of the 8th is fabulous.—*Id.* 303.

The 9th he doubts, may have been insidiously intercalated to make men abhor initiation—306 : it is based, he says, on cunning, dissimulation and revenge ; is a Degree of a sect or party, does not belong to the primitive initiation, never ought to have been in Scottish Masonry, and the Chapters ought to be forbidden to confer it—313, 321. The history of the 10th Degree, he says, is essentially false—323. The 11th contains but a single point of morals and no instruction, and so is almost a nullity—326. The very title of the Degree discloses the ignorance of its authors ; it ought to disappear from the Scottish Rite—329–330. The history of the 12th is insignificant and improbable—336. Of the 13th, he says, “the further we advance in the capitular Degrees, the more our embarrassment increases, on account of the confusion and improbability which reign in each Degree. A parabolic language and paucity of Symbols make these Degrees almost unintelligible.”—340. There is, viewed in relation to morals and religion, nothing instructive or useful in it—346.

The 16th, he says, is not worth preserving ; there is in it neither utility nor instruction—386. The 19th is characterized only by allegories, inexhaustible sources of explanations

more or less rational, more or less positive, and at the same time more or less erroneous—420. Out of the 20th, the most fertile imagination and perspicacious penetration could not extract the least instructive notion, nor the least useful consequence. It is really not a Degree; for there is nothing in it of what makes a Degree; its instruction is long, and is composed of an incoherent medley of allegories.—*Id.* 431, 5, 6. The 23d and 24th represent Sabeism only—474. The 25th is an extravagant compound of events, facts and science, at once political, religious and scientific; its initiation insignificant.—477, 480. The 27th ought not to be in the scale as a Degree. It has neither symbols nor allegories connected with initiation; and is still less a philosophical Degree. It seems to have been stuck in simply to fill a gap and retain the name of a celebrated Order—507. Its instruction is wholly Christian. It expresses the sincere piety of the Templars. That is all there is of the Degree—515. The doctrine of the 29th, he says, is so contrary to all religions in vogue, that to develop it in all its purity would wound tender consciences; and it ought to be conferred only on educated and enlightened men, who would appreciate it: in fact, it is only communicated, and never conferred.—*Id.* 528, 9.

Such are the opinions of VASSAL.

Chemin Dupontès says,—*Mémoire sur l'Ecossisme*, p. 322:—“From the 4th Degree to the 30th, only four or five Degrees are *conferred*, all the others being so summarily *communicated* as to be virtually annihilated. Again, in conferring these four or five Degrees thus preserved, the Rituals are far from being exactly followed. We have even heard in solemn meetings of the High Degrees, the *naïf* avowal, that they did not dare to use the cahiers with initiates possessed of common sense.”

And at p. 323: “The manuals, the rituals, the cahiers of the different régimes, present very great differences, and we are certain in advance of praising, criticising or omitting things that are in one ritual, and not in another.” At p. 338: “One would have a very incorrect idea of Scottish Masonry, if he were to content himself with studying it in the cahiers of the

Grand Orient. We shall therefore be compelled constantly to contrast its cahiers with those of such Masonic Bodies as have preserved the genuine Rituals."

Of the Degrees from the 19th to the 27th, he says, "In fact, the Grand Orient has substituted in the place of the Ancient Rituals certain philosophical maxims. It has not, it is true, melted several Degrees together, as it has done in the preceding classes. It has given a formulary of reception for each Degree; but it has cut up these Degrees more than even the others; it has taken from them all principle of life, action and interest."—366.

Of the 24th Degree he says,—p. 373,—“This Degree, which is nevertheless not to be despised, is limited, in the Cahiers of the Grand Orient, to the hackneyed obligation of discretion.”

Of the 25th,—p. 375 :—“In the Cahiers of the Grand Orient, they content themselves with making the Candidate promise to employ all his energies to destroy superstition and make morality triumph; and to prove that he really means to keep his promises, he is required on the spot to compose a *moral essay*.”

