

UGLE's External Relations 1950-2000: policy and practice

Inaugural Address by Bro James W. Daniel

13 November 2003

Introduction



Referring to the leaflets *Basic Principles for Grand Lodge Recognition and Aims and Relationships of the Craft* the Grand Master of the United Grand Lodge of England ('UGLE'), MW Bro HRH The Duke of Kent, said at his Installation on 27 June 1967: 'These two documents contain all that is vital in our Grand Lodge contacts with our Masonic neighbours.'¹ That statement remains true, but neither those leaflets nor any subsequent official publications fully set out the UGLE's external relations policy, or document and discuss its implementation. While I can only agree with our Grand Master that 'The whole system and science of Masonic foreign relations is a complicated business'² I shall nevertheless attempt in this paper

- (a) to highlight what I consider to be the main aspects of Grand Lodge's activities in the 'sensitive field'³ of external relations during the last half of the twentieth century – as reported in the *Proceedings* and other publicly available documents
- (b) to show how the UGLE's policy developed during that time, and
- (c) to distil from this review the main features of the UGLE's external relations policy at the start of the twenty-first century.

Definitions

For the purposes of this paper

- (a) I have preferred to use the term '**external relations**' to include not only 'relations between us and other Grand Lodges',⁴ as the Grand Master defined the term in 1991, but 'relations between the United Grand Lodge of England and other Masonic bodies' as the Board of General Purposes defined it in the leaflet *Freemasonry's External Relations*,⁵ which Grand Lodge published in 1993/4.
- (b) '**the Craft**' means the First, Second and Third Degrees ('basic Freemasonry')⁶
- (c) '**regularity**' is as defined in the UGLE's *Basic Principles for Grand Lodge Recognition and Aims and Relationships of the Craft*.
- (d) '**recognition**' means the decision of one Grand Lodge to permit 'intervisitation', ie to allow (i) its members to visit Lodges under another Grand Lodge and (ii) its Lodges to admit visitors from that other Constitution. (The two Grand Lodges are then said to be in 'fraternal association',⁷ 'in amity',⁸ or to be 'in Masonic intercourse' with each other.)
- (e) I use the terms '**the Sister Constitutions**'⁹ and '**the Home Grand Lodges**' to mean the English, Irish and Scottish Grand Lodges only.¹⁰

Methodology

I shall briefly review UGLE's external relations from 1919-1949 before looking in more detail at the main events between 1950 and 2000 (both years included), decade by decade, restricting my sources to official publications. My conclusions follow, and the paper ends with a possible draft of the UGLE's external relations policy at the start of the 21st century.

The historical context: UGLE's external relations 1919-1949

For an understanding of the UGLE's external relations policy and practice from 1950 to 2000 there are two prerequisites. The first is to remember that the UGLE took the momentous step of breaking off¹¹ relations with the Grand Orient of France ('GOF') in 1878¹² on the ground that the GOF had removed 'from its Constitutions those paragraphs which assert a belief in the existence of TGAOTU', such belief being 'the first and most important' of the 'Ancient Landmarks'. The second is to have reviewed UGLE's external relations activities since the end of the First World War, which I shall attempt in the following paragraphs.

MANAGEMENT

By 1919 Grand Lodge's external affairs were being managed by the Board of General Purposes (which I shall hereafter refer to as 'the Board' or 'the BGP'), more specifically by its 'Colonial, Indian and Foreign Committee'. Grand Lodge normally accorded or withdrew recognition on the recommendation of the Board, acting on a request from the Grand Master to investigate the applicant's qualifications.

QUEENSLAND (and the 1905 CONCORDAT)

After the First World War one of the Board's first actions in the field of interconstitutional affairs was to recommend to Grand Lodge the recognition of the United Grand Lodge of Queensland, which had started life before the war as the Grand Lodge of Queensland, a breakaway body formed by a minority of Irish Masons.¹³ Before Grand Lodge finally agreed to recognize this body, on 30 April 1920, the Board cleared its lines with its two Sister Constitutions, with which a relevant agreement had been drawn up at a tri-partite conference on 29 June 1905.¹⁴ At that conference the representatives had resolved, among other things:

'[that] The question of recognising a new Grand Lodge in any Colony or other territory in which the three Grand Lodges have equal jurisdiction and have Warranted Lodges working therein, shall not be taken into consideration unless at least two-thirds of the Lodges under each jurisdiction have signified their adhesion to such new body; and such recognition shall only be granted by agreement of the three Grand Lodges.'

'[and that] After the recognition of such new Grand Lodge as a sovereign body, the respective authorities of the three Grand Lodges will surrender their rights to warrant new
 ● Lodges within the jurisdiction of the new body, provided always that the rights of Lodges not adhering to the new body shall be fully safeguarded.'

This resolution, together with one 'that any member of the Order who may be suspended or expelled in one jurisdiction shall not, while so disqualified, be permitted to visit or join any Lodge under the jurisdiction of the others' (and one concerning the presence of Installed Masters at Boards of Installed Masters under the English Constitution¹⁵), was adopted by Grand Lodge at its meeting in September 1905, and subsequently signed by the Grand Master. Commenting in the 1960s on the Queensland affair in his chapter in Grand Lodge's publication *Grand Lodge 1717-1967*.¹⁶ RW Bro Sir James Stubbs noted that:

'...the safeguarding of the rights of the Lodges which opted to remain under the UGLE was, in accordance with normal procedure, accompanied by a surrender on the part of the home jurisdiction of the right to warrant any further Lodges in Queensland, thus giving full sovereignty to the new body except in so far as it voluntarily permitted continuance of existing Lodges as part of the terms for recognition...'

'AIMS AND RELATIONSHIPS OF THE CRAFT'

Also in April 1920, partly as a reaction to the 'various irregular bodies which sprang into existence or revived with the end of hostilities',¹⁷ the Board issued an early version of its statement '*Aims and Relationships of the Craft*'. A fuller version, which emphasized 'certain fundamental principles of the Order',¹⁸ including the policy of not recognising any Grand Lodge that did not adhere to those principles, was accepted by Grand Lodge in September in 1938.¹⁹ This was 'reiterated with strengthening clauses'²⁰ on 7 September 1949 and is still valid today. It is reproduced here as Appendix A.

'BASIC PRINCIPLES FOR GRAND LODGE RECOGNITION'

Despite having already published the first version of '*Aims and Relationships of the Craft*' in 1920 (see above), the Board found it necessary in April 1929 to have Grand Lodge approve another document setting out in detail the '*Basic Principles for Grand Lodge Recognition*'. According to Bro Stubbs²¹

'Negotiations for the establishment of friendly relations, ie recognition, with other Grand Lodges had in the past generally been conducted on the basis that an application for recognition by the junior body was investigated by the Board at the request of the Grand Master. This was done by means of an exchange of correspondence to establish the nature of their principles and practices, but without, so far as can be seen, any hard-and-fast rules on the subject. If the results of the investigation and correspondence were satisfactory, a recommendation was made to Grand Lodge that recognition be accorded. Exchange of representatives, which was a matter for the Grand Master, not for Grand Lodge, usually but not invariably followed.'²²

The '*Basic Principles for Grand Lodge Recognition*' (hereafter referred to simply as the '*Basic Principles*') laid down the missing 'hard-and-fast rules' and from 1929 they were normally strictly applied.²³ The 1929 publication is attached as Appendix B for ease of reference.

Two comments on the *Basic Principles* are pertinent here. First, there is no mention in the *Basic Principles* of territorial control, territorial limits or 'exclusive sovereign rights'.²⁴ Secondly, it should be noted that *Basic Principles* Nos. 2, 3 and 6 all relate to belief in the GAOTU and/or to the Volume of the Sacred Law. That these three were considered to be the essential *Basic Principles* was later confirmed by MW Bro The Earl of Scarbrough when he proclaimed that:

'We require of every one of our members a belief in God, and our standards are based on the Volume of the Sacred Law. Those are our essential Landmarks.'²⁵

ATTENDANCE AT INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES

Before the publication of the '*Basic Principles*' the Board had already decided that attendance at international conferences where the basic principles of the English Craft might have been matters for argument or discussion, or where members of irregular or even unrecognized Grand Lodges might be encountered, should be forbidden. It accordingly ruled out attendance at the 'International Conference of Freemasons' to be held in Switzerland in 1921.

QUASI- AND PARA-MASONIC BODIES

Again, following its fundamental principle of not recognizing para-Masonic bodies, or any which admitted women to membership, Grand Lodge refused to accord recognition to the 'Honourable Fraternity of Antient Masonry' and 'The Order of the Eastern Star' in 1921, and in June 1929 Grand Lodge gave its approval to a general caution against 'The Loyal Order of Moose' and similar bodies which 'went beyond the ordinary bounds and limitations of Friendly Societies'.²⁶

TERRITORIAL MATTERS

While I have yet to find any official public statement of the UGLE's territorial claims in the period immediately leading up to 1950, UGLE's actions lead one to believe that Bro Stubbs's description of its policy in this respect in 1967 was equally valid between 1919 and 1950:

'In the view of the UGLE it possesses sole and exclusive territorial sovereignty over England, Wales, the Channel Islands, and the Isle of Man. It shares with Ireland and Scotland exclusive rights over such parts of the British Commonwealth as have not established local sovereign Grand Lodges...Elsewhere territory is either open, there being no sovereign Grand Lodge in existence and therefore free for any Grand Lodge to establish Lodges, or closed by reason of the existence of a sovereign Grand Lodge.'²⁷

Moreover, as Bro Stubbs added, 'in recent generations at least' the UGLE had accepted that this 'closure' of a territory applied even if the 'sovereign Grand Lodge in existence' was not recognized by the UGLE.²⁸

In this respect two exceptional events occurred in the period 1919-1949. First, in 1927, the then President of the Board, RW Bro Sir Alfred Robbins, persuaded the Grand Orient of Uruguay to recognize 'the independent and regular position of Silver Lodge, No. 3389' (EC) in its territory – though it had been formed in Montevideo in 1909 without Uruguay's full consent – in return for an assurance that the UGLE 'will not countenance or authorise the establishment of lodges within its [Uruguay's] Jurisdiction, contrary to the wishes or subversive of the powers and privileges of that Grand Orient.'²⁹ Secondly, in 1935, the Grand Orient of Brazil voluntarily permitted the formation in its territory of the Northern Division of the UGLE's District of South America comprising 'a body of English-speaking and English-working lodges known as the Grand Council of Craft Masonry in Brazil'³⁰ which until then had worked under that Grand Orient. These two events are examples of the way in which the more usual practice of exclusive territoriality can be amended by the mutual consent of two Grand Lodges.

A CONDITIONAL RECOGNITION, AND A SUSPENSION OF RECOGNITION

Two further unusual events between the World Wars are worth mentioning here as they are relevant to decisions taken after 1950:

First, the 'Grand Lodge of F & AM of Finland' was recognized in 1928 on condition that, 'in the event of English Brethren desiring to establish a Lodge under that Jurisdiction, to work in the English language their own ritual and by-laws...every facility would be accorded them to do so'.³¹ This was an unusual condition and concession.

Second, on 6 December 1933 those attending the Quarterly Communication of the UGLE stood while the Pro Grand Master read out a message from the Grand Master, MW Bro HRH The Duke of Connaught, to the effect that he had 'decided that intercourse and exchange of representatives between the UGLE and the Grand Lodge of the Philippine Islands be suspended.'³² The ground for this decision – unusually, perhaps uniquely, taken by the Grand Master himself – was that the Philippines had insisted on warranting lodges in China (until then the preserve of the three 'Home Grand Lodges' and the Grand Lodge of Massachusetts), with the avowed intention of forming a sovereign Grand Lodge of China. This, the occupying (masonic) powers believed, was 'detrimental to the highest interests of the Order' 'in the present condition of that country'. It was not until 1938 that the Board was able to report to Grand Lodge that 'fraternal intercourse and the exchange of Representatives...has now been resumed.'³³

THE SECOND WORLD WAR AND ITS IMMEDIATE AFTERMATH

Such was the baggage of external relations concerns, practices, agreements and precedents which the UGLE took with it into the war years of 1939-45. Then, as in the First World War,³⁴ Grand Lodge had to consider the question of those whom the Board at first classified as 'Brethren of Enemy Nationality and Birth who are members of English Lodges'.³⁵ In early 1940,³⁶ after much debate, Grand Lodge accepted the Board's recommendation that for the duration of the war:

'No Brother being a national of any State with which Great Britain is at War shall attend or be admitted to any Masonic Meeting held under the English Constitution ...'

on the ground that masons were 'bound by their masonic Obligation to the Sovereign of their native land', and not 'our' native land.

1950-2000**INTRODUCTION**

Once hostilities had ended, Grand Lodge exhorted lodges to be particularly careful to check the credentials of would-be candidates for initiation and of visitors, and to avoid association with unrecognized bodies. To quote Bro Stubbs once again: 'The authorities of Grand Lodge...realized that the restoration of peace and comparatively free circulation of Masons about the world as well as the revival of Masonry were going to create serious problems...'³⁷ How right they were! The expansion of regular Freemasonry, or, more precisely, of the number of Grand Lodges recognized by the UGLE, is shown in the following table.

Location and numbers of recognised Grand Lodges (as per the Year Books for 1950 and 2000)		
	<u>1950</u>	<u>2000</u>
Africa	1	11
Asia	1	4
Australasia	7	7
Europe	9	24
North America:		
Canada	9	10
USA	49	67
Central America	5	5
West Indies	2	3
South America	<u>12</u>	<u>14</u>
Total	<u>95</u>	<u>145</u>

As I shall show, most of this expansion of fraternal relations can be accounted for by lodges in Africa gaining independence from the National Grand Lodge of France, by the revival of Freemasonry in Eastern Europe, or by the recognition of Prince Hall Grand Lodges in the USA. But these numbers do not give the whole picture, nor do they show the Grand Lodges with which the UGLE changed its relationships – sometimes more than once. By examining the principle events it is possible to see how the UGLE's policy and practice changed over this period.

MANAGEMENT

The names of those who filled the key offices as far as the formulation and

implementation of Grand Lodge's external relations policy are listed in Appendix C for ease of reference.

None of the Duke of Connaught's successors as Grand Master copied his example of suspending the UGLE's relations with another Grand Lodge without Grand Lodge's prior approval, but the appointment of representatives near recognised Grand Lodges remained the Grand Master's prerogative. Until August 1972, according to the *Proceedings*, applications for recognition were still technically made to the Grand Master, who then caused enquiries to be made and, if these proved satisfactory, allowed his name to be joined with the Board's in recommending to Grand Lodge that it accord recognition to the applicant. This practice appears to have ceased after that date.

In one instance only, the Board itself – without prior reference to Grand Lodge (or apparently to the Grand Master) – decided that 'relations' could be 'resumed' with another Grand Lodge, namely the 'Grand Lodge of Vienna (Austria)', on the ground that it had been recognised before the war, had then ceased to operate, and was now reformed as a not 'substantially different body'.³⁸

The Board's 'Colonial, Indian and Foreign Committee' had its name changed by Grand Lodge on 2 June 1954 to 'the more appropriate title of External Relations Committee' on the grounds that 'Its duties are practically entirely confined to the relations between the Grand Lodge of England and other Jurisdictions' and because 'The old name is quite out of date; the Committee has nothing to do with any Colonial matters, it has nothing to do with any Indian matters, which are completely domestic within our Constitution, and the word "Foreign" does not exactly appeal to us because the business of the Committee is to deal with our Sister Constitutions all over the world, including Scotland, Ireland, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and so on'.³⁹

The 1950s

URUGUAY DERECOGNIZED

The first reported action of Grand Lodge in the field of external affairs in the period 1950-2000 was to accept the Board's recommendation 'That in view of the Grand Lodge [*sic*] of Uruguay not conforming with the Basic Principles of Freemasonry for which the Grand Lodge of England has stood throughout its history, recognition be withdrawn from that Grand Lodge.'⁴⁰ The Board had come to the conclusion 'that it is quite clear that the Grand Lodge of Uruguay no longer requires such a belief' [that is in the GAOTU]. The President of the BGP, in moving the motion, did not, however, refer to the *Basic Principles for Grand Lodge Recognition*. Instead he quoted clauses 3, 4 and 8 of *Aims and Relationships of the Craft*, which had been reaffirmed the previous year, under the last of which the UGLE 'refuses absolutely to have any relations with such Bodies [that is, in this case, those Bodies which do not adhere to the principles relating to the GAOTU and the Volume of the Sacred Law] or to regard them as Freemasons'.

ICELAND, AUSTRIA, GERMANY, and ISRAEL RECOGNIZED

Iceland, Austria, Germany and Israel were the four Grand Lodges with which the UGLE entered into fraternal association in the 1950s. All had been found to conform with the Basic Principles.

Iceland's recognition in 1951 is of interest here because '[as] there is no English Constitution Lodge in Iceland... We have, therefore, no rights to surrender or conditions to impose.'⁴¹

I have already mentioned how and why the Board itself enabled relations with Austria⁴² to resume.

Compared with Austria, Germany posed a much more difficult problem. In July 1949 'the remnants of some 175 lodges in the Western Zone' had inaugurated the United Grand Lodge [*sic*] of Germany. This new Grand Lodge did not, however, include German lodges practising the Swedish Rite. Although (according to Bro Stubbs)⁴³ the

Board would much have preferred the complete unification and 'had held consultations ...with both sides of the German controversy' it had concluded 'that the United Grand Lodge [of Germany] had done all it could to come to terms with the "Prussians" and failed through no fault of its own'. In making its recommendation for recognition to Grand Lodge on 5 December 1956 the Board noted that the United Grand Lodge of Germany was now the largest group of lodges in the territory, and that it had already been 'recognised by a considerable number of Grand Lodges with which the United Grand Lodge of England is in fraternal association'. (This would appear to be the first occasion, in recent history at least, that the Board took into account either the applicant's relative size in a shared territory or its prior recognition by other recognized Grand Lodges). But it was not until 1960⁴⁴ that the Board could recommend the recognition of the United Grand Lodges [*sic*] of Germany. Only then could the BGP state that

'This body now represents and controls virtually the whole of Freemasonry practised in Western Germany, a Union having recently been effected between the "United Grand Lodge of Germany" now known as the Land Grand Lodge (Ancient Free and Accepted Masons) ... and the "Grosselandesloge", now known as the Land Grand Lodge (Masonic Order of Swedish Rite) ...'

