from HUGH SINCLAIR M.A. (OXON.) ALN COURT ELLINGTON NE615LR FOUNDER OF MFRFM, MOVEMENT FOR A REGISTER OF FREEMASONS ALN COURT ELLINGTON NE61 5LR

Submission to members of the General Synod of the Church of England, calling for a register of Masonic clergy, sent to you with the permission of Mr. David Williams, Clerk to the Synod, and Mr. Alastair Callcutt, Synod Support Unit

prologue to submission

MFRFM

Movement for a Register of Freemasons

16.3.06

The Rt. Rev. Graham James, Chair, Central Religious Advisory Committee of the BBC, BBC, Broadcasting House, Portland Place, LONDON W1

Dear Sir.

Do we know all we need to know about religious broadcasters? Submission to CofE General Synod calling for a Register of Masonic Clergy

An MP of some seniority in the House of Commons, well-respected for his independence of mind, has written to me, stating that in an age of transparency there should be disclosure of Masonic affiliation in the Church.

I would be pleased if you would bring the Submission (copy enclosed) to the attention of the Committee. When the clergy buttonhole the public via radio or tv, they have the privilege of addressing a captive audience. From the heights of Mount Olympus they can deliver *the Christian message* across a wide spectrum of current affairs which may include such topical subjects as equal opportunities, glass ceilings, and women priests (even Bishops). They may even, occasionally, express *the Christian message* on Freemasonry. There is an observable tendency among some contemporary clergy to adopt a stance of studied liberalism towards Freemasonry, with fairness to all, inclusivity and no witch-hunts at the top of their agenda. Among this wing of the church, a trend may be observed, laying stress on the tendency of the Freemasons 'to involve women more in their counsels.' I quote here a vicar from Lincolnshire. The Archdeacon of Totnes even implies, erroneously, that the Freemasons, an all-male order, recognize a small eccentric fringe of Women Freemasons. They do not, as a recent BBC R4 programme on Women Freemasons confirmed.

A Register serves 2 practical purposes. One, it identifies clergy who are Freemasons. Two, it enables us to ask of the rest, what on earth can you possibly know of a society of secret members sworn to secrecy? Answer, nothing, so be quiet! And don't keep mentioning *the money*! A lot of people donate large sums of cash to various causes, and as we currently hear, not always for the purest of motives.

Yours truly,

cc Chairman of the BBC, Ms Ruth Gledhill, Mr. Jonathan Petre, Mr. Richard Batson

The Masonic Antient Charges state that "you are .. to prefer a poor Brother, that is a good man and true <u>BEFORE</u> any other poor People in the same Circumstance." This obligation binds all Freemasons – including clergy, lawyers and public servants – of every degree.

MFRFM seeks to argue for a public register of Freemasons. : 01670 861736

Press self-censorship limits the reporting of matters Masonic so please consider forwarding the contents of this letter to others

submission to 4 churches

PRACTISE WHAT YOU PREACH or "DON'T GIVE ME THAT CANT" (the late Anthony Bevins)

to

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND
THE CHURCH IN WALES
THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND (NB ALSO PETITION TO SCOTTISH PARLIAMENT PE927, HEARING DATE 22.2.06)
THE SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH

calling for a public register of clergy who are members of the Freemasons or any oath-bound society with a secret membership

In England and Wales, members of the judiciary, magistrates and JPs have to declare Masonic membership. The Standards Board for England requires the same accountability from councillors under a code of conduct introduced in response to the sleaze which hit the head-lines in the 1990s.

A. "THE INDEPENDENT" 4.12.92: THE MASONIC SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE GENERAL SYNOD HEADLINE: QUESTIONS OVER CHURCHMAN'S CHARITY TRIP [Secretary-General of the Synod and high-ranking Freemason in Craft and Royal Arch] Andrew Brown reports on a leading Anglican's visit to South Africa with a homosexual friend

"The most powerful layman in the Church of England took his homosexual friend around South Africa on a trip for an Anglican charity, the Independent has learnt. He later repaid to the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge the extra cost involved. The bills, showing the two men shared a room on the trip in 1990, were approved by Patrick Gilbert, the society's then managing director, who resigned suddenly last year and is now facing charges of indecent assault.