Of the 26th,—p. 377 :—“There is nothing of all this in the Cahiers of the Grand Orient. The knowledge and opinions of the Candidate are judged of by a *moral essay of his composition*. He is congratulated on being permitted to concur in soliciting entrance into the Temple of Wisdom; and the Pass-Word is given him, which is, and the single sign, which is to”

Of the 27th,—p. 380 :—“According to these historical data, which seem to have escaped the notice of those who got up the Cahiers of the Grand Orient, the Commander of the Temple could be one of the most important of the Degrees styled philosophical. They have made it a nullity, reduced to the ordinary obligation.”

Of the 29th,—Knight of the Sun,—p. 385 :—“The Cahiers of the Grand Orient have made the Degree almost null. The aspirant requests to be allowed to emerge from the darkness, to see the True Light, and to know the Holy Truth.”

Mr. Foulhouse tells us that a few years ago some one intrusted him with a copy of "a French Ritual" to be revised and corrected; and that he found its Cahiers not worth correcting, they disagreeing almost *in toto* with Vassal's book.

Does *Mr. Foulhouse* imagine that no one knows enough to tell those whom he is deluding, that the old Rituals differ from *Vassal*, simply because *Vassal*, like *Des Etangs*, the Grand Orient and every Body else who chose, *made* the Rituals to suit himself. Nobody goes to *Vassal* to get a *correct* Ritual; if they go to him at all, they go to get *Vassal*. His book contains *Vassal's* Rite, and not the *Scottish* Rite. He went on the principle of *Chemin Dupontès*, who said that each Scotch Rite Degree was a *frame*, which each could fill up as he thought proper. We have no objection to *Mr. Foulhouse* filling up the frames in any way he likes: many others have done it before him, and many will do it after him. Few have done it or will do it as badly as he.

But we do object to his pretending that he is working by the old Rituals and the old Scottish Rite; especially when he undertakes to tell us that *we* have only "recently-manufactured Rituals." We rather suspect that we have many more Rituals and many *older* Rituals than he has.

And we object also to his undertaking to pass his own principles or rather notions, upon any portion of the fraternity, as the genuine Scottish Rite. Good or bad, they are his own. He has made up a Compendium of what he says each Degree teaches: but scarcely any of them teach what he says. If he has *made* them to do so, he has made a *Foulhouse-and-Vassal* Rite; but it is not the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite, and as little the Rite of Perfection.

It is true that the object of the Scottish Rite is to effect the physical, moral and intellectual improvement of its initiates. A very few, only, of its Degrees, as originally framed, conduct to that end in any marked degree. It is an agglomeration, not a systematic succession of Degrees. It teaches industry and the excellence of labor, the moral virtues, and the great cardinal truths on which all Religions are founded. Its intellectual teachings are to be found in

its words and symbols, and not in its formal instruction. They are conveyed by obscure hints, the most important of which *Mr. Foulhouse* has not the learning to comprehend. And not comprehending them; not understanding that the highest purpose of Masonry is to inform the intellect; and thinking that it needs must have some *mission*, he sets it to reforming and emancipating the world. On the same principle you might make it an Abolition Society. That, too, aims at "the enfranchisement of man, and conquering his rights."

It is not and never was the object of Masonry to endeavor to effect the political, religious and *social* emancipation of the Peoples; but it is not a new thing or an original idea, this attempt to pervert it to that. Under that Programme and Manifesto, it becomes, or at least may at pleasure be made, an Association for the Propagation of Red Republicanism and Agrarianism in politics, Materialism, Pantheism or Atheism in religion, and Fourierism, with its doctrine "Property—it is theft," in Socialism. France has pretty well taught us what "*Emancipation*, Religious, Political and Social," means; and also the *EMPIRE* teaches us what it ends in.