It is noteworthy that Grand Lodge did not and has not accorded separate recognition to any of the individual Grand Lodges of which the United Grand Lodges of Germany consists.

In 1957 the UGLE had no such difficulty in recognising the Grand Lodge of Israel which had been formed from five Scottish Constitution lodges there in 1953, was already recognized by Scotland, and 'which is now the only independent Masonic Jurisdiction in Israel.'⁴⁵

TIES WITH GRAND LODGES IN THE USA

The UGLE, in the persons of its Rulers, the President of the BGP and the Grand Secretary, paid particular attention to maintaining and developing its relationship with Grand Lodges in the USA and Canada: Representatives of the Grand Lodge of New York came to London and discussed 'matters of mutual interest'⁴⁶ and even addressed Grand Lodge⁴⁷; the Assistant Grand Master (Sir Allan Adair) and the Grand Secretary (Sir Sidney White) visited Canada and the USA in 1955; and Sir Ernest Cooper (President, BGP) attended New York's 175th Anniversary celebrations and received their award for distinguished service.⁴⁸

But the major Anglo-American masonic event during the 1950s was the extensive visit to the USA and Canada by the Grand Master (Lord Scarbrough) and his new Grand Secretary (James Stubbs) in 1958. Although in fact this was not the first time a Grand Master of the UGLE had attended a masonic function in the USA,⁴⁹ as was claimed in the *Proceedings* of 4 June 1958, the visit is noteworthy here because, on his return, the Grand Master reported that 'the (so-called) Mother Grand Lodge of the world is held in some estimation by our fellow Masons in Canada and the US' and concluded that 'we all of us have a great responsibility to see that that opinion should always remain justified'.⁵⁰

The 1960s

INTRODUCTION

The predominant concerns of the UGLE in the 1960s, in terms of its external relations, were the influence of irregular Freemasonry in Europe (especially in connection with the irregular Grand Lodge of France) and the creation of sovereign Grand Lodges in South Africa and India. Developments in Belgium, Switzerland, Italy and Luxembourg also

demanded attention. Other Orders were occasionally mentioned. Of Lord Scarbrough's retirement as Grand Master in 1967, Bro Stubbs wrote:

'This brought to an end a Grand Mastership of outstanding importance not only to English Masonry, but to that of the world generally, a period in which the prestige and influence for good of the Mother Grand Lodge has increased with each year.'⁵¹

And one of the largest international Masonic meetings ever held marked the Installation of the new Grand Master in 1967.

FRANCE

At the first Quarterly Communication of the new decade the Board of General Purposes explained to Grand Lodge why it could not recommend the recognition of the Grand Lodge of France. First it reminded Grand Lodge that relations had been severed with the Grand Orient of France in 1878 because that body had resolved:

'...to rescind the first and second paragraphs of its Constitutions whereby it acknowledged "the existence of God and the immortality of the soul" and substituted therefor "absolute liberty of conscience" ... The understanding of the Board is that the presence of the Volume of the Sacred Law was thereby prohibited and still remains so, and that no safeguard exists against the admission of atheists...'

Turning then to the Grand Lodge of France the BGP accepted that recently reported resolutions by the Grand Lodge of France to replace the Volume of the Sacred Law and to break off relations with the Grand Orient were:

'...evidence of some movement towards regularity ... [but] it is felt that the persistence of an irregular minority will make it quite impossible for the Board to recommend to the Grand Master the recognition of the Grand Lodge of France or of any other Grand Lodge with which it is closely associated. The Board is of the opinion that a return to the true and regular principles of Freemasonry and the total eradication of irregular elements and tendencies is something that can only be accomplished over a long period and must stem from a sincere change of heart within the Grand Lodge of France: it cannot be accomplished by a series of resolutions, still less can it be established by influences outside that country.'⁵²

The Board's statement concluded with a reminder that the only Grand Lodge in France recognized by the UGLE was the 'Grande Loge Nationale Française'.

With this statement the Board demonstrated yet again that for the UGLE the essential basic principles for Grand Lodge recognition were numbers 2,3 and 6, that is those relating to belief in the GAOTU and to the Volume of the Sacred Law. Any Grand Lodge which failed to satisfy these criteria (such as the Grand Orient of France, Uruguay and the Grand Lodge of France) was condemned as irregular, and its irregularity could hardly be purged.

The Board was well aware that the irregularity of the Grand Lodge of France could be infectious. The delay in recognizing the United Grand Lodges of Germany until December 1960⁵³ was 'occasioned by a mischief-making body, since deceased, known as the Luxembourg Convention, whose leaders had drawn the new German organization into a dangerous liaison with the irregular Grand Lodge of France'.⁵⁴ Not all Grand Lodges in the USA had yet ruptured relations with the Grand Lodge of France, and it was suspected that some in Europe were unofficially permitting contacts with the irregular body. And related problems in the Netherlands were to result in a major change in South Africa (see below). The Board therefore repeated and reinforced its regular warnings to members of the English Constitution about visiting overseas.

SOUTH AFRICA

In June 1961 the BGP reported to Grand Lodge that '[whereas] for many years the English, Irish, Scottish and Netherlandic lodges in South Africa have worked together in the closest union and harmony... Circumstances have now arisen which have caused the Netherlandic lodges to break away from the Grand East of the Netherlands and establish an independent Grand Lodge'⁵⁵ [the 'Grand Lodge of South Africa']. Bro Stubbs's gloss on this potentially awkward development was that:

'The Netherlandic Lodges... viewed with some suspicion and even alarm the conduct of their parent Grand Lodge under Bro Davidson, the protagonist of the Luxembourg Convention. Sooner than run the risk of contamination by irregular European Masonry and of ostracism by the Lodges of the other three Constitutions [in South Africa], they decided in 1961 to establish themselves as an independent Grand Lodge.'⁵⁶

The ground for this development had been well prepared.⁵⁷ Although published records do not mention any prior negotiations with the Home Grand Lodges the *Proceedings* show that in early 1957 the Assistant Grand Master and the Grand Secretary of the UGLE had attended the bicentenary celebrations of the Grand East of the Netherlands,⁵⁸ and on 5 July 1957 RW Bro Col C. Graham Botha 'Deputy Grand Master Designate for South Africa (Netherlands)' had attended the Quarterly Communication of the UGLE.⁵⁹ As the new Grand Lodge did not 'claim sole sovereignty within the territory of the Union of South Africa and has engaged itself not to expand further beyond the boundaries of the Union than to incorporate such of the Netherlandic Lodges in Rhodesia as wish to join it,' the Board could state that 'No curtailment of the sovereign rights of the three Home jurisdictions therefore arises' and 'there is nothing to prevent us giving Warrants for new Lodges in South Africa should we see fit to do so.' The Grand Lodges of Ireland and Scotland had already accorded recognition to the Grand Lodge of South Africa. Grand Lodge accepted the Board's recommendation without discussion.

So cordial were the new interconstitutional relations in South Africa that in 1965 the UGLE granted the Grand Lodge of South Africa's request to be invited to:

'...to become a party to that part of the Concordat [of 1905 with Ireland and Scotland] which provides that any member who may be suspended or expelled in one jurisdiction shall not, while so disqualified, be permitted to remain a member⁶⁰ of or to visit or join any lodge under the jurisdiction of the others.'⁶¹

As Bro Stubbs commented in 1967: 'Masonry went on in South Africa very much as it was before, and practically speaking without making any difference to the other three Constitutions.'⁶²

INDIA – AND THE CONCORDAT OF 1905

In Grand Lodge on 27 April 1960 Lord Scarbrough made the following statement about India, and why it had been decided to waive the terms of the Concordat agreed with the Sister Constitutions in 1905:

'Ever since the constitutional changes took place in India, the question of masonic independence has been in mind... As England, Ireland and Scotland are all intimately concerned in this matter, I took counsel with my Brother Grand Masters and, after a number of meetings, we all three came to the conclusion that the best interests of Freemasonry in India would be served if, in this instance, we waived the terms of a concordat entered upon by our predecessors in 1905, under which in any particular territory a two-thirds majority of the Lodges under each of the three Constitutions must vote for an independent Grand Lodge before the matter would receive favourable consideration at home. We felt that with the wide variety of membership of our Lodges in

India, such a requirement might have the effect of holding up progress towards an independent Grand Lodge almost indefinitely ...⁶³

(Although in 1905 the then Grand Master did not sign the Concordat until the resolutions it contained had been approved by Grand Lodge, the 1960 agreement to waive one of its terms does not seem to have required Grand Lodge's prior approval.)

Reading between the lines, the decision to waive the 1905 Concordat must have been taken in the knowledge that in one or perhaps even two of the Home jurisdictions in India a two-thirds majority of lodges voting in favour might not have been achieved – and, on the other hand, that the pressure for 'progress' was such that lodges which voted in favour might simply have broken away and formed a Grand Lodge anyway (as they had in Canada in the 1850s and, more recently, in Queensland). It would appear that in 1960 the Home Grand Lodges preferred to aim for progress and harmony in India, rather than to stick rigidly to the 1905 Concordat.

In September 1961 the Board reported to Grand Lodge 'that the results of the ballot [of all Lodges in the subcontinent] show that ninety-six English Lodges together with a substantial number from the other two Constitutions wish to take part in the formation of an independent Grand Lodge of India' and that inauguration would take place on Friday, 24 November 1961. The Board continued:

'It is therefore hoped that all concerned will feel that the new Grand Lodge is being established under the best possible auspices and with the active support of the Home Grand Lodges ... In accordance with normal Masonic practice, it is the intention of the MW the Grand Master not to warrant any further English Lodges within the territory occupied by the new Grand Lodge. This and other similar matters will be the subject of a treaty to be formally ratified between the two Grand Lodges as soon after the establishment of the Grand Lodge of India as possible.'⁶⁴

On the stated date, the Grand Master Mason of Scotland consecrated the Grand Lodge of India, the Deputy Grand Master of Ireland constituted it and the Deputy Grand Master of the UGLE installed its first Grand Master.

On 13 December Grand Lodge received a copy of the Deputy Grand Master's report to the Grand Master, and accepted the Board's urgent motion that recognition be accorded immediately.⁶⁵ On the same day, the Grand Master, the Grand Registrar and the Grand Secretary signed the duplicate copy of the 'Concordat between the United Grand Lodge of England and the Grand Lodge of India', the other copy of which had been signed in New Delhi after the inauguration and installation on 24 November. Unlike the 1905 Concordat, this one was not put to Grand Lodge for approval but its text was attached as an appendix to the *Proceedings* of 13 December 1961. Three clauses of the Concordat are of particular interest here:⁶⁶

- (a) 'That the MW The Grand Master of the United Grand Lodge of England will in future grant no warrant for a new Lodge in any part of the Republic of India ...'
- (b) 'That the Grand Lodge of India expressly guarantees for each Lodge that decides to remain under the United Grand Lodge of England and for its members:
 - (i) Their right to the same [NB but undefined] privileges and courtesies which are now extended by the three Constitutions [that is the Home Grand Lodges] to one another
 - (ii) Their right not to have undue pressure put on them to persuade them to join the new Grand Lodge at a later stage
- (c) 'That any member of the Order, whether in the United Grand Lodge of England or in the Grand Lodge of India, who may be expelled by his Grand Lodge shall in no circumstances be permitted to join or visit a Lodge holden

under the other Grand Lodge' and 'That if any member be suspended by competent Masonic authority, save in the case where such suspension applies to a particular Lodge or Lodges only, the name and Lodge of the member together with the period of his suspension shall be communicated to the aforementioned authorities, and any member so suspended shall not be permitted during the period of such suspension to join or visit a Lodge holden under the other Grand Lodge.'

The UGLE and the Grand Lodge of India remained in amity, under this Concordat, until 1992.

BELGIUM

On 10 March 1965⁶⁷ the Grand Registrar of the UGLE, in his comments on a recommendation from the BGP to recognise the breakaway but regular 'Grand Lodge of Belgium', reminded Grand Lodge that the UGLE had severed relations with the Grand Orient of Belgium in the latter half of the 19th century 'because they did away with the Volume of the Sacred Law and a belief in a [*sic*] Supreme Being.' Five lodges, wishing to practise regularly and to be recognized as such, had since broken away from the Grand Orient of Belgium and in 1959 had been consecrated and constituted into the Grand Lodge of Belgium by Grand Master of the Grand East of the Netherlands. Grand Lodge was informed that:

'The Grand Lodge of Belgium having made application for fraternal recognition the Most Worshipful the Grand Master caused the usual enquiries to be made regarding its origin and standing, and the Board having adopted a favourable report from the External Relations Committee recommends that the Grand Lodge be invited to accord recognition to the Grand Lodge of Belgium.'

It was also noted that 'many Grand Lodges which the Grand Lodge of England recognises are now in fraternal relationship with the new Grand Lodge.' Scotland had already recognized it, and Ireland was believed to have followed suit. The UGLE accepted the BGP's recommendation. It had not acted precipitately; it had waited several years until it was certain that the Grand Lodge of Belgium was indeed practising regularly – and particularly, we may assume, that it conformed with those Basic Principles relating to the Volume of the Sacred Law and a belief in God with which the Grand Orient of Belgium had 'done away'.

THE GRAND LODGE ALPINA OF SWITZERLAND

The Board reported to Grand Lodge in September 1965⁶⁸ 'that so far as the Grand Lodge Alpina is concerned recognition of the Grand Lodge of France still exists, and Alpina would not be able, even if it wished, to prevent the attendance of irregular French Masons at meetings of its Lodges.' The BGP therefore recommended 'to the Grand Lodge that it should formally forbid all members of the English Constitution to attend meetings of the Grand Lodge Alpina of Switzerland or any of its constituent Lodges until such time as its relations with the Grand Lodge of France have been formally broken by a resolution of the Grand Lodge.' It gave three reasons for this recommendation:

1. 'To protect the integrity of members of the English Constitution'
2. 'to prevent the risk of their meeting in Lodge members of an irregular body'
3. 'to strengthen and encourage the Grand Master of the Grand Lodge Alpina of Switzerland and his Grand Officers to break off relations with the irregular Grand Lodge of France.'

With its approval of that recommendation, and for the first time since 1950 – perhaps

even in all its history – the UGLE restricted intervisitation with a Grand Lodge which it still recognised. English freemasons were no longer allowed to visit Swiss lodges even on condition that they would withdraw if any irregular freemason was found to be present. No outward visits were to be allowed at all.

A year later, the UGLE's sanctions against Alpina appeared to have worked. In September 1966 the Board reported that on 2 July 1966 Alpina had 'decided to break off relations with the irregular Grand Lodge of France'. The UGLE accepted the BGP's recommendation that the visiting ban imposed in the previous September should be withdrawn. Now keenly aware of its duty of promoting and protecting regular Freemasonry throughout the world, and adopting the designation which Lord Scarbrough had referred to as 'so-called' in 1958 (see above), Grand Lodge accepted the BGP's view that the Alpina affair:

'...will once more have shown the whole Masonic world that the United Grand Lodge of England is prepared to stand fast to basic principles, and will never in any circumstances tolerate irregular Freemasonry or be tempted to lower the standards which we as the Mother Grand Lodge of the world seek to maintain.'⁶⁹

When the President of the BGP and the Grand Secretary visited Grand Lodge Alpina in December 1966 they expressed the hope that the 'friendship within our two Grand Lodges which has lasted for so many years' would 'last for many years to come' 'despite the recent threat to it.'⁷⁰ That hope would be dashed in the 1970s.

ITALY

When in 1966 'in a response to a request from the MW the Grand Master' the BGP reported that it was investigating 'the Masonic situation in Italy' it told Grand Lodge that it was:

'...far from satisfied that there is any organization in that country exerting sole Masonic sovereignty, or that any one claiming such sovereignty has more justification than another in its claims. If and when this question of jurisdiction is settled to the satisfaction of the Board, it will be possible to proceed to the further question of regularity both of origin and of practice.'⁷¹

When the BGP next brought Italy to Grand Lodge's attention – in 1972 (see below) – it revealed that it had had additional reasons for not recommending the recognition of any Italian body in 1966.

LUXEMBOURG

Although it had applied to the Grand Master for recognition many years before, the Grand Lodge of Luxembourg was not recognized until 1969.⁷² The delay was occasioned by the lack of proof that the Grand Lodge of Luxembourg had been regularly established 'by a recognised Grand Lodge or by three or more regularly constituted Lodges'. In December 1969 the BGP was able to report to Grand Lodge that 'All our doubts upon that matter and any objection which might have arisen under that head have now been overcome by the good offices of the [recently recognised] Grand Lodge of Belgium.'

THE UNIVERSAL LEAGUE OF FREEMASONS

That the UGLE still had to guard its members against 'so-called International Associations... which admit to membership Bodies failing to conform strictly to the principles upon which the Grand Lodge of England is founded' is evident from the fact that in September 1965 it ruled that 'membership of it [the Universal League of Freemasons] or attendance at any of its functions is incompatible with regular Freemasonry.' This ban was not in itself surprising, but in recommending it the BGP unusually and incorrectly equated the lack of recognition with irregularity:

'...many of the members [of the Universal League of Freemasons] owe allegiance to Grand Lodges which are not recognised by us. At any gathering of the Universal League today, therefore, an English mason may be expected to come into contact with those who must be regarded as masonically irregular.'⁷³

QUASI- AND PARA-MASONIC BODIES

During a discussion about the admissibility of membership of the Order of the Eastern Star at the Quarterly Communication in December 1961⁷⁴ the President of the BGP had to remind Grand Lodge of the fourth Basic Principles, namely 'That the membership of the GL and individual Lodges shall be composed exclusively of men; and that each GL shall have no Masonic intercourse of any kind with mixed Lodges or bodies which admit women to membership.' Some Brethren then asked for the 1921 ruling against recognition of the Eastern Star (see above) to be reviewed. The Grand Master, Lord Scarbrough, said the ruling was clear and should be followed, but added that:

'If later a very large number of Brethren do feel that this issue which has been raised about the Order of the Eastern Star ought to be investigated again – and I hope that will not be the case ... that can be done on some future occasion, and very deliberately, by the BGP.'

The issue does not seem to have been raised again.

On 9 March 1966 Grand Lodge ruled against membership of 'The Independent United Order of Mechanics'. The BGP had reported that the Order had 'certain resemblances to the Craft which are enough to bring it prima facie within the terms of Rule 176' and that it appeared 'that this Order has settled in England in a wider and more permanent basis than heretofore.'⁷⁵

THE EXTRA-CRAFT DEGREES AND ORDERS

The existence of other masonic Orders and Degrees to which members of the Craft could belong without risking Grand Lodge censure was only very occasionally mentioned in Grand Lodge during the 1960s:

In the 'Penalties Debate' of 9 December 1964 His Hon Judge F. Donald McIntyre, *QC*. PAGReg said:

'There are other Degrees, you know, to which, in due time some of you may come and some have already come, where Obligations are imposed without the slightest sign of a penalty in any shape or form. So far as I know, nobody admitted into those Degrees – those side Degrees, as they are sometimes called – has ever failed the solemn trust which he has undertaken without penalty.'

And when investing RW Bro Lord Harris with the Grand Master's Order of Service to Masonry in March 1968 the presiding officer, the Deputy Grand Master, said of him that 'perhaps his greatest quality is his capacity for conciliation and for maintaining relations between the various Masonic bodies and organisations.'⁷⁶

THE GRAND MASTER'S INSTALLATION IN 1967

The expansion of England's international relations since 1950 was demonstrated at the installation of Bro HRH The Duke of Kent as Grand Master on St. John's Day on 27 June 1967 by the representation of 69 of the 101 Grand Lodges now recognized by the UGLE (65 by their Grand Masters and four more by Representatives). External relations, and the UGLE's international responsibilities, were frequently mentioned during the proceedings, as were the essential basic principles.⁷⁷ The following extracts from the *Proceedings* must suffice here:

- The Representatives of the UGLE near other Grand Lodges were severally received and then formally welcomed by the Pro Grand Master ‘as part of ourselves.’⁷⁸
- The Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Massachusetts reported his Grand Lodge’s continuing adherence ‘to the ancient Landmarks and Masonic principles laid down by the Mother Grand Lodge in 1723’.
- The Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Belgium described the UGLE’s ‘clearly assumed mission in the world’ as ‘to be the exemplary keeper of masonry’s true tradition’.

Finally, having first declared that ‘there is only one true type of Freemasonry, based on belief in God and his Revealed Will,’ the newly installed Grand Master, MW Bro HRH The Duke of Kent, addressed his Pro Grand Master, Lord Scarbrough, and recalled his role in the defence of regular Freemasonry since 1951:

‘MW ProGM, when you were installed in this same place in 1951, the disruptive influence of the second World War was still very evident. By no means had all the Grand Lodges which had disappeared under its shadow been yet revived. While some were struggling to set themselves up again on their old foundation, against the opposition of materialism and a growing abandonment of spiritual values, it was evident that others would be content to water down their basic requirements, little realising how quickly such a lowering of standards would weaken their whole structure. We were indeed fortunate in your leadership at such a critical time, fortunate that you gave every encouragement to those in authority in our external relations to maintain the standards set up by our Basic Principles and our Aims and Relationships, which had been published to the world and which gave, and still give, a standard of Masonic regularity to all who care to apply them. These two documents contain all that is vital in our GL contacts with our Masonic neighbours.’

The 1970s

INTRODUCTION

In the 1970s the UGLE had to deal once again with problems of regularity in Switzerland and Belgium. A few Grand Lodges were added to the list of those it recognised, some only after lengthy investigation. As the ease of international travel and communications increased, the UGLE became more aware of the complications which could arise from the fact that some Grand Lodges – especially some it had long recognised – applied different standards when assessing a Grand Lodge’s regularity and when according recognition.

MANAGEMENT

There were no significant changes in the way the UGLE managed its external relations during the 1970s, as far as one can tell from its official publications. Rulers continued to travel widely and Representatives were noticed at Quarterly Communications. The 1976 conference ‘of all regular European Grand Lodges’ which the UGLE initiated was probably a significant event: the Grand Master referred to it in his 1977 Address to Grand Lodge and said that it was the first since 1957 (though the 1957 one is not otherwise mentioned in the *Proceedings*), but no details of its deliberations were reported to Grand Lodge.⁷⁹

TURKEY

The UGLE recognized the Grand Lodge of Turkey in 1970, but only after the BGP had spent several years satisfying itself that it was of regular origin and that there was ‘a substantial link between the Grand Lodge of Turkey as revived in 1948 and its earlier existence before suppression in or about 1935.’ The BGP had been worried that ‘It

appeared at first to have originated out of the wholly irregular Grand Orient of France' but the BGP now accepted Turkey's claim 'that its principal sponsor was the Grand Lodge of Egypt which at the time in question was still working regularly and was still recognised by the UGLE.'⁸⁰ The Grand Orient of France had cast a long shadow.

THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

In December 1970 the Grand Lodge of the Dominican Republic was recognized. The *Proceedings*⁸¹ do not relate how long it had taken the BGP to satisfy itself after it received the application to the Grand Master for recognition – the applicant had been established in 1865/1866 – merely that 'lengthy correspondence has now shown that this Grand Lodge in its origin, its principles, and its recognition of [*sic*] other Grand Lodges conforms to the requirements of the UGLE.' This statement by the BGP is noteworthy as it would appear to be the first time – certainly in the period under review – that the BGP had at least one specific requirement over and above the Basic Principles for Grand Lodge recognition, namely that the applicant should not have masonic relations with Grand Lodges of which the UGLE did not approve. (It will be recalled that as far as relations with other bodies are concerned the fourth Basic principle requires only that 'each Grand Lodge shall have no masonic intercourse of any kind with mixed or bodies which admit women to membership.')⁸²

IRAN

Unlike the Grand Lodge of Turkey and even the Grand Lodge of the Dominican Republic, the Grand Lodge of Iran was recognized by the UGLE in December 1970 within months of its establishment, thereby setting a precedent for similar cases in the future. The Board explained its decision to change its normal policy as follows:

'This Grand Lodge, recently formed by a union of Scottish, French (GLNF), and German Lodges, has applied for recognition. Such recognition has already been granted by the sponsoring Grand Lodges, and in the circumstances the Board can see no advantage to be gained by the exercise of its normal policy of waiting to see how a new Grand Lodge develops in its early and formative years before granting recognition...'⁸³

ALPINA (*continued*)

In March 1971⁸⁴ the UGLE 'completely severed' its relations with the Grand Lodge Alpina of Switzerland on the ground that by still permitting irregular freemasons [that is members of the Grand Lodge of France] to attend its meetings Alpina no longer satisfied the fifth Basic Principle for Grand Lodge recognition, namely that of exercising 'sovereign jurisdiction over the Lodges under its control.' This was particularly painful for the President of the BGP. He was the Representative of Alpina 'next to the Grand Lodge of England.' He had received an assurance from the new Grand Master of Alpina that he was as determined as his predecessor not to permit intercourse with the Grand Lodge of France – only to discover on his return to England that even during his visit to Switzerland a letter from Alpina's Deputy Grand Master had been in circulation to all Swiss Lodges to the effect that 'individual Masters were free to admit visitors from Grand Lodges which are not recognized by the Grand Lodge Alpina.' In moving the motion for de-recognition the Grand Registrar commented that:

'This, Brethren, is not the attitude of a sovereign Grand Lodge: it is not the attitude of a Grand Lodge that follows the course of regularity even at the risk of losing some of its members: it is more typical of a loose confederation of independent Lodges, each setting up its own standards of Masonic right and wrong.'

It may be relevant to note here that later in 1971, on the death of RW Bro E.J. Rutter OSM, the Chairman of the External Relations Committee, W Bro Oscar F. Boehringer

was appointed his successor. In any case, fifteen months later⁸⁵ the UGLE re-recognized Alpina on receiving the BGP's report that:

'The Directorate of the Grand Lodge Alpina has now withdrawn the circular letter which the Board understood as opening the door of Swiss Lodges to irregular Masons, and has made it clear that it intends to exert full control over its constituent Lodges. In the light of the assurances given, it appears to the Board that it would be unreasonable to maintain the withdrawal of recognition, a step taken at the time with deep regret and as a last resort.'

Reading between the lines of the *Proceedings* it would appear that not all the Grand Lodges recognized by the UGLE had followed its example in derecognizing Alpina in 1971, and that the UGLE had had to explain its action in greater detail than would perhaps have been the case in earlier years. The key relevant passage in the BGP's Report is:

'The Board would wish Grand Lodge to know that its example in this matter has been followed by Grand Lodges in the Commonwealth and elsewhere, and that much correspondence has ensued with other Grand Lodges in fuller explanation of what took place. The Board is firmly convinced that the UGLE has made a successful stand for regularity on behalf of Freemasonry as a whole.'

The UGLE would have to take even greater care in future to prepare the ground for any action it proposed to take in its efforts to coordinate international defence against irregular Freemasonry, particularly against the continuing influence of those irregular Bodies in France whose practice it deemed irregular⁸⁶ in terms of its essential Basic Principles.

ITALY

After many years of doubt and difficulties, and in close coordination with its Sister Constitutions, the UGLE finally recognized the Grand Orient of Italy in September 1972.⁸⁷ The BGP explained that its first doubts had concerned the Grand Orient of Italy's regularity of origin, but that it had now come to the conclusion that:

'...there can be no reasonable doubt that the earliest Lodges in that country had obtained their Warrants from England. It is claimed, and there seems to be no reason to doubt the authenticity of the claim, that the present day Freemasons of Italy are in direct Masonic descent from those Lodges and from other equally regular parent bodies that had established Lodges in the various independent States that made up Italy prior to its unification in the last century. There appear to have been sufficient survivors from the period of suppression of Freemasonry under the fascist regime for organised activity to start again almost at once...'

But, as the BGP had told Grand Lodge in 1966⁸⁸ Freemasonry had then 'started haphazard under a considerable number of authorities which constantly regrouped themselves and gave little evidence of either permanence, stability of sovereignty.'

What the Board had not told Grand Lodge in 1966 was that:

'...shortly after the best established and the most widespread had sought recognition from England what appeared to be good evidence came to light that its leaders had sought to apply pressure on their members to vote in a particular direction at a General Election.'⁸⁹

Thus when the GOI had first applied for recognition (presumably in the early 1950s), the Board was not only concerned as to whether it exercised 'sole Masonic sovereignty' in Italy, as it had been in 1966. It must also have been of the view either that the GOI failed to satisfy the seventh Basic Principle which requires that 'the discussion of...

politics within the Lodge shall be strictly prohibited' or that it was not following the seventh principle set out in *Aims and Relationships of the Craft* namely the 'unalterable policy of standing aloof from every question affecting the relations between one government and another, or between political parties.'

By September 1972, however, the Board had decided the following 'four main points':

- (i) The Grand Orient of Italy is now indisputably the predominant Masonic organisation in the whole of Italy: while splinter groups exist, and are likely to continue to exist in the light of the fissile nature of Italian affairs (for it should be remembered that Italy as a nation is a bare century old) they are only splinter groups, unrecognised outside Italy and unable inside Italy seriously to contest the Grand Orient's claim to Masonic sovereignty
- (ii) The Grand Orient has been meticulous in the last two decades in avoiding any imputation of political interference and has removed from the questionnaire put to candidates for initiation any reference to political affiliations
- (iii) The Grand Orient of Italy does not, since the restoration of relations between the UGLE and the Grand Lodge Alpina of Switzerland, have relations with any Grand Lodge which England considers to be irregular or does not recognise
- (iv) The Grand Orient's principles correspond closely with those of other recognised Grand Lodges, and are such as the UGLE can accept as satisfactory.'

The Board accordingly recommended that the Grand Lodge grant recognition, adding the intriguing comment that 'this will render the circle of our Masonic recognitions in Europe complete.' (The absence of Spain and Portugal is explained by the fact that Freemasonry was still banned in those countries.)

In respect of the development and application of the UGLE's external relations policy its recognition of the Grand Orient of Italy is noteworthy for the three reasons:

- (i) in a territory occupied by several Grand Lodges, the UGLE had in the end opted for the 'predominant Masonic organisation' and the one which had the best claim to 'Masonic sovereignty', as it had in Germany a few years before;
- (ii) the Grand Orient was the first Body since at least 1950 to have been suspected of contravening the seventh Basic Principle; and
- (iii) the GOI's Masonic intercourse with the Grand Lodge Alpina while Alpina was no longer recognized would have blocked the GOI's recognition.

JAPAN

The Grand Lodge of Japan had been formed in 1957 by the Grand Lodge of the Philippines. Since then, England had formed no more lodges there, for, as the Pro Grand Master said in his Report to Grand Lodge in December 1973⁹⁰ on his visit to the English Constitution Rising Sun Lodge in Kobe:

'It is common knowledge...that in accordance with Masonic practice following the establishment of a national Grand Lodge no further warrants are issued by external bodies.'

By 1973 Scotland and Massachusetts had already recognized the Grand Lodge of Japan, with which they too shared the territory. But the Pro Grand Master also reported that the District Grand Master had strongly recommended against recognizing Japan 'in the foreseeable future, and this view together with his reasons for it have been transmitted to the BGP.' The reasons were not explained to Grand Lodge at that time and did not come to light until recognition was finally granted in 1985 (see below).

COMPLICATIONS WITH RECOGNITION

By September 1974 the BGP felt it necessary to acknowledge that not all Grand Lodges

recognized the same Grand Lodges as the UGLE and to advise Brethren in some detail as to how to extract themselves from potentially embarrassing situations:

‘Brethren must also be careful to remember that the lists of recognised Grand Lodges differ to no small extent between one Grand Lodge and another, so that it is always possible that when they visit a Lodge under another Constitution there will be present, quite legitimately so far as it is concerned, members of a Constitution not recognised by ourselves. Such a situation calls for tact and diplomacy on the part of our members in withdrawing without giving offence, particularly where the visit has been formally arranged; but it has to be borne in mind that it is part of their duty as members of the English Constitution not to associate masonically with members of unrecognised Constitutions and that this duty transcends the more apparent calls of courtesy and politeness. When visits are contemplated or being arranged it is therefore essential to ascertain in writing through the G Sec’s office whether the Lodge to be visited is fully alive to this complication, and is prepared to accept it.’⁹¹

Four years later, the Grand Master himself returned to this subject and explained why the UGLE tended to take longer than some of its friends to recognize a Grand Lodge, and why it often recognised fewer than they did:

‘The whole system and science of Masonic foreign relations is a complicated business at which over the years the Board of General Purposes has become most adept: their long experience has taught them to beware of pitfalls and to be cautious about taking precipitate action. I am not infrequently asked why we do not recognise such and such a Grand Lodge when the whole of the North American Continent does, and I am able to reply with confidence that the Board is not influenced by such considerations and is taking the case on its merits: that it has the advantage too in many cases of having advice available from expert members of our own Constitution on the spot. I believe that Grand Lodge’s reputation stands high with all Grand Lodges that are determined to maintain the standards that we and they have inherited, and correspondingly low with those – and unhappily they do exist – that are all for “moving with the times” and under cover of so doing abandoning the principles for which we have stood, and are standing and, God willing, will continue to stand’.⁹²

BELGIUM (continued)

In June 1979 the UGLE withdrew recognition from the Grand Lodge of Belgium on the grounds that ‘The requirement of belief in God has virtually been abandoned’ and ‘There is little discouragement of, and no sanctions against, inter-visitation with irregular bodies.’ Judging by the way UGLE had acted in the past, the first of these grounds was the one which caused the immediate rupture of relations. While the UGLE could not be accused of interfering directly in the internal affairs of another Grand Lodge, the Board did state that this drastic action ‘will leave the regular Lodges and Brethren free to take such action within Belgium as will re-establish masonry in that country on a regular basis.’⁹³

In December 1979 the BGP was able to report that the Regular Grand Lodge of Belgium had been established ‘immediately’ after the UGLE withdrew recognition from the Grand Lodge of Belgium. The BGP’s recommendation that the UGLE should already recognize the fledgling Regular Grand Lodge of Belgium was accepted without debate, as usual. As the UGLE was not known for taking what its Grand Master had recently described as precipitate action we can only assume that there must have been very close cooperation between the UGLE and the ‘staunch upholders of regularity’ in Belgium for some considerable time before England broke off relations with the Grand Lodge of Belgium in June 1979.

From the UGLE’s official publications one cannot tell in this instance the extent to which the UGLE sought a coordinated international response to this latest outbreak of irregularity. But in September 1982⁹⁴ the BGP had to warn members of the English Constitution that:

'...unfortunately a few [recognised European Grand Lodges] still recognise the Grand Lodge of Belgium. Brethren of the English Constitution wishing to visit Lodges in Europe should, therefore, be on their guard against Masonic contact with members of Lodges under the Grand Lodge of Belgium.'