Mr. Foulhouse may well say that his Rite has nothing in common with *any* other Masonic Rite, except its principles of Philanthropy. God be devoutly thanked for that! If he chooses to call it "Masonry" and the "Scottish Rite," let him do so, and preach and administer it as much as he will. Fortunately, mischievous as it must be, it can do but little harm in this country, where it will be confined to a very limited class of persons, and can be safely left to sputter and cackle at its leisure.

The 24th and 25th Considerations are: "That by that same Treaty—of 1834—it is decreed that no Masonic Power of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite, nor any subordinate associations thereupon depending, can, under any pretence whatsoever, be merged into a power or association of another Rite; that it cannot legally become, under any title whatsoever, a section or a dependency of that power or association; that such a measure would

“entail upon the power committing the act, the loss of its
 “independence, of its authority, and even of its existence.”
 —*Ibid.*

“That the self-styled Supreme Council at Charleston has,
 “consequently, placed itself without the pale of the Ancient
 “and Accepted Scottish Rite, when, from its origin, and in
 “violation of that fundamental principle, it has given up the
 “first three Degrees thereof to the York Rite, and has
 “merged them into the Grand Lodges of the latter, and that
 “in consequence of that violation, none of the ‘individuals’
 “whom that Council or its Consistory in Louisiana are
 “pleased to admit, can be lawfully initiated, even according
 “to the Statutes, Ordinances, Treaties, Alliances, which
 “they invoke.”

These “Considerations,” so far as they charge that the
 Supreme Council at Charleston, by not regarding an article,
 or a principle embodied in an article, of the Treaty of 1834,
to which she was no party, has put herself out of the pale of
 the Scottish Rite, are too absurd to be replied to.

And so far as they claim that the Supreme Council cannot
 make regular Scottish Masons, because it has yielded up the
 first three Degrees to the Grand Lodges,—as this humbug
 has been figuring largely for some time, we might as well
 explode it at once. To do that we need only to say :

1st. That a person who has received the three symbolic
 Degrees in a regular Lodge of either the English, French,
 or Scottish Rite, is a regular Master Mason, and every reg-
 ular Body of Masons in the world is bound to consider,
 recognize, and receive him as such.

2d. That a Master Mason who has regularly received the
 third Degree in *one* Rite, does not need to receive it in
 another, in order to be admitted to visit in Lodges of that
 order.

3d. That any Master Mason in good standing is competent
 to receive the Degrees above the 3d, of the Scottish Rite :
 and nothing more ever was required. If he was of the York

Rite, he could be affiliated to the 3d Degree, and then receive the others.

4th. That as the Supreme Council at Charleston had the right to authorize its subordinates to give the Degrees, commencing with the 4th, to Master Masons of the English Rite, it was equally competent for her to say that, for the sake of Peace, she would leave to the symbolic Lodges of the English Rite, the conferring of these first three Degrees; or in other words, would receive Master Masons, ready-made, from them, instead of making them herself through her subordinates.

5th. That so the Supreme Council of France had a perfect right to resign to the Grand Orient the conferring of the Degrees up to and including the 18th, and did not annihilate herself by doing so.

6th. That the first Grand Consistory of Louisiana, and the Supreme Council of New Orleans, when in and before 1839, and for a long time after, *they* left the conferring of the first three Degrees to symbolic Lodges, did no more than they had a perfect right to do.

The truth is, that nobody ever could have raised a doubt on the subject, except some one who never looks beyond *words* into the essence of *things*, and who thinks one set of words as good as another, if they *sound* as well.

The 26th "Consideration" is:

"That there is, besides these reasons which are suggested by the *Charlestonians* themselves and which condemn their pretensions, a positive and incontrovertible fact, to wit: the Scottish Rite, in thirty-three Degrees, such as we profess it, has no other possible foundation than the old Constitutions of the various Bodies, which possessed them in the whole or in part before 1761, and especially the *Primeval Rite* of the same name."