As the UGLE does not appear to have restricted or severed relations with any Grand Lodge over its continued recognition of the Grand Lodge of Belgium after the UGLE had found it to be irregular in terms of one of the 'essential' Basic Principles, and as the problem does not resurface in the *Proceedings*, we may perhaps make two assumptions: first, that the UGLE allowed its friends time to catch up with it, and second that they soon did so. (It will be recalled that in 1965, when Alpina was found not to have stopped visits from members of the similarly irregular Grand Lodge of France, the UGLE forbade visits to Swiss lodges and then derecognized Alpina in 1971.)

The 1980s

INTRODUCTION

Judging from the *Proceedings* this decade seems to have posed UGLE fewer problems than its two predecessors. Six Grand Lodges were recognized (three very promptly). In two remarkable cases, intervisitation was not restricted. A new problem was located within England. And Rules and procedures concerning visitors and candidates from other jurisdictions were strengthened. With the advantage of hindsight one now knows that this was the calm before the storms that broke in the 1990s.

RULES AND PROCEDURES

In 1982,⁹⁵ perhaps in reaction to the growing complexity of Masonic interconstitutional relations, the BGP not only issued its annual warning but instructed lodges that:

'In the case of candidates [for initiation] whose residence or place of business is in a locality which is under the jurisdiction of another Grand Lodge, enquiry should be made of the Grand Secretary of this Grand Lodge, who will, if appropriate, pass the enquiry to the Grand Secretary of the foreign Grand Lodge.'

It also somewhat cryptically drew members' attention 'to the provisions of subparagraphs (e) to (h) of Rule 163 regarding Joining Members from lodges under another Grand Lodge.' Under this Rule, before the ballot can be taken for such a Joining Member, the Secretary of the Lodge has to 'apply to the Grand Secretary... to ascertain that the Grand Lodge under which the Brother *was* initiated *is* [my emphasis] recognised by the Grand Lodge.'⁹⁶

The new problem arose from the fact that 'There are Lodges of unrecognised Grand Lodges meeting in England, mostly connected with the "King Solomon Grand Lodge."⁹⁷ The BGP therefore noted that 'the hazard of admitting a member of an unrecognized Constitution arises not only in connection with overseas visitors.'

ALASKA AND HAWAII

These two new Grand Lodges were recognized in the same years that they were established: Alaska in 1981 and Hawaii in 1989. That their applications for recognition were dealt with on the fast track is explained by the fact that they both were formed by lodges that until then had been under the jurisdiction of a recognized Grand Lodge, namely and respectively the Grand Lodges of Washington and California.

SPAIN

The UGLE took somewhat longer to recognize the Grand Lodge of Spain although it had also been sponsored by a recognized Grand Lodge, in this case the National Grand

Lodge of France (the 'GLNF'), and comprised lodges which hitherto had been under the GLNF's jurisdiction. In recommending Spain's recognition in June 1987⁹⁸ the Board explained that the matter had been 'under constant review' and that there had been 'much correspondence on the subject and a report by [the District Grand Master for Gibraltar].' There are still echoes of the BGP's caution in its report that it now felt that 'so long as can be reasonably forecast, the Grand Lodge of Spain will continue to maintain a regular path.' Despite this unusual note of hesitation the recommendation was accepted.

GABON

Gabon, another creation of the GLNF, had to wait six years after its establishment in 1983 before it was recognized by the UGLE in September 1989.⁹⁹ No explanation of the delay was given to Grand Lodge, despite the BGP's expressed confidence in this case 'that the Grand Lodge of Gabon will continue to maintain a regular path.' Perhaps Gabon had been slow to forward its application for recognition? Gabon would prove to be the first of several African Grand Lodges formed by the GLNF in the 1980s and 1990s to be recognised by the UGLE (see below).

JAPAN (continued)

The BGP had kept the Grand Lodge of Japan (established in 1957) under review for many years, and had reported to Grand Lodge in 1973 that its case for recognition was not supported locally (see above). That in 1985 the BGP felt able to recommend recognition was apparently due to either or both of the following reasons, each taken from the terms of the Board's report to Grand Lodge: Japan was now recognized by 'a large number of other regular Grand Lodges' and/or that 'Appropriate arrangements are being made to safeguard the interests of the District of Hong Kong and the Far East.'¹⁰⁰ The latter is more likely to have been the stronger reason as the UGLE still had one Lodge in Japan (in Kobe) and members of the English Constitution were probably still interested in the future of the 'Masonic Hall in Yokohama which was rebuilt after the earthquake of 1923 almost entirely out of English funds.'¹⁰¹

CHINA

Like the Grand Lodge of Japan, the Grand Lodge of China had been formed after the Second World War by lodges under the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of the Philippines. Soon after its establishment 'it went into abeyance' but 'was reconstituted in Taiwan in 1954.'¹⁰² One can perhaps gather from the terms of the Board's recommendation on its behalf in December 1987 that there were concerns about the safeguarding of the UGLE's lodges in Hong Kong: 'the Board feels confident that the interests of our Brethren in Hong Kong and the Far East will be safeguarded.' Grand Lodge accepted the recommendation, and the Board's unique rider 'that to reflect its *de facto* jurisdiction more accurately it be listed in the *Masonic Year Book* under the title "Grand Lodge of China (reconstituted in Taipei in 1954)".'

ARGENTINA

Argentina and the United Kingdom were at war from early April until mid June 1982. Whereas for the Second World War the UGLE had decided that 'No Brother being a national of any State with which Great Britain is at War shall attend or be admitted to any Masonic Meeting held under the English Constitution,' for this more local war, with a country where there were still English lodges, Grand Lodge was not even asked to consider restricting intervisitation. Perhaps the BGP decided to 'wait and see' before bringing the matter to the attention of Grand Lodge, or perhaps events moved too quickly for there to be any noticeable local impact on fraternal relations between the two Constitutions. The *Proceedings* are silent on this matter.

ITALY (continued)

In 1981 the Lodge P2 affair broke on to the news-stands. In June¹⁰³ the BGP reported that the Grand Orient of Italy¹⁰⁴ had informed it that Lodge P2 had been suspended since 1976, that its Master had also been suspended, and that 'proceedings are pending against him before the appropriate Masonic tribunal in Italy.' Moreover, the BGP was able to assure Grand Lodge that 'The authorities of the Grand Orient have recently reaffirmed their adherence to the Basic Principles for Recognition, and in particular No. 7.' Recognition was not affected and the matter was not mentioned again in Grand Lodge during the 1980s.

1990-2000*INTRODUCTION*

Though well attended by the majority of the Grand Lodges it recognised, the UGLE's celebration of its 275th anniversary was held in June 1992 under some ominous clouds, and the storm broke almost immediately afterwards. Within two years – and without the support of the overwhelming majority of its friends overseas – the UGLE had withdrawn recognition from the Grand Lodges of India and Greece and the Grand Orient of Italy, and banned its members (even those in its remaining lodges in Canada) from visiting an ever growing list of North American Grand Lodges because of their relations with Prince Hall Grand Lodges. Faced with widespread misunderstanding, opposition and even retaliation, the UGLE revisited, developed and explained in greater detail and with greater frequency than ever its relations with other Grand Lodges. Between 1990 and the end of 2000 the subject was brought before Grand Lodge more often than in any similar period in its history, and must have been a major and constant preoccupation of those who managed its affairs.

The storm had not died away by the end of 2000, but some positive achievements during this period can also be recorded: new or re-formed Grand Lodges in Eastern Europe and Africa were recognized; Uruguay was re-recognized and a log-jam was broken in Brazil; several Prince Hall Grand Lodges were granted recognition; and full relations were eventually restored with all previously recognized Grand Lodges in the USA – and in Canada where, in the shared territory of Newfoundland and Labrador, the UGLE unusually allowed its lodges to establish a new Grand Lodge.

As events between the 275th anniversary in June 1992 and the end of 1994 had a significant impact on the UGLE's relations with most of the Craft Grand Lodges it recognized, I shall present the facts about the period 1990-2000 (as published in the *Proceedings*) in three sections: before July 1992, from July 1992 to the end of 1993, and then from 1994 to 2000.

*(1) From March 1990 to June 1992**MANAGEMENT*

A 'useful' meeting of European Grand Secretaries was held in London in November 1990 and 'was attended by most of the Grand Secretaries of European Grand Lodges.'¹⁰⁵ In his Address to the UGLE on 24 April 1991¹⁰⁶ the Grand Master reported that the November meeting had 'confirmed European Grand Lodges' common understanding of the basic principles' and he commented that 'In the past year there has been more activity than usual in what the Board calls External Relations – that is, relations between us and other Grand Lodges.' In December 1991 Bro Boehringer retired as Chairman of the External Relations Committee after 20 years' service, and was praised thus by the Grand Master when investing him as a member of his Order of Service to Masonry:

'...his advice and experience have been valued by Presidents, the Board, Grand Secretaries

and Senior Masons overseas for more than twenty years. He has travelled extensively and often on Masonic business - mainly in Europe, where his command of languages, wide-ranging interests and personal contacts have served Grand Lodge well...'¹⁰⁷

Bro Boehringer was succeeded as Chairman of the Committee first by RW Bro J.M. Marcus Humphrey of Dinnet (whom, as 'the MW Grand Master Mason of our sister Grand Lodge of Scotland,' the Grand Master had constituted a member of the English Grand Lodge and appointed its Senior Grand Warden in 1986 under Rule 7 to mark Scotland's 250th anniversary)¹⁰⁸ and then by RW Bro Sir John Welch in 1997.

GERMANY (continued) and THE GRAND LODGE OF FRANCE (again)

In June 1990 the President of the Board reported to Grand Lodge that:

'Earlier this year we heard that the Grand Lodge of AFAM of Germany, one of the Constituent Grand Lodges of the United Grand Lodges of Germany, were permitting intervisitation with Brethren of Lodges under the unrecognised Grand Lodge of France...Correspondence with Germany established that this action by a subordinate Grand Lodge was with the knowledge and approval of the Senate of the United Grand Lodges and was "...to normalise a frequent and clandestine practice..."'¹⁰⁹

The Board ordered members of the English Craft to stop visiting lodges under the United Grand Lodges of Germany, though it did not forbid visits the other way.

In the circumstances, the Board's report seems to be a considerable understatement of the shock and/or annoyance with which it must have received the German Senate's reply to its questions, and its reaction appears to have been surprisingly mild. All recognised Grand Lodges were well aware of the seriousness with which the UGLE viewed any contact with those Grand Lodges it had classified as irregular, particularly the Grand Orient of France and the Grand Lodge of France. After all, relations had only recently been severed with the Grand Lodge of Belgium and (briefly) with the Grand Lodge Alpina for infractions in this respect. That the UGLE did not ban visits from German to English lodges (let alone require those who were members of both the English and the German Constitutions to choose between them) may have been due to the fact that one of the 'Constituent' German Grand Lodges was the 'Grand Lodge of British Freemasons in Germany' and/or to the hope that the one-way ban on visits would be a sufficient shot across the bows of United Grand Lodges of Germany in whose creation it had played such an important part. Whatever the reason, Germany soon assured the UGLE that the practice would stop, and in December the restriction on intervisitation was removed.¹¹⁰

Two words in the BGP's report of June 1990 are worth further comment here: 'unrecognised' as applied to the Grand Lodge of France, and 'subordinate' as a description of the constituent Grand Lodges in Germany. While the GLF was indeed 'unrecognised' it had also been declared to be 'irregular', and it is therefore surprising that the more serious description was not applied in this instance. The description of the five Grand Lodges comprising the United Grand Lodges of Germany as 'subordinate' may not have been very palatable to them but was technically correct as they had transferred to the United Grand Lodges of Germany all responsibility for the Craft's external and public relations. By joining the union none could therefore claim to be an entirely 'independent, self-governing organization' as required by the fifth Basic Principle. That is presumably why none of the constituent Grand Lodges is recognized by the UGLE.

URUGUAY (continued)

Forty years after it had been declared irregular (see above) the Grand Lodge of Uruguay was re-recognized by the UGLE on 12 September 1990. The BGP had at last been able

to report that 'it now seems the former atheist influence...has been eradicated' and that it had received 'Assurances that regularity has been restored.'

HUNGARY and CZECHOSLOVAKIA

In Eastern Europe the political context had significantly changed. In November 1989 Hungary's National Assembly had 'approved an amended constitution which described Hungary as an independent democratic state,'¹¹¹ and the Berlin Wall had been opened. 'Free elections were held in Czechoslovakia in June 1990 and the Communist party was defeated.'¹¹²

Not surprisingly, those who attended the Quarterly Communication on 12 September 1990 loudly applauded Grand Lodge's decision to recognize the Symbolic Grand Lodge of Hungary.¹¹³ Its recognition so soon after its establishment in 1989 is explained by the fact that it consisted of lodges that until then had been under the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of Austria, with which the Board had resumed relations on behalf of Grand Lodge in December 1952 (see above).

The revived Grand Lodge of Czechoslovakia was recognized three months later, in December 1990.¹¹⁴ The BGP did not follow the precedent it had set with the Grand Lodge of Austria in 1952 but instead reverted to the normal practice of putting its recommendation to Grand Lodge for approval. The Board noted that the Grand Lodge of Czechoslovakia:

'...which was recognised by the UGLE in 1930, was forced to close in 1939. This summer, survivors revived the Grand Lodge for a second time and it has now applied for recognition. The re-formed GL is regular...'

PRINCE HALL GRAND LODGES

Unfortunately, while barriers between the peoples of Western and Eastern Europe were being dismantled, masonic barriers were being erected between members of the English Craft and certain North American Grand Lodges. In June 1990¹¹⁵ the Board told Grand Lodge that:

'Reports have been received of intervisitation between Brethren of some Grand Lodges in North America and their counterparts under unrecognised "Prince Hall" Grand Lodges. Until more definite news has been received and considered, Brethren visiting North America should be more than usually alert to the possibility of Masonic association with Brethren under unrecognised Grand Lodges, and, as usual, take polite but effective measures to withdraw if necessary.'

By March 1991 the Board had 'considered reports that the Grand Lodges of Connecticut, Wisconsin, Nebraska and the State of Washington have each recognised the "Prince Hall" Grand Lodge operating within its jurisdiction, been recognised by it and have established reciprocal rights of intervisitation.' It concluded that 'This means that members of Masonic constitutions not recognised by the UGLE may be encountered in Lodges in North America under Grand Lodges which we at present recognise' and it accordingly banned visits to Lodges under those four Grand Lodges. When adding Colorado and Minnesota to the proscribed list for outward visits in June 1991 the President of the BGP indicated to Grand Lodge that the Board was faced with a so far intractable problem:

'I fear others will follow [on to the list], Brethren, but you may be sure that we are trying hard to find a solution to this problem but, I emphasise, not at the expense of compromising our adherence to the basic principles for Grand Lodge recognition'¹¹⁶

However, the BGP did not at that time brief Grand Lodge on Prince Hall Freemasonry,

nor explain why it could not recognize a Prince Hall Grand Lodge already recognized by the 'State' Grand Lodge.

When the Grand Master addressed Grand Lodge in April 1991, and when the President of the BGP announced that North Dakota and Idaho had been added to the list in March 1992, their statements indicated that the UGLE's restriction of masonic intercourse with an increasing number of the Grand Lodges it recognized in the USA was not well understood and that impatience was being voiced:

'We all hope that it will not be long before a solution to this particular problem is found, but in the meantime bans like this, which are not imposed lightly, are essential if we are to continue to adhere to the basic principles for Grand Lodge recognition. These principles are important as guardians of Masonic regularity, and I wish those concerned well as they work to preserve Freemasonry as we and other regular Grand Lodges know it.'¹¹⁷

'Brethren, you may wonder at the Board's apparently unsympathetic attitude to the difficulties which arise from the recognition or near recognition of "Prince Hall" Freemasonry by some North American Grand Lodges. The Board believes that it understands what our North American Brethren intend, but cannot, for various and good reasons, follow the line being taken by them. In the meantime, lack of news of diplomatic activity does not mean that nothing is being done'¹¹⁸

THE IVORY COAST

The UGLE recognized the Grand Lodge of the Ivory Coast in March 1991.¹¹⁹ It had been formed from Lodges previously under the National Grand Lodge of France in February 1989 and it would prove to be the first of several such Grand Lodges in Africa that the UGLE recognised promptly after their inauguration.

ALPINA and the GRAND LODGE OF FRANCE (yet again)

Also in March 1991 the President of the BGP had once again to report that he had 'heard that some Lodges under the Swiss Grand Lodge "Alpina" were visiting and receiving visits from Brethren under the unrecognised Grand Lodge of France.'¹²⁰ In view of Alpina's poor record in this respect (see above) and the UGLE's recent sanctions against the United Grand Lodges of Germany for the same fault it is surprising that the UGLE did not react vigorously on this occasion. Instead it accepted the BGP's advice that as Alpina's Grand Chancellor had since 'written to say that Swiss Lodges should be in no doubt that such visitors should not be received' the position should 'be kept under review' and that 'in the meantime, Brethren of the English Constitution should ensure that the only French Freemasons they meet when visiting Switzerland are those under the Grande Loge Nationale Française.'

COLOMBIA and the 'restated' SHARED TERRITORY RULE

In March 1992 the UGLE added a fourth Colombian Grand Lodge (the 'Occidental Grand Lodge of Colombia at Cali,' formed in 1935) to the three it already recognized in the territory. The President of the BGP commented that the proposed recognition would be:

'...interesting as an apparent exception to what was understood as a general rule: that only one Grand Lodge is recognised in any one territory. The rule is better stated as a preference for recognising one Grand Lodge per territory, but permitting the recognition of two (or more) if they agree to share jurisdiction. This restated rule...also applies in those parts of the world where there are Lodges of the English Constitution operating amicably within the territory of another Grand Lodge.'¹²¹

PORTUGAL

Also in March 1992 the UGLE recognised the 'Regular Grand Lodge of Portugal' (into which the GLN of France had transformed its six lodges there in June 1991), the Board

having made the unusual statement that it believed that 'the cause of regular Freemasonry in Portugal will be enhanced if the new Grand Lodge is now accorded recognition'.¹²² Until then the UGLE must have deemed Portugal to be 'open' territory¹²³ for it had formed three lodges there since 1989.¹²³ Normally, after the formation of a regular sovereign Grand Lodge in such a territory¹²⁴, the UGLE would then have regarded it as 'closed' and observed the masonic convention of not forming any new lodges there. In Portugal's case, however, the Board had obtained from the new and sovereign Grand Lodge an undertaking that it would safeguard not only 'the future of our Lodges' but also 'our rights to warrant new Lodges' there.¹²⁵ Only in South Africa had such 'rights' been preserved on the recognition of a local sovereign Grand Lodge (see above). The *Proceedings* do not relate why or how this most unusual concession on the part of the Regular Grand Lodge of Portugal was obtained.¹²⁶

THE UGLE'S 275TH ANNIVERSARY

At the celebration of the UGLE's 275th anniversary at the Royal Albert Hall in London on 10 June 1992, which had been planned as 'an important international event',¹²⁷ there were represented no fewer than 84 of the 117 Grand Lodges it recognized. (At the Grand Master's Installation in 1967 the figures were 69 out of 101.) The visitors, particularly those from Hungary and Czechoslovakia, were warmly welcomed and heard the Grand Master say that whereas the UGLE could 'take little credit for the increase of Grand Lodges which we recognise as regular' he counted as an achievement 'the care taken by our Board of General Purposes, working closely with the Grand Lodges of Ireland and Scotland, to maintain regularity as we see it'. The Grand Master also reminded his audience that 'the recognition of a Grand Lodge is an act of sovereignty, which cannot be ordered by other bodies, but it follows Basic Principles which are followed by all regular Grand Lodges.'¹²⁸ These comments are of particular interest in the context of this paper as they show the UGLE's awareness that although 'all regular Grand Lodges' might indeed follow the same basic principles, they could and did differ in according or withdrawing recognition, or in restricting masonic intercourse with a recognised Grand Lodge.

(2) From July 1992 to December 1993

INDIA (continued)

In its Paper of Business for the Quarterly Communication to be held in September 1992 the Board stated:

'...[that it had learned] that on 31 July 1992 the Grand Lodge of India is to consider amendments to its Book of Constitutions to promote and encourage membership of its Lodges. The amendments would end the current right of a Brother of the Indian Constitution to be also a member of Lodges meeting in India under other Constitutions. The amendments are stated not to affect Brethren who were members of other Constitutions before the Grand Lodge of India was formed in 1961. If passed, the new rules would amount to a grave breach of the Concordat which expressly guarantees the right of our Lodges and Brethren in India (a) to the same privileges and courtesies then extended by the three Home Constitutions to each other and (b) not to have undue pressure put on them to persuade them to join the Grand Lodge of India. The Board, after hearing the views of the Grand Lodges of Ireland and Scotland, which also have Lodges in India, and our Indian Districts, believes that if the proposed amendments are adopted it can do no other than recommend to Grand Lodge that it ceases to recognise the Grand Lodge of India.'

At the September meeting the President of the BGP reported that the GLI had approved the offending amendments to their Book of Constitutions. The Grand Registrar accepted that 'there is no doubt that a Grand Lodge has the right to regulate

its internal affairs,' but he dismissed the GLI's claim that it had not broken the Concordat, and added that:

'If, however, when it [that is a Grand Lodge] is formed, it gives express guarantees in a Concordat, it is bound by them – unless, after negotiation with the other party to the Concordat it is released from its obligations. No such negotiation was sought... [and] we are left with no alternative to withdrawing recognition...'

The Pro Grand Master pointed out to Grand Lodge that:

'...if this resolution is passed, it will have an immediate effect, and Brethren of the English Constitution who are also members of Lodges under the Grand Lodge of India must either sever all connections with what will then have become an unrecognised Grand Lodge or resign from their English Constitution Lodges, and all visiting between the two Constitutions must cease.'

The resolution was approved without debate.

By its rapid and decisive response, without the more usual prior restriction of intervisitation, the UGLE had shown how seriously it took what it perceived to be a breach of its bilateral agreement with a daughter Grand Lodge, even if the alleged breach did not render the Grand Lodge of India irregular or offend against the UGLE's *Basic Principles for Grand Lodge Recognition*. Never before had the UGLE broken off relations so quickly with a Grand Lodge it had established or with which so many of the members of the three Home Grand Lodges enjoyed dual membership and shared their masonic meeting places.

The UGLE's derecognition of the GLI provoked widespread incomprehension among and criticism by many Grand Lodges outside the British Isles. The GLI thenceforth became more active and visible. Nevertheless, the UGLE kept the GLI beyond the pale until well into the 21st century. It now seems ironic that the Prestonian Lecture in 1979 was entitled "Who must otherwise have remained at a perpetual distance" – 250 years of Freemasonry in India: a study in resolved discords.¹²⁹

So great was the divide between the UGLE and the GLI that in the summer of 1993 a warrant was even issued for an additional English Constitution Lodge¹³⁰ to be established in India. (That Lodge has never been consecrated, but, if it had, the UGLE itself would have broken not only its express promise made to the GLI at its foundation but also one of the conventions it had long maintained.) The legal dispute that ensued from the decision to issue Lodge of Shankar's Warrant came before the Indian courts¹³¹ and was still there at the end of 2000.

The Grand Master reminded Grand Lodge in his April 1993 Address that:

'...we have "a little local difficulty" with the Grand Lodge of India putting undue pressure on Brethren to persuade them to belong only to the Indian Constitution'¹³²

but apart from the brief mentions of the Lodge of Shankar court case in April 1995¹³³ and September 1996,¹³⁴ the Indian affair only surfaced once again in Grand Lodge in the period under review.¹³⁵ Relations had still not been restored by the end of 2000.

PROCEDURES : 'SUSPENSION'

Before moving the BGP's resolutions to suspend the recognition of the Grand Orient of Italy and to withdraw recognition from the Grand Lodge of Greece in June 1993¹³⁶ (see below) the Grand Registrar explained how the Board intended to interpret any decision to suspend a Grand Lodge. He first reminded Grand Lodge that 'suspension of recognition' meant that visits to and from the suspended Grand Lodge and its subordinate bodies would have to cease, and then added that as suspension was 'a

temporary condition pending further action (either complete withdrawal or a re-establishment of normal relations)' it was now the Board's intention that:

'...our Brethren who are also members of Lodges under the suspended body should not be asked to resign from them but should refrain from attending their meetings; and our Brethren should not be asked to withdraw if they encounter Brethren of the suspended body in Lodges under other Grand Lodges with which we have normal relations.'

'Suspension' had not been applied by the UGLE since its Grand Master suspended the Grand Lodge of the Philippines in 1933 (see above) when the term was synonymous with 'withdrawal.' With the new definition of 'suspension' the BGP now had an additional sanction to apply in cases where it judged that the cessation of outward visits was not enough and that withdrawal of recognition was not (yet) appropriate.

ITALY (continued)

On 9 June 1993 the UGLE voted to 'distance itself from the Grand Orient of Italy by suspending recognition' having learned that the BGP had 'strong grounds for believing that (a) there are illegal Lodges operating under the Grand Orient of Italy and (b) the Grand Orient of Italy has active links with the Grand Orient of France.' The temporary measure of suspension was recommended as the BGP needed to assess 'conflicting evidence about all this.' In making the case for suspension the President of the BGP gave some details of the problems in Italy, and briefly mentioned a new development: 'MW Bro di Bernardo resigned on 16 April as Grand Master and the next day formed and became the Grand Master of a new Grand Lodge, the Regular Grand Lodge of Italy'.¹³⁷

In September 1993 the UGLE withdrew recognition from the GOI on receiving the BGP's report that there was 'sufficient evidence of illegal Lodges, unregistered Brethren, links with unrecognized and irregular Grand Lodges, irregular practices and interference by other Masonic orders' to confirm the earlier decision.' The relevant Basic Principles were not stated, but this catalogue indicates that the BGP thought it had grounds under at least No. 5.

In December 1993¹³⁸ the Board recommended that Grand Lodge should recognize the Regular Grand Lodge of Italy which had been formed in April that year. The RGLI was not only practising regularly but was reportedly growing in strength and 'its members are all...uninvolved in Italy's current scandals.' In the BGP's opinion 'Denying recognition could be seen as a lack of confidence in the new Grand Lodge, and might encourage other Grand Lodges in Italy to fill the vacuum. Recognition would promote 'Masonic stability.' These two reasons were additional to those normally advanced on behalf of an applicant. Grand Lodge voted in favour of the BGP's resolution.

The UGLE's speedy recognition of the RGLI after withdrawing recognition from the GOI was unusual. The closest comparison would be with events in Belgium in 1979 (see above), but there 'The requirement of belief in God... [had] virtually been abandoned' and the Grand Lodge of Belgium had thus offended against the essential principle – which the GOI had not.

GREECE

Relations with Greece followed a remarkably similar path. In December 1992 the Board had warned Grand Lodge that it might have to recommend stopping visits to lodges under the Grand Lodge of Greece ('GLG') if it ascertained that the GLG was indeed 'sharing sovereignty on Craft affairs with the Supreme Council which operates in its jurisdiction' – which, if true, would have contravened the fifth Basic Principle for Grand Lodge recognition. In the meantime, brethren had been urged to be 'cautious when visiting the Grand Lodge of Greece and Lodges under its jurisdiction'.¹³⁹

In the Paper of Business for the Quarterly Communication in June 1993 the Board

stated that it had received reports that the GLG was also in contravention of two of the other Basic Principles, namely Nos. 3 and 7:

‘The Grand Lodge of Greece (a) has been unable to show its independence from the Supreme Council in Greece [BP No. 5] (b) has substituted mere assertions for the obligations required of candidates in the three Craft degrees [BP No. 3] and (c) encourages discussion of politics [BP No. 7]’

The Board was therefore recommending that recognition of the GLG ‘be suspended until these matters have been satisfactorily resolved.’ However, when Grand Lodge met, the President of the BGP told it that on the basis of further information received from Greece (into which he went in some detail)¹⁴⁰ the Board was now convinced of the ‘blatant involvement in political activities’ of the GLG and its lodges on several occasions in May that year. The Grand Registrar’s motion:

‘That in view of the Grand Lodge of Greece’s encouragement of the discussion of politics in Grand Lodge and in its subordinate Lodges, recognition of that Grand Lodge be withdrawn’

was passed without debate.¹⁴¹ Members of the English Craft who until then had also been members the Greek Constitution were consequently instructed to resign from one or the other.

At the next Quarterly Communication, in September 1993, the UGLE recognized the National Grand Lodge of Greece which the Board reported as being of regular origin (being so established in 1986) and practice, growing in strength and being wooed by ‘two of the four other Grand Lodges in Greece’ – ‘the third is effectively a province of the Grand Orient of France and so hopelessly irregular.’¹⁴²

(3) 1994–2000

POLICY and PRACTICE defended, explained and developed

The *Proceedings* from 1994 to 2000 indicate that the UGLE soon found that it had to explain in greater detail and even defend its decisions to withdraw recognition from the Grand Orient of Italy and the Grand Lodge of Greece on the ground that they ‘were behaving irregularly.’¹⁴³ For example, in March 1994 the President of the BGP made a statement about attendance ‘at Lodges overseas’ in the course of which he noted that:

‘Grand Lodges in North America, and in Australia and New Zealand may not have withdrawn recognition (as have England, Ireland and Scotland, and other Grand Lodges in Europe) from the Grand Orient of Italy and the Grand Lodge of Greece ...’

In April 1994 the Grand Master acknowledged that the speed with which the UGLE had withdrawn recognition had also raised eyebrows:

‘Some other Grand Lodges were surprised by the speed with which recognition was withdrawn [from Italy and Greece], but once our Board of General Purposes was certain that the Grand Lodges were behaving irregularly, it would have been wrong to have delayed action.’¹⁴⁴

The ban on visits to lodges in Spain in 1995 (see below) was acknowledged to be ‘inconvenient.’¹⁴⁵ In 1997 the BGP declared it was ‘conscious that Grand Lodge’s ruling that our brethren should not associate masonically with members of unrecognised Constitutions is not well understood abroad.’¹⁴⁶ And in June 2000 the Board’s Report acknowledged that:

'...unusually, the overwhelming majority of the Grand Lodges with which the UGLE was in amity [in September 1993, when the UGLE recognised the National Grand Lodge of Greece] did not [follow suit], some expressing the view that the UGLE had acted hastily and/or without full knowledge of the relevant facts.'¹⁴⁷

That the UGLE's derecognition of the regular Grand Lodge of India was continuing to be relevant to the UGLE's relations with other Grand Lodges is demonstrated by the BGP's report in September 1996 that on 2 March 1995 'the Grand Secretary wrote to the Grand Secretaries of Grand Lodges recognised by the UGLE' about the fact that 'the Grand Lodge of India had sought an injunction to prevent the formation of a new Lodge in Bombay by the UGLE.'¹⁴⁸

In what now looks like the first step in a new campaign to explain its external relation policy and practice the BGP issued the leaflet '*Freemasonry's External Relations*'¹⁴⁹ which 'summarises and explains the Basic Principles for Grand Lodge Recognition.'¹⁵⁰ Next, at the Quarterly Communication in June 1994,¹⁵¹ it defined and explained the UGLE's views on the 'Masonic discussion of politics.' After a reminder of the Basic Principle under which 'the discussion of religion and politics within the Lodge shall be strictly prohibited' the Board declared that:

'The phrase "within the Lodge" should not be interpreted narrowly but extends to Masonic circumstances generally, and must be read in the light of paragraph 6 of *Aims and Relationships of the Craft*.'

By way of explanation the BGP added that:

'...the rule which forbids Masonic discussion of politics is designed to prevent regular Freemasonry becoming involved in any way in affairs of State, whether they are domestic or external. Great care must be taken to ensure that nothing is done which might allow it even to seem to be so involved. Grand Lodges which ignore these principles are not conducting themselves regularly and cannot be expected to be or remain recognised.'

All this amplified the earlier and rather simpler statement of 'the general rule that regular Freemasons should not as *Freemasons* discuss or advance views on political questions.'¹⁵²

The BGP's reminders at the Quarterly Communication in September 1994¹⁵³ that caution was required when visiting overseas and when inviting visitors from other jurisdictions, and that members of the English Constitution were required 'to avoid association with unrecognised Masons', were made in the knowledge that many of the UGLE's friends had not followed its example of breaking off relations with the unrecognised Grand Lodge of India or the irregular Grand Lodge of Greece and the Grand Orient of Italy – and that many of the Grand Lodges it recognized in North America now recognized Prince Hall Grand Lodges within what they had previously regarded as their own territory. The BGP must also have been aware that its ban on visiting those North American Grand Lodges contrasted oddly with the fact that as yet the UGLE had not banned visits to Grand Lodges that were still in amity with the bodies in Italy and Greece which it had declared to be practising irregularly.

Then, in December 1994, the BGP issued a lengthy and detailed statement on 'Regularity and Recognition' and a 'Short History of Prince Hall Masonry.'¹⁵⁴ In the first of these the BGP went over the ground covered by its earlier publications¹⁵⁵ once again, but it also introduced definitions of two terms, both relevant to its conduct of external relations: 'landmarks' and 'Craft Freemasonry'. To be considered regular and therefore eligible for recognition a Grand Lodge must:

'...adhere to "landmarks" (a landmark is an essential characteristic of regular Freemasonry), viz:

- (1) its Brethren must believe in a¹⁵⁶ Supreme Being (the GAOTU)
- (2) obligations must be taken on or in full view of the VSL
- (3) it must display the three Great Lights of Freemasonry when it or its Lodges are open
- (4) discussion of religion and politics in its Lodges must be prohibited, and
- (5) its membership must be male, and it must have nothing to do with mixed or women's Lodges.'

'Craft Masonry' was then defined in the section explaining independence: 'A Grand Lodge must have undisputed authority over Craft (or basic) Freemasonry within its jurisdiction ...'

Furthermore, these two papers ('Regularity and Recognition' and a 'Short History of Prince Hall Masonry') at last make it clear why the BGP had had such difficulty over the recognition of any Prince Hall Grand Lodge since the Prince Hall Grand Lodge ('PHGL') of Massachusetts first applied for recognition in 1988: by the standard the UGLE had codified in the 1920s the formation in the early 1800s of the PHGL of Massachusetts, from which 'All Prince Hall Grand Lodges are descended,' was irregular. It had not been 'established lawfully by a duly recognized Grand Lodge or by three or more regularly constituted Lodges' as the first Basic Principle required.¹⁵⁷ Any Grand Lodge that permitted intervisitation with and/or recognized a PHGL – and there were now at least thirty-four such in North America – was therefore permitting association with not only an unrecognized body (in which case the BGP could just have instructed members to exercise due caution when visiting within its jurisdiction) but with an irregular body. That was why visits to their meetings were banned – though it still does not explain why the same measure was not applied to Grand Lodges which still recognised irregular bodies in Italy and Greece.