To this "Consideration" we simply answer that the foundation of the Scottish Rite, as a separate and distinct

Rite, is the Constitutions of 1786, whenever and wherever they were made : that they and they alone created the rank, office, power, and dignity of Sovereign Grand Inspector-General : they arranged the Degrees of the Rite ; and they were accepted and received by all who received the Rite, as its fundamental law ; and that for a man to repudiate these Constitutions as *forged*, and still claim to be a 33d and to have a Supreme Council and administer the Ancient and Accepted Rite, is equivalent in logical accuracy and ethical consistency to denouncing a transaction as a theft, and retaining the stolen goods ; to alleging a patent of nobility to be forged, and still claiming and wearing the title which it pretended to create.

The 27th "Consideration" is :

"That according to the principle—which alone is just—
 "that every Mason, whether he be a Catholic or a Protest-
 "ant, a Christian or a Heathen, has the right to form,
 "together with his Brethren, a Supreme Council in his
 "country ; that every Sovereign and Independent State has,
 "for the same reason, a right to a Supreme Council ; that
 "no Supreme Council of another State can interfere with its
 "Jurisdiction, and still less establish, within the limits of
 "its territory, Bodies opposing it for the interest of a foreign
 "power."

Such, in fact, is at present the great argument : that every sovereign and independent State has the *right* to have a Supreme Council of its own. To that we answer :

1st. That if that *be* so, it will be time enough for Louisiana to have one, when the Body of Scottish Masons in the State, by convention or general consent, concur in creating one : and that whatever the right of *Louisiana*, that is *one* thing, and the right of *Mr. Foulhouse* to create a Supreme Council and proclaim himself or it Autocrat of the Scottish Rite in Louisiana, is *another* : that Louisiana has not selected him to enforce her right to a Supreme Council ; does not think it essential to her dignity, that he should be perched up on a pasteboard pinnacle of mimic power, that a few infatuated adherents may duck and cringe to him ; and that when the

Scottish Masons of Louisiana as a Body, want him to assert their rights, they will let him know.

2d. It does not follow that every perfectly Sovereign and Independent State is entitled to a Supreme Council, if we abandon the Constitutions of 1786. Masonry has nothing to do with political divisions of countries. And as little does it follow that every realm under one government should have *but* one. England and Ireland have separate Councils. Without these Constitutions, there is simply no rule on the subject. You cannot argue from political organization to Masonic organization, by analogy, because there is no such analogy. If there were, Canada could not have an independent Grand Lodge, nor Ireland an independent Supreme Council.

3d. Each State of the Union is *sovereign* only in some respects, and not at all *independent*. It is neither independent of its Sister-States, nor of the United States. In our relations with foreign powers, we are all but one nation,—in peace as well as in war, but one. The Grand Orient of France, the Supreme Council of England, would have a perfect right to refuse to recognize a swarm of petty Supreme Councils hatched out like flies in summer, in thirty, forty, or fifty States. It might with as much propriety be next claimed that every Parish ought to have one. Even to create one in each State would sadly diminish the dignity and splendor of the Body. It would have been better, perhaps, to have had but one for the whole United States, like a National Grand Lodge, in which Delegates from every State should have met to consult and legislate. The more you multiply them, the more unimportant you make them; and no benefit results to any Body, except that you flatter the vanity of a few small men who could not otherwise attain any other than a subordinate rank in Masonry.

ALBERT PIKE, 33d.:
Grand Commander.

APPENDIX.

Patent of Alexandre François Auguste Comte de Grasse-Tilly, from the original in the Archives of the Supreme Council at Charleston.

*Universi terrarum orbis Architectonis Gloria ab ingeniis.
Deus meumque Jus.
Ordo ab Chao.*

From the East of the Grand and Supreme Council of the most Puissant Sovereigns, Grand Inspectors-General, under the celestial canopy of the Zenith which answers to 32' 4' North Lat.

To the most Illustrious, most Valiant and Sublime Princes of the Royal Secret, Knights of K.-H., Illustrious Princes and Knights, Grand Ineffable and Sublime Free, Accepted and Perfect Masons, of all Degrees, Ancient and Modern, over the surface of the two Hemispheres :

To all to whom these Letters of Credence shall come :

Health, Stability, and Power.