But now a possible solution to the Prince Hall problem had been found. The BGP pointed out that by contemporary standards 'the formation of the PHGL of Massachusetts could have been seen as merely eccentric, and of acceptable regularity' and that 'the philosophy and practice of Prince Hall Masonry today are of exemplary regularity.' The Board therefore recommended that 'the problem of regularity' should be solved by ignoring 'the unusual formation' and that the PHGL of Massachusetts 'should be deemed to be and accepted as regular.' Regularity was only one part of the problem, however. Recognition could not be granted to a second Grand Lodge in a territory without the agreement of the first. (This long-standing convention was later refined by UGLE – see below – in its debates on Greece.) Luckily, the Grand Lodge of Massachusetts had already indicated that it would have no objection. The Grand Registrar was therefore able to move that 'notwithstanding its unusual formation, the Grand Lodge of Massachusetts should now be accepted as regular, and be recognised.' Grand Lodge voted in favour of the resolution.

PRINCE HALL GRAND LODGES (continued)

After the recognition of the first Prince Hall Grand Lodge in December 1994 (see above) others made similar applications to the UGLE. Having judged each application on its merits, and accepting none unless the already recognized Grand Lodge in the territory had already signified its agreement, the UGLE recognized the Prince Hall Grand Lodges of Connecticut in September 1996; Pennsylvania, Ohio, California and Hawaii in June 1997; 'Colorado and its Jurisdiction', 'Washington and its Jurisdiction', Wisconsin and 'Oregon (and jurisdiction)' in December 1997; Illinois, Minnesota, Nebraska and New Mexico in March 1998; Indiana in September 1998; and Rhode Island, Kansas and the 'Republic of Liberia' in June 1999.

As each recognition was granted, the ban on visits to lodges in the relevant territory was lifted. By March 2000 only four Grand Lodges remained on the banned list: New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Quebec. Having first imposed an outwards visit ban in North America as long ago as 1990 (see above) the BGP recommended and Grand Lodge agreed 'that these additional visiting restrictions

should now be lifted and that brethren visiting North America be subject to the same guidelines as apply when visiting elsewhere in the world.'

MORE GRAND LODGES IN AFRICA

With the precedent of its recognition of the Grand Lodge of the Ivory Coast in 1991, the UGLE quickly recognized seven further creations of the National Grand Lodge of France in Africa: Senegal (formed in 1993) in June 1994, Togo (1992) in September 1994, Benin (1995) in September 1996, Madagascar (1996) in December 1997, Burkina Faso (1997) and Guinea (1998) in September 1998, and Mali (1999) in June 1999.¹⁵⁸ In only one of these countries, Togo, did the UGLE itself have any lodges, and there it recognized the Grande Loge Nationale Togolaise only after it had been 'given guarantees which preserve the position of present and future lodges of the English Constitution in Togo.'¹⁵⁹ As in the case of Portugal (see above), the convention of an externally-based Grand Lodge not adding to its extant lodges in what had become a 'closed' territory was not to be applied in Togo. Under a further bilateral agreement the Togolese Grand Lodge promised that its lodges would not work in English and 'in return, we have promised that our lodges in Togo will work in no other language than English.'¹⁶⁰

RUSSIA

After the end of the 'Cold War' the National Grand Lodge of France was also able to form the Grand Lodge of Russia (in June 1995), which the UGLE recognized in December 1997.¹⁶¹

SPAIN and the GRAND ORIENT OF ITALY

In March 1995 the UGLE took action against the Grand Lodge of Spain, one of the Grand Lodges that still recognized or had re-recognized the Grand Orient of Italy. Spain had apparently suspended recognition in May 1993, but restored it in October 1994. Members of the English Constitution were therefore told not 'to attend meetings within the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of Spain, which includes the Balearic and Canary Islands' until further notice, in case they should meet 'Freemasons from an unrecognised Grand Lodge' there.¹⁶² Spain withdrew recognition from the Grand Orient of Italy in June 1995 and the ban on outward visits was lifted.¹⁶³

PORTUGAL (continued)

Unlike Spain, in Portugal there were still lodges under the UGLE, so when in 1996 there were reports of 'internal friction and disputes within the Regular Grand Lodge of Portugal which may be of a serious nature' the Board recommended that 'our Brethren should not visit Lodges in Portugal except those of our jurisdiction.' That ban was lifted in September 1997, by which time the recognised Regular Grand Lodge of Portugal had changed its name to the 'Grande Loja Regular de Portugal (Legal)'.¹⁶⁴

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

Reading between the lines in the *Proceedings* of September and December 1997,¹⁶⁵ and remembering the terms of the 1905 Concordat with Ireland and Scotland on the recognition of new Grand Lodges in territories they share (see above), one is led to assume that the creation and immediate recognition of the Grand Lodge of Newfoundland by the UGLE in December 1997 was not entirely straightforward.

In September 1997 the BGP told Grand Lodge that 'Earlier this year the twenty-seven Lodges comprising the [English] District of Newfoundland voted by ballot in favour of forming an independent, sovereign Grand Lodge of Newfoundland and Labrador.' The President of the BGP also reported that 'the matter was considered at its meeting in July but withheld from the Paper of Business for this Quarterly Communication until the views of the Grand Lodge of Scotland were thoroughly understood.' He added: 'That has now been achieved.' Scotland's views can be gleaned

from the further statement that 'The local District Grand Lodge of the Scottish Constitution and the Grand Lodge of Scotland accept that a Grand Lodge will be formed, but few if any Lodges of the Scottish Constitution will join the new Grand Lodge.' Grand Lodge nevertheless accepted the BGP's recommendation that if the new Grand Lodge were formed, as planned, on 1 November it should be recognized at once. In December 1997 the BGP reported that the Grand Lodge of Newfoundland and Labrador 'was duly formed on 1 November by the MW Pro Grand Master in the presence of the Grand Master Mason of Scotland' and immediately recognized.

The inauguration ceremony had been 'based on that performed by the Home Grand Lodges in India in 1961,' but in other respects there were significant differences from the creation of the Grand Lodge of India in 1961. In the case of Newfoundland and Labrador there is no indication in the *Proceedings* that the Grand Masters of England and Scotland agreed to waive the 1905 Concordat, or that the lodges in the Scottish District had been balloted; all the lodges in the English District had voted in favour and transferred their allegiance to the new Grand Lodge, but on 1 November all the Scottish lodges had retained their allegiance to Scotland; and the Grand Master Mason of Scotland took no formal part in the ceremony. Perhaps on this occasion England alone had had to take the decision which the three Home Grand Lodges had taken on the application of their 1905 Concordat in India when faced with the demand for a Grand Lodge there in 1961? Perhaps England felt that, given the circumstances that had arisen in the shared territory of Newfoundland and Labrador, the Concordat (or, rather, its requirement that a two-thirds majority of the lodges under each of the Home Constitutions must vote for an independent Grand Lodge before the matter would receive favourable consideration at home) might have had the effect of holding up progress towards an independent Grand Lodge almost indefinitely – to adapt the words used in 1961.¹⁶⁶ Whatever the truth of the matter, this would appear to be the first occasion since 1949, and probably since long before then, that the UGLE in the end had to opt in favour of acting pragmatically in the best interests of its own members rather than of harmonising its action with a Sister Constitution.

GREECE (resolved)

By July 2000 the UGLE had made two decisions with regard to Greece which were at least as difficult as those it had taken in relation to Newfoundland and Labrador. Once again, the UGLE gave priority to the interests of its members, and did not act in harmony with its Sister Constitutions – but in this instance its decisions were understood and supported by the overwhelming majority of the other Grand Lodges it recognised.¹⁶⁷

As early as June 1996 the Board had reported the 'good news' that 'the grounds for our withdrawing recognition from the Grand Lodge of Greece ("GLG") may no longer apply.' But the President of the BGP had also pointed out that 'Recognition does not follow automatically when a Grand Lodge is regular.' Even if the GLG were perceived to have returned to regularity,¹⁶⁸ the UGLE had meanwhile recognized the National Grand Lodge of Greece ('NGLG') and therefore could not also (re-) recognize the GLG under 'the convention which requires us to ensure that a Grand Lodge which we recognize agrees to our recognizing a second Grand Lodge working in the same area.'¹⁶⁹ The President hoped, however, that 'In the fullness of time ... we will be in a position to recognize both,' but added that '...until the situation changes we will continue to recognize only the National Grand Lodge of Greece.' The Board clearly hoped that the two regular Grand Lodges in Greece would 'become reconciled', though it acknowledged that 'such reconciliation may take years.'¹⁷⁰

The problem caused by the continued withdrawal of recognition from the now possibly regular GLG became acute in Cyprus where 'We have seven Lodges in our District ... and there is an equal number of Lodges under the Grand Lodge of Greece, and the Brethren who belonged [*sic*] to both Constitutions have been placed in the very disturbing position of having to elect whether their prime allegiance is to us or to the

Grand Lodge of Greece.' Indeed, the President of the BGP continued, 'the need to make this choice has led to great unhappiness and our District Grand Master has suspended the working of all English lodges in Cyprus.'¹⁷¹

By September 1999 no reconciliation had been achieved in Greece. In the interim the Board had 'informally suggested to both Greek Grand Lodges that they might wish to consider consenting to our recognising both of them' and at the last minute had attempted 'to broker an accommodation between the two sovereign Grand Lodges operating in Greece' – but without success. (It was later disclosed that although the NGLG had consented a few days earlier to the recognition of the Grand Lodge of Greece, the GLG had 'refused its consent on the ground that the NGLG had been formed irregularly and was therefore an irregular body.'¹⁷² On the Board's recommendation that it was in Grand Lodge's 'best interests', and against the advice of RW Bro M.B.S. Higham, PJGW (Past Grand Secretary), the Grand Lodge then took the difficult and probably unique decision 'to withdraw recognition from the National Grand Lodge of Greece, despite its continuing regularity.' The Board had hoped that this action would enable the two Greek Grand Lodges to discuss their future relationship and to reach a decision to the benefit of all regular Freemasons in Greece, and in Cyprus where English Constitution lodges meet alongside those of the two Greek constitutions.'¹⁷³

The second difficult decision was not taken until June 2000 when the BGP asked Grand Lodge to affirm:

'...its established practice of not recognising a second Grand Lodge in a territory without the consent and agreement of both the Grand Lodges concerned...'

and then to recognize the Grand Lodge of Greece.¹⁷⁴ Bro Higham opposed both motions, and was supported by W Bro P.G. Williams, PSGD (and the former Grand Secretary of the Grand Lodge of Mark Master Masons, though, quite properly, this was not mentioned.) RW Bro Sir John Welch, PSGW, spoke in the debate as Chairman of the Board's External Relations Committee, the first holder of that office so to do. He accepted Bro Higham's point that the 'established practice' had not been so 'officially formalised or affirmed by Grand Lodge' but he argued that as this 'eminently sensible convention' had in fact been observed and followed by the Board and indeed by Grand Lodge for many years' it should now be affirmed. The Board recommended the re-recognition of the GLG for the following reasons:

1. it could not recognize both Greek Grand Lodges under the convention that both should consent, because the GLG refused its consent
2. the GLG held the breakaway NGLG to be of irregular origin; the External Relations Committee had referred to the NGLG as an irregular body in 1987; and the present Board had been 'unable to find the evidence that later persuaded Bro Higham in 1993 to state in his paper to the ERC that "the National Grand Lodge of Greece was regularly formed"'
3. only the GLG had a Lodge on the island of Zante, where the one English lodge in Greece was situated
4. the District Grand Master of the English District in Cyprus urged the re-recognition of the GLG 'in the interest of the nine English lodges under his jurisdiction'
5. the GLG was 'the larger and the older of the two Greek Grand Lodges' and
6. the GLG was 'still ... recognized by the overwhelming majority of the Grand Lodges with which the UGLE is in amity.'¹⁷⁵

Both motions were approved.

The importance Grand Lodge gave to the interests of its members in Zante and Cyprus and to its worldwide interests are clear. Ireland and Scotland would not follow

its example, however; unlike the England, they had ‘no direct interests in either Greece or Cyprus’ and therefore saw ‘no urgent need to consider changing their relationship with the National Grand Lodge of Greece.’

BRAZIL

Until late 1999 the UGLE (and its Sister Constitutions) recognized only the Grand Orient of Brazil (‘GOB’) in that country, whereas most of the other Grand Lodges which it recognized preferred to recognize the Brazilian State Grand Lodges that operated within ‘the territory of the Grand Orient of Brazil’. In December 1999,¹⁷⁶ however, the President of the BGP reported that in October 1999 the GOB had for the first time recognized one of the State Grand Lodges. It had ‘entered into a state of mutual recognition’ with the Grand Lodge of the State of Sao Paulo and supported Sao Paulo’s application for recognition’. He advised Grand Lodge that:

‘That brings this case within the established exception to the principle that this Grand Lodge will not recognise a second Grand Lodge in the same territory unless both those Grand Lodges are content with the arrangement.’

CROATIA and ESTONIA

Austria had consecrated the Grand Lodge of Croatia on 8 November 1997, and Finland the Grand Lodge of Estonia in May 1999. In both cases the constituent lodges and membership had previously been under the jurisdiction of the respective recognized Grand Lodge. The UGLE recognised Croatia in December 1999, and Estonia in March 2000.

MACEDONIA

With the consecration of Skopje Lodge No. 9721 in Macedonia in late 2000 the UGLE established its first lodge in an ‘open’ territory for what appears to be only the second time since 1950, the other occasion having been when it set up its first lodge (in the modern era) in Portugal in 1989.

OTHER ORDERS (continued)

As in the rest of the periods covered by this paper, other masonic Orders and degrees with which the UGLE had long lived in quiet harmony and peace were rarely mentioned in the *Proceedings*. When interference by local Supreme Councils in Italy and Greece was alleged (see above), the President of the BGP hastened to point out that:

‘...this sort of problem does not arise under our constitution. The Supreme Council of [*sic*] England and Wales distinctly recognises the Grand Lodge’s authority over its Lodges and Brethren, and has lived in harmony with Grand Lodge for over a century.’¹⁷⁷

The only other mention seems to be in the citation preceding the award of membership of the Grand Master’s Order of Service to Masonry to RW Bro Sir James Stubbs, *KCVO* on 9 December 1992 when it was mentioned that ‘He has been promoted to very high rank in many masonic Orders beyond the Craft and Royal Arch and he is still in active office in one of them.’

However, it should be noted here, if only for completeness, that when the UGLE declares a previously recognized Craft Grand Lodge to be irregular, the decision is of immediate relevance to the autocephalic and independent masonic Orders and degrees with their headquarters in either Duke Street or St. James’s Street, London. One of the reasons why they have lived in harmony with the UGLE since at least the latter half of the 19th century¹⁷⁸ is that they normally require their candidates to have been raised in the UGLE or in a Craft Grand Lodge which either still is recognized by the UGLE (as is the case with the Grand Lodge of Mark Master Masons, for example)¹⁷⁹ or was recognised by the UGLE at the time of their raising (as the Supreme Council

requires).¹⁸⁰ To maintain the harmony, sometimes in difficult circumstances, the Grand Secretary of the UGLE, the Grand Secretary General of the Supreme Council and the Grand Secretary of the Orders and Degrees run from Mark Masons' Hall stay in close if unofficial contact.¹⁸¹

MAINTAINING RELATIONSHIPS with OTHER CRAFT GRAND LODGES

The *Proceedings* of 13 December 2000 report the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the 'permanent and intimate tie' between the Grand Lodge of Sweden and the UGLE by the visit of MW Bro HRH The Duke of Kent, Grand Master, to Sweden. Though I have not mentioned them, there are also frequent if brief reports in the *Proceedings* of official visits to and from other Grand Lodges. Representatives were normally exchanged with recognized Grand Lodges in the traditional way, and those who visited Grand Lodge were given a special welcome. (In the period 1950–2000 one Representative of the UGLE near another Grand Lodge was actually invested with his Representative's jewel in Grand Lodge,¹⁸² and on another occasion the Pro Grand Master wore in Grand Lodge the Representative's badge with which he had been invested by the Grand Lodge of India.)¹⁸³ Other means used by those charged with managing the UGLE's external affairs included attendance at conferences: as we have seen there is the occasional mention of Conferences of European Grand Secretaries, and in September 2000 we find what appears to be the first mention in the *Proceedings* of the 'Annual Tripartite Conference of the three home Grand Lodges.'¹⁸⁴ And the special relationships which the UGLE continued to enjoy with Ireland, Scotland and Sweden on the one hand, and with the National Grand Lodge of France on the other were marked in various additional ways: Rulers in the first three of these were on special occasions appointed to senior offices or given high ranks in one or more of the others – and a Ruler in the English Craft normally conducted the installation of Grand Masters of the National Grand Lodge of France, which the UGLE had established at the opening of the 20th century.

Conclusion

The United Kingdom's status as a player on the world stage had been in decline since the end of the nineteenth century. Two World Wars further reduced its strength. While the British flag was replaced around the world by those of newly independent countries, and Britain's occupation of the Suez Canal ended in ignominious withdrawal, other countries in Western Europe made remarkable recoveries from the disaster of 1939–1945. They sought a closer relationship with each other as a guarantee against another European war, and to provide a counterweight to the ever growing power of the USA. The UK found it more difficult to act on its own and harder to maintain and exercise any influence on other countries.

To some extent one can see similarities in the masonic world since 1945. The number of independent Grand Lodges has grown significantly. In India and Canada many English Constitution lodges were removed from the UGLE's list when they became founder members of the new Grand Lodges there. Not all the Grand Lodges recognized by the UGLE recognize the same Grand Lodges as the UGLE does. The UGLE's interpretation of the still commonly accepted basic principles for Grand Lodge recognition has not always found wide support and it has had to work harder to get its views understood. Public criticism of Freemasonry in one country has often found a ready echo elsewhere. Peace, the ease of international travel and the speed of international communication have indeed brought in their wake the 'serious problems' the Board foresaw in the late 1940s.