Know ye, that we the undersigned, Sovereign Grand Inspectors-General, duly and lawfully established and congregated in Supreme Council of the 33d Degree, have carefully and duly examined our Illustrious Brother, Count Alexandre François Auguste de Grasse-Tilly, in the several Degrees which he has lawfully received ; and at his special request we do hereby certify, acknowledge and proclaim our Illustrious Brother Alexandre François Auguste de Grasse-Tilly, of Versailles, in France, ancient Captain of Cavalry, and an Engincer in the service of the United States of America, to be an Expert Master and Past Master of the Symbolic Lodge, and also a Secret Master, Perfect Master, Intimate Secretary, Provost and Judge, Intendant of the Building, Master Elected of nine, Illustrious Elected of fifteen, Sublime Knight Elected, Grand Master Architect, Royal Arch, and Grand Elect, Perfect and Sublime Mason. We do also certify him to be a Knight of the East or Sword, Prince of Jerusalem, Knight of the East and West, Knight of the Eagle and Sovereign

Prince of Rose Croix de Heredom, Grand Pontiff, Master *ad vitam*, Patriarch Noachite, Chevaliér Prussian, Prince of Libanus, Grand Master Ecossais, Knight of St. Andrew, and Chief of the Tabernacle, Prince of the Tabernacle, Prince of Mercy, Knight of the Brazen Serpent, Commander of the Temple, Sovereign Knight of Sun, Prince Adept, K-H.-Knight of the White and Black Eagle, Prince of the Royal Secret, and Sovereign Grand Inspector-General, and Member of the Supreme Council of the 33d Degree.

And we do also certify that the said Illustrious Brother is Grand Commander for life in the French West India Islands.

And we hereby authorize and empower our said Illustrious Brother Count Alexandre François Auguste de Grasse-Tilly to establish, congregate, superintend, and inspect all Lodges, Chapters, Councils, Colleges, and Consistories of the Royal and Military Order of Ancient and Modern Free Masonry, over the surface of the two Hemispheres, agreeably to the Grand Constitutions.

We, therefore, command all and every of our aforesaid Knights, Princes and Sublime Masons to receive and acknowledge our Illustrious Brother, Count Alexandre François Auguste de Grasse-Tilly, in his several qualities, to the highest Degree in Masonry ; and we shall reciprocate the attentions shown to him, to those Brethren who may present themselves to our Supreme Council, furnished with lawful certificates or letters of credence.

To which letters of credence, we, the undersigned Sovereign Grand Inspectors-General, members of the Supreme Council of the 33d Degree in Charleston, South Carolina, hereunto subscribed our names, and affixed thereto the Grand Seal of the said Illustrious Order, in the Grand Council Chamber, near the B. . B. . under the C. . C. ., this nineteenth day of the 12th month called *Adar*, of the Restoration 5562, Anno Lucis 5802, and of the Christian Era the 21st day of February, 1802.

JOHN MITCHELL, K-H., P. R. S.,
Sovereign Grand Inspector-General, 33d, and Grand Commander.

FRED. DALCHO, K-H., P. R. S.,
Sovereign Grand Inspector-General, 33d, and Lieutenant-Grand Commander.

ISAAC AULD, K-H., P. R. S.,
Sovereign Grand Inspector-General of the 33d.

J. B. BOWEN, K-H., P. R. S.,
Sovereign Grand Inspector-General, 33d, and Grand Master of Ceremonies.

J^N B^E M. DELAHOGUE,
Sov. Grand Insp.-General, 33d, and Lieut. G. C. of the French West Indies.

I. D. LIEBEN, K-H., P. R. S.,
Grand Insp.-Gen., 33d, and Grand Treasurer of the Empire, p. t.

AB. ALEXANDER,
Sov. Grand Insp.-Gen. of the 33d and Gr. Secretary of the Holy Empire.