In this rapidly changing context the UGLE had to keep its external relations under constant review, and, where necessary, develop its policy to suit the increasing complexity of the masonic world – while steadfastly adhering to the basic principles it

had codified and the aims and relationships it had published in the 1920s. Its determination in this respect is based on self-preservation as well as on tradition; to permit masonic association with Grand Lodges that could be seen to be active in political or religious matters would weaken the position of the Craft in England, where its abstention from such activities had from the start been its attraction – and its strongest bulwark against attack by State or Church. Its success was demonstrated most visibly by the steady growth in the number of Grand Lodges represented at the Installations of its Grand Masters from 1950 to 1967 and the 275th anniversary celebrations in 1992.

A possible draft of the UGLE's external relations policy at the start of the 21st century, extrapolated from its official publications

Aims

The UGLE establishes, maintains, suspends, withdraws or refuses to have relations with other (Craft) Grand Lodges in the best interests of the members of the English Constitution and to promote and defend regular Freemasonry. It regards itself, and is widely regarded, as the guardian of regular Freemasonry, and it intends to maintain that reputation.

Policy Documents

The basic principles which the UGLE applies when assessing the regularity of another Grand Lodge are set out in the two base documents: '*Basic Principles for Grand Lodge Recognition*' and '*Aims and Relationships of the Craft*'.¹⁸⁵

Other important official publications are the leaflet '*Freemasonry's External Relations*' and the Board's paper '*Regularity and Recognition*'.¹⁸⁶ As the UGLE maintains a particularly close relationship and still shares several territories with its two Sister Constitutions, the *Concordat* with them, adopted by Grand Lodge in September 1905, is also important.

Jurisdiction and territorial rights (as at 31 December 2000)

The UGLE possesses sole and exclusive territorial sovereignty over England, Wales, the Channel Islands, and the Isle of Man. The establishment of a Lodge in any of this territory by any other Craft Grand Lodge will be regarded as an invasion.

The UGLE shares with the Grand Lodges of Ireland and Scotland exclusive rights over the United Kingdom's Overseas Territories (for example Anguilla, Bermuda, the Cayman Islands, Gibraltar, Montserrat, and St. Helena) and such parts of the (former British) Commonwealth as have not established local sovereign Grand Lodges (for example Ghana and Nigeria). The establishment of a Lodge in any of these territories by a foreign Grand Lodge will be regarded as an invasion.

In addition, the UGLE retains jurisdiction over its lodges in several other territories where it now recognizes local Grand Lodges (for example in Argentina, Brazil, Greece, Japan, Portugal, Togo and Uruguay) or where a local Grand Lodge has yet to be established (for example, in Monaco).

The UGLE will not normally establish a Lodge in a territory where there is a regular sovereign Grand Lodge in existence, nor will it establish any additional lodges in a territory once a local Grand Lodge has been regularly established there. However, by mutual agreement with the respective local Grand Lodges, it retains the right to establish additional lodges in the Republic of South Africa, Portugal and Togo. And in Finland 'English Brethren' will be enabled 'to establish a Lodge [under Finland's jurisdiction], to work in the English language their own ritual and by-laws.'

Management

The day-to-day management of the UGLE's external affairs is delegated by Grand Lodge to its Board of General Purposes. However, it is for Grand Lodge itself, advised

by the BGP, to decide whether to recognize another Grand Lodge, to restrict intervisitation, or to suspend or withdraw recognition. The Grand Master may appoint any Brother to represent him in a recognised Grand Lodge.

'Regularity' and 'Recognition'

These two terms are defined and explained in the two base documents listed above. The UGLE's policy in these respects has been refined and developed since 1950 as follows:

- (a) When considering an application for recognition the Board will not only require evidence that the applicant is regular in origin and practice as defined in the *Basic Principles* and *Aims and Relationships* but may also take into account
 - (i) the applicant's relative size if it is not the only Grand Lodge in the territory;
 - (ii) by whom the applicant is already recognized (An applicant will not be recommended if it is in fraternal association with a Grand Lodge which the UGLE has declared to be irregular, and will not normally be recommended if it is already in fraternal association with a Grand Lodge which the UGLE has not recognised.)
 - (iii) whether recognition will bring 'Masonic stability' or fill 'a vacuum' (as argued in favour of the Regular Grand Lodge of Italy)
 - (iv) the applicant's age (The BGP normally requires an applicant Grand Lodge to have existed for long enough to prove its stability, but recognition may be granted soon after establishment if the constituent Lodges were previously under a long-recognized Grand Lodge.)
 - (v) whether there is a recognized Grand Lodge in the territory already. (The UGLE prefers to recognize one Grand Lodge per territory, but the BGP will consider recommending the recognition of two or more if both or all consent.)
 - (vi) whether there are English Constitution Lodges in the territory (If there are, the UGLE's recognition of the applicant may be made conditional upon an agreement that the UGLE will have the right to form new Lodges there).
- (b) When considering the regularity of an applicant's origin the BGP may recommend that a Grand Lodge's 'eccentric' origin should be deemed to be regular if it was formed before the Basic Principles were codified.
- (c) The UGLE may agree to waive the 1905 Concordat with Ireland and Scotland in respect of a nascent Grand Lodge in a territory shared with either or both, or decide to bypass it (after consultation) in the interests of its members.
- (d) Recognition will be withdrawn if a Grand Lodge ceases to conform with the Basic Principles and/or if it permits intervisitation with such irregular bodies as the Grand Orient of France and the Grand Lodge of France (that is irregular in terms of the essential Basic Principles which concern belief in God and the Volume of the Sacred Law)
- (e) Recognition will also be withdrawn from a Grand Lodge formed by the UGLE if, in the UGLE's view, it breaks the terms of the Concordat between them to the detriment of the remaining Lodges and members under the English Constitution in the territory they share
- (f) Recognition may also be withdrawn from a Grand Lodge in favour of another in the same territory if it no longer represents the majority of regular Masons there and if one of the two refuses its consent to the UGLE's recognition of both –

and if the UGLE adjudges the change to be in the best interests of its Lodges in the territory.

- (g) Recognition may also be withdrawn from a Grand Lodge which permits intervisitation with the Grand Orient of Italy, from which the UGLE withdrew recognition on the evidence of 'illegal Lodges, unregistered Brethren, links with unrecognised and irregular Grand Lodges, irregular practices and interference by other Masonic orders'
- (h) If recognition is withdrawn: dual membership and intervisitation must immediately cease.
- (i) Recognition may be suspended, as a temporary measure, while Grand lodge decides whether to withdraw recognition altogether.
- (j) While recognition is suspended, intervisitation must cease – but dual membership may continue and members of the EC do not need to withdraw from meetings at which members of the suspended constitution are present.
- (k) Intervisitation may be restricted by Grand Lodge, whereby outward visits to the offending Grand Lodge are banned, but visitors from that Constitution are still welcome in English Lodges.
- (l) War does not necessarily cause the suspension or withdrawal of recognition, or restrict intervisitation.
- (m) Despite the occasional mention in Grand Lodge of the existence of 'accepted' extra-Craft Masonic Orders and Degrees the UGLE does not recognize them, claims no authority over them, and would not accept any interference from them. Nevertheless, the UGLE continues to exist in harmony with the Supreme Council for England and Wales and other long-established and 'accepted' Orders and Degrees in the United Kingdom, as it has for more than a century.¹⁸⁷
- (n) Members of the English Constitution are forbidden to be members of or to have 'Masonic intercourse' with the following organizations as they have mixed Lodges or admit women to membership, or have been deemed to be quasi- and para-Masonic organisations:
 - (i) The Honourable Fraternity of Antient Masonry (1921)
 - (ii) The Order of the Eastern Star (1921)
 - (iii) The Loyal Order of Moose and similar bodies which go 'beyond the ordinary bounds and limitations of Friendly Societies' (1929)
 - (iv) The Universal League of Freemasons (1965)
 - (v) The Independent United Order of Mechanics (1966)

[The dates refer to the year in which membership of the organization was banned.]

This draft is an incomplete statement of the UGLE's policy in that it does not include anything that cannot be found in its official publications. On the other hand it is, I believe, a faithful résumé of what has been published, and may therefore be of use as well as of interest.

Appendix A
Aims and relationships of the Craft (current edition)

(Accepted by Grand Lodge, 7 September 1949)

IN AUGUST 1938, the Grand Lodges of England, Ireland and Scotland each agreed upon and issued a statement identical in terms except that the name of the issuing Grand Lodge appeared throughout. This statement, which was entitled 'Aims and Relationships of the Craft' was in the following terms:

1. From time to time the United Grand Lodge of England has deemed it desirable to set forth in precise form the aims of Freemasonry as consistently practised under its jurisdiction since it came into being as an organised body in 1717, and also to define the principles governing its relations with those other Grand Lodges with which it is in fraternal accord.
2. In view of representations which have been received, and of statements recently issued which have distorted or obscured the true objects of Freemasonry, it is once again considered necessary to emphasise certain fundamental principles of the Order.
3. The first condition of admission into, and membership of, the Order is a belief in the Supreme Being. This is essential and admits no compromise.
4. The Bible, referred to by Freemasons as the Volume of the Sacred Law, is always open in the Lodges. Every Candidate is required to take his Obligation on that book or on the volume which is held by his particular creed to impart sanctity to an oath or promise taken upon it.
5. Everyone who enters Freemasonry is, at the outset, strictly forbidden to countenance any act which may have a tendency to subvert the peace and good order of society; he must pay due obedience to the law of any state in which he resides or which may afford him protection, and he must never be remiss in the allegiance due to the Sovereign of his native land.
6. While English Freemasonry thus inculcates in each of its members the duties of loyalty and citizenship, it reserves to the individual the right to hold his own opinion with regard to public affairs. But neither in any Lodge, nor at any time in his capacity as a Freemason, is he permitted to discuss or to advance his views on theological or political questions.
7. The Grand Lodge has always consistently refused to express any opinion on questions of foreign or domestic state policy either at home or abroad, and it will not allow its name to be associated with any action, however humanitarian it may appear to be, which infringes its unalterable policy of standing aloof from every question affecting the relations between one government and another, or between political parties, or questions as to rival theories of government.
8. The Grand Lodge is aware that there do exist Bodies, styling themselves Freemasons, which do not adhere to these principles, and while that attitude exists the Grand Lodge of England refuses absolutely to have any relations with such bodies, or to regard them as Freemasons.
9. The Grand Lodge of England is a Sovereign and independent Body practising Freemasonry only within the three Degrees and only within the limits defined in its Constitution as 'pure Antient Masonry'. It does not recognise or admit the existence of any superior Masonic authority however styled.

10. On more than one occasion the Grand Lodge has refused, and will continue to refuse, to participate in Conferences with so-called International Associations claiming to represent Freemasonry, which admit to membership Bodies failing to conform strictly to the principles upon which the Grand Lodge of England is founded. The Grand Lodge does not admit any such claim, nor can its views be represented by any such Association.
 11. There is no secret with regard to any of the basic principles of Freemasonry, some of which have been stated above. The Grand Lodge will always consider the recognition of those Grand Lodges which profess and practice, and can show that they have consistently professed and practised, those established and unaltered principles, but in no circumstances will it enter into discussion with a view to any new or varied interpretation of them. They must be accepted and practised wholeheartedly and in their entirety by those who desire to be recognised as Freemasons by the United Grand Lodge of England.
-

The Grand Lodge of England has been asked if it still stands by this declaration, particularly in regard to paragraph 7. The Grand Lodge replied that it stood by every word of the declaration, and has since asked for the opinion of the Grand Lodges of Ireland and Scotland. A conference has been held between the three Grand Lodges, and all unhesitatingly reaffirm the statement that was pronounced in 1938: nothing in present-day affairs has been found that could cause them to recede from that attitude.

If Freemasonry once deviated from its course by expressing an opinion on political or theological questions, it would be called upon not only publicly to approve or denounce any movement which might arise in the future, but would sow the seeds of discord among its own members.

The three Grand Lodges are convinced that it is only by this rigid adherence to this policy that Freemasonry has survived the constantly changing doctrines of the outside world, and are compelled to place on record their complete disapproval of any action which may tend to permit the slightest departure from the basic principles of Freemasonry. They are strongly of opinion that if any of the three Grand Lodges does so, it cannot maintain a claim to be following the Antient Landmarks of the Order, and must ultimately face disintegration.

Appendix B
Basic Principles for Grand Lodge Recognition (current edition)
(Accepted by Grand Lodge, 4 September 1929)

THE MW The Grand Master having expressed a desire that the Board would draw up a statement of the Basic Principles on which this Grand Lodge could be invited to recognise any Grand Lodge applying for recognition by the English Jurisdiction, the Board of General Purposes has gladly complied. The result, as follows, has been approved by the Grand Master, and it will form the basis of a questionnaire to be forwarded in future to each Jurisdiction requesting English recognition. The Board desires that not only such bodies but the Brethren generally throughout the Grand Master's jurisdiction shall be fully informed as to those Basic principles of Freemasonry for which the Grand Lodge of England has stood throughout its history.

1. Regularity of origin: i.e. each Grand Lodge shall have been established lawfully by a duly recognised Grand Lodge or by three or more regularly constituted Lodges.
2. That a belief in the GAOTU and His revealed will shall be an essential qualification for membership.
3. That all initiates shall take their Obligation on or in full view of the open Volume of the Sacred Law, by which is meant the revelation from above which is binding on the conscience of the particular individual who is being initiated.
4. That the membership of the Grand Lodge and individual Lodges shall be composed exclusively of men, and that each Grand Lodge shall have no Masonic intercourse of any kind with mixed Lodges or bodies which admit women to membership.
5. That the Grand Lodge shall have sovereign jurisdiction over the Lodges under its control; i.e. that it shall be a responsible, independent, self-governing organisation, with sole and undisputed authority over the Craft or Symbolic Degrees (Entered Apprentice, Fellow Craft, and Master Mason) within its Jurisdiction, and shall not in any way be subject to, or divide such authority with, a Supreme Council or other Power claiming any control or supervision over those degrees.
6. That the three great lights of Freemasonry (namely, the Volume of the Sacred Law, the Square, and the Compasses) shall always be exhibited when the Grand Lodge or its subordinate Lodges are at work, the chief of these being the Volume of the Sacred Law.
7. That the discussion of religion and politics within the Lodge shall be strictly prohibited.
8. That the principles of the Antient Landmarks, customs, and usages of the Craft shall be strictly observed.

Appendix C**External Relations: key office-holders 1950-2000**Grand Masters

The Duke of Devonshire	(1947 - 1950)
The Earl of Scarbrough	(1951 - 1967)
HRH The Duke of Kent	(1967 -)

Pro Grand Masters

The Earl of Scarbrough	(1967 - 1969)
The (7th) Earl Cadogan	(1969 - 1982)
Lord Cornwallis	(1982 - 1991)
Lord Farnham	(1991 - 2001)

Presidents of the Board of General Purposes

Sir Kenneth Newton	(1986 - 1991)
Lord Lane	(1991 - 1995)
G.R.P. Purser	(1995 - 1999)
The (8th) Earl Cadogan	(1999 -)

Chairmen of the External Relations Committee

William Horrocks	(1948 - 1962)
Edgar J. Rutter	(1962 - 1971)
Oscar F. Boehringer	(1971 - 1992)
J.M.M. Humphrey of Dinnet	(1992 - 1997)
Sir John Welch	(1997 -)

Grand Secretaries

Sir Sydney White	(1937 - 1957)
Sir James Stubbs	(1958 - 1980)
M.B.S. Higham	(1980 - 1998)
J.W. Daniel	(1998 - 2002)

Notes

¹ *Proceedings* (27 June 1967).

² *Op. cit.* (26 April 1978).

³ *Op. cit.* (11 December 1991).

⁴ The Grand Master, as reported in the *Proceedings* (24 April 1991).

⁵ See also *Proceedings* (8 June 1994 & 8 March 1995), when the Board said that its External Relations Committee 'deals with relations between Grand Lodge and other Masonic jurisdictions'.

⁶ See *Proceedings* (14 December 1994), (Appendix).

⁷ 'in fraternal association' was used of the Swedish Grand Lodge by the Board of General Purposes on at the Quarterly Communication on 5 December 1951.

⁸ 'in amity' was used of the Austrian Grand Lodge by the Board of General Purposes on at the Quarterly Communication on 3 December 1952.

⁹ The terminology is interesting: all three 'sister' Grand Lodges in the British Isles had in fact created themselves (that is without the benefit of a 'mother' Grand Lodge) – and yet, nearly a century later, under their International Compact of 1814 (according to Bro P.R. James in *Grand Lodge 1717-1967*), they made provision for 'constant fraternal intercourse' [my emphasis].

¹⁰ Unfortunately, during the period under review, the Board of General Purposes sometimes used the term 'Sister Constitutions' to include all those Grand Lodges with which the UGLE permitted its members to enjoy masonic intercourse.

¹¹ Actually, while the effect of the resolutions passed by Grand Lodge on 8 March 1878 was indeed to sever relations with the Grand Orient of France, the resolutions merely expressed profound regret over the action of the Grand Orient, and directed Masters of lodges 'not to admit any [my emphasis], foreign Brother as a Visitor unless – 1st. He is duly vouched for or unless his Certificate shows that he has been initiated according to the Ancient rites and ceremonies in a Lodge professing belief in TGAOTU, and 2nd. Not unless he himself shall acknowledge that this belief is an essential landmark of the Order'. (*Proceedings* 8 March 1878).

¹² *Proceedings* (8 March 1878).

¹³ Draffen, in his paper on 'Some Aspects of International Masonic Law', *AQC* 88 (1975), gives more detail.