I certify the above and foregoing copy to be conformable to the original.

Charleston, South Carolina, March 15, 1802.

AUGUSTE DE GRASSE,

{ Seal of Gr. Council of Pr. of R. : S. : }	{ Seal of Supreme Council. }	{ Seal of Gr. Council of Pr. of Jerusalem. }
---	------------------------------------	--

The following is a translation from the French original, in the Archives at Charleston, annexed to the above Patent :

UNIVERSI TERRARUM ORBIS ARCHITECTONIS GLORIA AB
INGENIIS.

Deus meumque Jus.

Ordo ab Chao.

At the East of the Grand and Sublime Council of the M. : Ill. : Sov. : Gr. : Insp. : G. :, under the C. : C. : of the Z. : answering to the 32d Degree, 45 min. North Lat.

To our most Ill. :, most V. : and S. : P. : of the R. : S. :, Knights K-H. :, Ill. : P. : and Knights, G. : Ineffable and Subl. : Masons of all Degrees, Ancient and Modern, over the surface of the two Hemispheres.

To all to whom these presents shall come, *greeting!*

HEALTH, STABILITY, POWER!

KNOW YE, that our Th. : Ill. : Bro. : Auguste de Grasse, Grand Inspector-General and Sov. : Gr. : Commander of the French Islands, is, by these presents, appointed the Representative of the Supreme Council of the 33d Degree of the French Islands and Representative of all Lodges, Chapters, Councils, Colleges, and Consistories of the Royal and Military Order of Ancient and Modern Free-Masonry, from the Knights of the East and West, 17th Degree, to the highest Degree of Masonry, near all Chapters, Councils, Colleges and Consistories of the same Sublime Degrees in the French Islands.

Therefore, we pray all our Illustrious Brethren to receive and acknowledge our aforesaid Ill. : Bro. : as our Deputy, and to render unto him all honors due him in said high capacity, and we

promise to reciprocate the same attentions shown him, to those Brethren who may present themselves in our Sublime Councils, furnished with Certificates or Letters of Credence.

To which Letters of Credence we have subscribed our names and affixed the Great Seal of our Sublime Order, in our Grand Council Chamber, near the B. . B. ., under the C. . C. . the 5th day of the 5th month called—5562, Anno Lucis 5802, and of the Vulgar Era, the 3d day of August, 1802.

JOHN MITCHELL, K-H., S. P. R. S.,
Sov. . Gr. . Insp. . Gen. . of the 33d Degree and Grand Commander of
the U. S. A.

FREDERICK DALCHO, K-H., S. P. R. S.,
Sov. . Gr. . Insp. . Gen. . of the 33d Degree and Lieut. . Gr. . Com-
mander of the U. S. A.

L. S. Seal of the Order. L. S.

ABRAHAM ALEXANDER,
Ill. . Sec. . Gen. . H. E.

We, Alexandre François Auguste de Grasse, Sov. . Gr. . Insp. . Gen. ., 33d Degree, Sov. . Gr. . Commander *ad vitam*, for the French Leeward and Windward Islands of America,

Certify that the above and elsewhere mentioned Letter of Credence is conformable to that deposited in my Archives.

Given at the Grand Orient of the CAPE, this 16th day of the 7th month of the year 5562.

[Signed] AUGUSTE DE GRASSE, K-H., P. of the R. S.,
A. CAIGNET.

By order,

[Signed]

DALET.

Examined and certified by us, we certify *these presents* to be conformable to the Patents transcribed upon our register, fol. 74 and 75.

At St. Yago de Cuba, the 10th day of the 11th Masonic month, 5805, and we affixed the Grand Seal of the Princes Masons, January 10th, 1806.

{ Grand Seal of }
{ the Princes Masons. }

ANT. BIDEAUD,
S. G. I. G.

Cornell University Library
HS 766.P63

Foulhouzeism and Cerneauism scourged : di



3 1924 015 055 951

dlit, anx