¹⁴ The 'Joint Conference' was reported to Grand Lodge and its resolutions were adopted on 6 September 1905. Furthermore, the Grand Master was then requested to sign the agreement on behalf of Grand Lodge. (see *Proceedings* of that date).

¹⁵ In this connection the reader may be interested to re-read footnote 66 of my paper 'Dr Robert Hamilton, MA, MD, 1820-1880: his Masonic life and times' on p.73 of *AQC* 114 (2002).

¹⁶ *Grand Lodge 1717-1967*, printed for the UGLE at the University Press, Oxford, in 1967 to coincide with the 250th anniversary of the UGLE.

¹⁷ Stubbs in *Grand Lodge 1717-1967*, Ch. IV.

¹⁸ *Proceedings* (7 September 1938), Appendix A.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ Stubbs, *op. cit.*

²¹ Stubbs, *op. cit.*

²² On the origins of the appointment of Representatives see Draffen in *AQC* 88 (1975), *op. cit.*

²³ As can be seen from Appendix B, the Board has eight 'basic principles' to apply when considering whether to recommend to Grand Lodge that it should recognise another Grand Lodge or to withdraw recognition. The first seven principles are clearly defined. The eighth, however, appears to be a catch-all one: 'That the principles of the Ancient Landmarks, customs, and usages of the Craft shall be strictly observed'. But the 'Ancient Landmarks, customs, and usages of the Craft' are not then defined. In such an important statement of 'those Basic Principles of Freemasonry for which the Grand Lodge of England has stood throughout its history' (as the preamble puts it) there was surely no place for imprecision. One must therefore assume that the phrase 'the Ancient Landmarks, customs, and usages of the Craft' describes the preceding seven basic principles, and that the eighth basic principle is but the requirement strictly to observe the other seven. It is, however, certain that whereas each of the other seven has been specifically invoked, the eighth has not.

²⁴ Stubbs, *op. cit.*

²⁵ *Proceedings* (6 November 1952).

²⁶ Stubbs, *op. cit.*

²⁷ Stubbs, *op. cit.*

²⁸ But see the section on Portugal below.

²⁹ *Proceedings* (6 June 1928).

³⁰ Stubbs, *op. cit.*

³¹ *Proceedings* (7 March 1928).

³² *Op. cit.* (6 December 1933).

³³ *Op. cit.* (1 June 1938).

³⁴ The 1916 ban on Brethren of German, Austrian, Hungarian, or Turkish birth was not lifted until 1927, and then only 'on the strength of a Lodge resolution passed by a three-fourths majority of the members present and voting by ballot.' (Stubbs, *op. cit.*.)

³⁵ *Proceedings* (6 December 1939).

³⁶ *Op. cit.*, (6 March 1940).

³⁷ Stubbs, *op. cit.*

³⁸ *Proceedings* (3 December 1952).

³⁹ *Op. cit.* (2 June 1954).

⁴⁰ *Op. cit.* (6 September 1950).

⁴¹ *Op. cit.* (5 December 1951).

⁴² *Op. cit.* (3 December 1952).

⁴³ Stubbs, *op. cit.*

⁴⁴ *Proceedings* (7 December 1960).

⁴⁵ *Op. cit.* (4 September 1957).

⁴⁶ *Op. cit.* (3 Sept 1952).

⁴⁷ *Op. cit.* (2 March 1955).

⁴⁸ *Op. cit.* (6 June 1956).

⁴⁹ The Earl de Grey and Ripon soon to become the Marquess of Ripon attended a meeting of the Grand Lodge of the District of Columbia in Washington on 10 April 1871.

⁵⁰ *Proceedings* (3 December 1958). Lord Scarbrough's address to the Grand Lodge of California, printed as an Appendix to those *Proceedings*, is noteworthy here for one comment: 'I believe Freemasons can do quite a lot to interpret our countries to each other. I am not suggesting, of course, that Freemasonry should formulate a kind of foreign policy. We leave that to our governments. We can, however, work on the foundation which our governments have laid, and help them by interpreting ourselves to each other'.

⁵¹ Stubbs, *op. cit.*, 'Conclusion'.

⁵² *Proceedings* (2 March 1960).

⁵³ *Op. cit.* (7 December 1960).

⁵⁴ Stubbs, *op. cit.*, pp. 192-4.

⁵⁵ *Proceedings* (14 June 1961).

⁵⁶ Stubbs, *op. cit.*, pp. 198-9

⁵⁷ Though (according to Draffen in *AQC* 88, *op. cit.*) without a round-table meeting of the four Constitutions working in South Africa.

⁵⁸ *Proceedings* (6 March 1957).

⁵⁹ *Op. cit.* (5 July 1957).

⁶⁰ Representatives of the three Home Grand Lodges met in April 1964 and agreed, inter alia, that the phrase 'to remain a member of' should be inserted into the 1905 Concordat. (They did not apparently consider amending the Concordat with India signed only a few years earlier.) The UGLE accepted this proposal when it adopted the Report of the BGP at its meeting on 9 September 1964. (See *Proceedings* for that date.) Although the insertion of this phrase is described in the *Proceedings* of 9 June 1965 as 'a minor alteration to its [the Concordat's original 1905] wording' it in fact introduced a remarkable change: a brother whose membership of an English Constitution lodge had been suspended by an authority under that Grand Lodge would ipso facto henceforth not only have his membership of a lodge under any other Sister Constitution suspended but *cease to be a member* of that lodge while so disqualified. Whether the implementation of this new provision has ever been requested merits further research.

⁶¹ *Proceedings* (9 June 1965).

⁶² Stubbs, *op. cit.*, pp. 198-9.

⁶³ *Proceedings* (27 April 1960).

⁶⁴ *Op. cit.* (13 September 1961).

⁶⁵ *Op. cit.* (13 December 1961). It is also of interest to note that in the Indian Concordat we find – possibly for the first time ever – the phrase '...those Grand Lodges, having mutually granted recognition to each other...' The use of this formula presumably avoided the need to mention that according to masonic protocol the junior Grand Lodge (India) would have had to request recognition from the senior (the UGLE).

⁶⁶ Though for the record it should perhaps be added that under the terms of the Concordat the Grand Lodge of India promised not to extend beyond the borders of its native land, rather as the Grand Lodge of South Africa had a little earlier.

⁶⁷ *Proceedings* (10 March 1965).

⁶⁸ *Op. cit.* (8 September 1965).

⁶⁹ *Op. cit.* (14 September 1966).

⁷⁰ *Ibid.* It was not until 1971, however, that Grand Lodge learnt that in 1966 the President of the BGP had also assured the Grand Master of Alpina that the UGLE would support him in his efforts to enforce his ban on intervisitation with the Grand Lodge of France 'though it was not our policy to interfere with the internal affairs of any other Grand Lodge.' (See *Proceedings*, 10 March 1971).

⁷¹ *Proceedings* (14 September 1966).

⁷² *Op. cit.* (10 December 1969).

⁷³ *Op. cit.* (8 September 1965).

⁷⁴ *Op. cit.* (13 December 1961).

⁷⁵ *Op. cit.* (9 March 1966).

⁷⁶ *Op. cit.* (13 March 1968).

⁷⁷ *Op. cit.* (27 June 1967).

⁷⁸ Between 1950 and 2000 such Representatives were officially but briefly welcomed whenever they attended Quarterly Communications, and official visitors to their countries from England sometimes called on

their help in arranging their programmes. Normally, however, relations between Grand Lodges were conducted through Grand Secretaries, and the role of the Representatives remained symbolic rather than operative.

⁷⁹ *Proceedings* (27 April 1977).

⁸⁰ *Op. cit.* (9 September 1970).

⁸¹ *Op. cit.* (9 December 1970).

⁸² It will also be recalled that where an already recognised Grand Lodge (Alpina of Switzerland) was later found to permit masonic intercourse with a Grand Lodge which the UGLE had proclaimed to be irregular – notably the Grand Lodge of France – the UGLE's reaction had been to apply sanctions, by forbidding members of the English Constitution to visit it.

⁸³ *Proceedings* (9 December 1970).

⁸⁴ *Op. cit.* (10 March 1971).

⁸⁵ *Op. cit.* (14 June 1972).

⁸⁶ The Grand Orient of France it would later describe as 'wholly irregular' (*Proceedings* 9 September 1970) and even 'hopelessly irregular' (*Proceedings* September 1993).

⁸⁷ *Proceedings* (13 September 1972).

⁸⁸ *Proceedings* (14 September 1966).

⁸⁹ *Op. cit.* (13 September 1972).

⁹⁰ *Op. cit.* (12 December 1973).

⁹¹ *Op. cit.* (11 September 1974).

⁹² *Op. cit.* (26 April 1978).

⁹³ *Op. cit.* (13 June 1979).

⁹⁴ *Op. cit.* (8 September 1982).

⁹⁵ *Op. cit.* (9 June 1982).

⁹⁶ The Secretary does not have to check anything else with the Grand Secretary at this stage – for example, whether the jurisdictions under which any other lodges to which the candidate belongs or has belonged are recognised. A heavy responsibility therefore rests on the lodge Secretary, and it would not be surprising to learn that some candidates for joining membership from unrecognised Grand Lodges may have slipped through the net until after their election and declaration of allegiance and until the Grand Secretary's staff subsequently received and vetted their Grand Lodge registration form.

⁹⁷ *Proceedings* (14 September 1988).

⁹⁸ *Op. cit.* (10 June 1987).

⁹⁹ *Op. cit.* (13 September 1989).

¹⁰⁰ *Op. cit.* (13 March 1985).

¹⁰¹ *Op. cit.* (12 December 1973).

¹⁰² *Op. cit.* (14 December 1987).

¹⁰³ *Op. cit.* (10 June 1981).

¹⁰⁴ Which, it will be recalled, the UGLE had recognised in 1972 after assurances that it had been meticulous for two decades 'in avoiding any imputation of political interference.'

¹⁰⁵ *Proceedings* (12 December 1990).

¹⁰⁶ *Op. cit.* (24 April 1992).

¹⁰⁷ *Op. cit.* (11 December 1991).

¹⁰⁸ *Op. cit.* (30 April 1986).

¹⁰⁹ *Op. cit.* (13 June 1990).

¹¹⁰ *Op. cit.* (12 December 1990).

¹¹¹ *Whitaker's Almanac 2000*.

¹¹² *Ibid.*

¹¹³ *Proceedings* (12 September 1990).

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁵ *Proceedings* (13 June 1990).

¹¹⁶ *Op. cit.* (12 June 1991).

¹¹⁷ *Op. cit.* (24 April 1991).

¹¹⁸ *Op. cit.* (11 March 1993).

¹¹⁹ *Op. cit.* (13 March 1991).

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*

¹²¹ *Proceedings* (11 March 1992).

¹²² In fact there was already a sovereign independent Grand Lodge in Portugal, namely the Grand Orient of Portugal – but this was presumably regarded as an irregular body, it being related to the Grand Orient of France. Thus 'open' had been redefined as 'there being no *regular* sovereign Grand Lodge in existence.'

¹²³ In September 1991 the English lodges were brought within the jurisdiction of the nearest English District Grand Lodge, which was therefor renamed the 'District of Gibraltar and Lusitania,' but in June 1995 the additional words were dropped, and the English lodges in Portugal were instead formed into 'the Group of lodges in Portugal and placed under a Group Inspector.'

¹²⁴ See note above about the addition of the word 'regular' to UGLE's policy since Bro Stubbs' definition in 1967.

¹²⁵ *Proceedings* (11 March 1992).

¹²⁶ A similar dispensation was later obtained when the Grand Lodge of Togo was formed. (*See Proceedings* 14 September 1994).

- ¹²⁷ *Proceedings* (12 December 1990).
- ¹²⁸ *Proceedings* (10 June 1992).
- ¹²⁹ *Proceedings* (14 June 1978).
- ¹³⁰ Lodge of Shankar No. 9526 in Bombay, for which the warrant was issued between the Quarterly Communications of 9 June and 8 September 1993. (*See Proceedings*, 8 September 1993).
- ¹³¹ *Proceedings* (26 April 1995).
- ¹³² *Proceedings* (27 April 1993).
- ¹³³ *Ibid.*
- ¹³⁴ *Proceedings* (11 September 1996).
- ¹³⁵ In December 1995 Grand Lodge heard from the Pro Grand Master that 'RW Bro Sir Ian Percival [had] journeyed to Hyderabad for a private and informal talk with the MW Bro K.L. Reddi, Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of India, [and that] it was agreed that representatives should now be appointed to prepare an agenda on which talks may take place. There are to be no preconditions.' The Pro Grand Master expressed the hope that the subsequent discussions would 'bring us all back into amity with one another at an early date.' A 'considerable amount of diplomatic activity' then took place, and in June 1996 it was announced that 'nothing will be agreed [with the Grand Lodge of India] before our Districts in India have been properly consulted.'
- ¹³⁶ *Ibid.*
- ¹³⁷ He also stated that 'on 20 April we advised our Brethren not to visit the Grand Orient of Italy or its lodges' but I have not found any mention of this in the *Proceedings* of 28 April.
- ¹³⁸ *Proceedings* (8 December 1993).
- ¹³⁹ *Proceedings* (9 December 1992).
- ¹⁴⁰ *Proceedings* (9 June 1993).
- ¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁴² *Proceedings* (8 September 1993).
- ¹⁴³ Quotation from the Grand Master's Address to Grand Lodge on 27 April 1994, as reported in the *Proceedings* of that date.
- ¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁴⁵ *Proceedings* (8 March 1995).
- ¹⁴⁶ *Proceedings* (11 June 1997).
- ¹⁴⁷ *Proceedings* (June 2000).
- ¹⁴⁸ *Proceedings* (September 1996).
- ¹⁴⁹ *Proceedings* (June 1994).
- ¹⁵⁰ Its description in the *Proceedings* (14 December 1994).
- ¹⁵¹ *Proceedings* (8 June 1994).
- ¹⁵² *Proceedings* (9 March 1994).
- ¹⁵³ *Proceedings* (14 September 1994).
- ¹⁵⁴ Appendices A and B to the *Proceedings* (14 December 1994).
- ¹⁵⁵ Namely *Aims and Relationships of the Craft and Basic Principles for Grand Lodge Recognition*.
- ¹⁵⁶ The use of 'a' rather than 'the' in this Appendix caused the President of the BGP to comment: 'In this it echoes the leaflet [*Freemasonry's External Relations*] ... but not the Basic Principles ... So long as the Appendix is understood not to dilute the requirement for belief in the GAOTU, I do not think it needs to be amended.' *See Proceedings* (14 December 1994).
- ¹⁵⁷ The set of Basic Principles adopted by the Grand Lodge of Scotland in 1961 makes no mention of the question of regularity of origin. Draffen's comments on this (*AQC* 96 pp. 133-134) are relevant.
- ¹⁵⁸ *See the Proceedings* of the meetings in the months indicated.
- ¹⁵⁹ *Proceedings* (14 September 1994).
- ¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁶¹ *Proceedings* (10 December 1997).
- ¹⁶² *Proceedings* (8 March 1995).
- ¹⁶³ *Proceedings* (14 June 1995).
- ¹⁶⁴ *Proceedings* (10 September 1997).
- ¹⁶⁵ *Proceedings* (10 September & 10 December 1997).
- ¹⁶⁶ *Proceedings* (27 April 1960).
- ¹⁶⁷ *Proceedings* (14 June 2000).
- ¹⁶⁸ And even if (though the President did not mention this) the Grand Lodge of Greece thereby once again represented the majority of regular Craft Freemasons in Greece, and was (still) recognised by most other Grand Lodges.
- ¹⁶⁹ *Proceedings* (12 June 1996).
- ¹⁷⁰ *Proceedings* (11 September 1996).
- ¹⁷¹ *Ibid.* In June 2000 it was disclosed that 'some 8% of the membership' of the English District in Cyprus had originally been expelled 'for not resigning from the Grand Lodge of Greece' but had then had their expulsion commuted to suspension' – and that they had nevertheless continued to pay their subscriptions. (*See Proceedings*, 14 June 2000).
- ¹⁷² *Proceedings* (14 June 2000).
- ¹⁷³ *Proceedings* (8 September 1999).
- ¹⁷⁴ *Proceedings* (14 June 2000).

¹⁷⁵ At the time, the NGLG was recognised only by Ireland and Scotland (who had no lodges in Greece or Cyprus), Spain and the NGL of France – which had indicated they would re-recognise the GLG if the UGLE did, the RGL of Italy, the RLGL of Portugal, South Africa, Togo, Benin, Ecuador and Venezuela (See *Proceedings*, 14 June 2000).

¹⁷⁶ *Proceedings* (8 December 1999).

¹⁷⁷ *Proceedings* (9 December 1992).

¹⁷⁸ See the author's paper on 'Pure - and Accepted - Masonry' in *AQC* 106 (1993).

¹⁷⁹ Rule 108 of the *Constitutions and Regulations* of the Grand Lodge of Mark Master Masons (ed. 2000).

¹⁸⁰ Rule 36 of *The Rules of the Supreme Council* (ed 1996).

¹⁸¹ These are the only meetings mentioned in this paper for which I cannot give chapter and verse from official publications, and I have therefore had to record my own experience of them.

¹⁸² Togo, in 1994. (See *Proceedings*, 14 September 1994).

¹⁸³ *Proceedings* (11 June 1975).

¹⁸⁴ *Proceedings* (13 September 2000).

¹⁸⁵ Both reproduced as appendices to this paper, for ease of reference.

¹⁸⁶ Published as an Appendix to the *Proceedings* (14 December 1994).

¹⁸⁷ This relationship if further examined in my paper on 'Pure - and Accepted - Masonry', in *AQC* 106 (1993).