The Rev Sir Derek Pattinson, as he now is, [holding the Masonic ranks of JGD, PSGD, Craft, and AGDC, Royal Arch*] was secretary-general of the Church of England's General Synod for 18 years, until 1990, when he was knighted on retirement and embarked on training for ordination. He was also chairman of the executive committee of the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, a 300-year-old missionary society and publishing house, currently being investigated by the Charity Commissioners after revelations about the extravagance of Mr Gilbert, its last managing director.

Sir Derek set off on a prolonged fact-finding trip around southern Africa at SPCK's expense in the autumn of 1990, while he was still secretary-general of the Synod. In Johannesburg he was joined, by pre-arrangement, by Barnaby Miln [reported to be in Hertford Jail in 1995: fraud in an old people's home], a homosexual activist who had been one of the youngest Justices of the Peace in England.

For most of the years when Sir Derek, 62, was training for the priesthood, he lived with Mr Miln in a flat in Westminster owned by the diocese of London. Dr. Graham Leonard, the traditionalist who has now announced he plans to leave the Church of England in protest against women priests, was then Bishop of London. He agreed to Sir Derek's ordination without the customary investigation of his suitability by the Church's Advisory Council on Ministry. "It's perfectly true that [Sir Derek] never went on a selection conference, because technically he was the employer of the staff who were arranging it," Dr. Leonard said.

Mr Miln claims that Dr. Leonard knew the set-up. "The Daily Mail chap, Tony Doran, had got through the outer door on the morning of the deaconing and accused [Sir Derek] to his face of being a homosexual. And Derek sent him away," he said. "The telephone then started ringing and Graham Leonard decided to go ahead... The organist was told to play full blast, should there be a protest, and at the private do afterwards, Graham Leonard came up to me and said: "I did you a favour, Barnaby." Dr. Leonard attended a packed General Synod debate in 1987 when Sir Derek was on the platform and Mr Miln then a lay member, announced that he was a homosexual. The Synod went on to pass by an overwhelming majority, a motion condemning "homosexual genital activity."

Before Sir Derek could become a priest, Dr Leonard retired, and was replaced by the Rt Rev David Hope, the former bishop of Wakefield. He compelled Sir Derek to return to the theological college at Mirfield, Yorkshire, for an extra term, which he had hoped to skip. But he did ordain him. Dr Hope said: "I knew that they were sharing rooms or a flat. But it was put to me that Barnaby Miln was looking after Derek, caring for or about him. I would presume that their domestic arrangements were satisfactory and wholesome because I was not told otherwise."

Sir Derek serves as a curate in St. Gabriel's, Warwick Square, central London, whose rector is David Skeogh. Mr Skeogh, a "high" Anglo-Catholic, is a former school-teacher who served as Dr Leonard's domestic chaplain both in Truro and London.

While Sir Derek was away at Mirfield last spring Mr Miln began a relationship with David O'Reilly, a young Irishman. He had previously been attracted to a handsome Australian teacher, whose athletic interests led him [Miln] to take up an exercise programme, which resulted in a knee injury. Mr Miln said he was due for a cartilage operation at the end of March and "needed somebody to get me around. And Derek was due back from Mirfield for the ordination and so forth. So we needed somebody to drive us around." David O'Reilly was Mr Miln's chauffeur and lover from April until he died in mysterious circumstances behind King's Cross railway station, north London, on 6 August this year.

On 20 May, for reasons which are still unclear, two police cars pulled over Mr Miln's car as Mr O'Reilly was driving him along the Westway to London. The two men were taken separately to police stations and interrogated for six hours. The car was searched but nothing unusual was found except some leaflets promoting the Anglican Centre in Rome.

Mr O'Reilly introduced Mr Miln to hard drugs very soon after their relationship began. Mr Miln said that in very little time he was spending hundreds of pounds a week on heroin and cocaine. On 6 August, Mr Miln's 45th birthday, Mr O'Reilly drove him to King's Cross. He parked there, left Mr Miln in the car, and went to buy some cocaine. What happened next is unclear. Mr Miln believes it was murder: the Crown Prosecution Service found no case to answer, when police passed on papers of the case. In any case, Mr O'Reilly fell, or was pushed, under the wheels of a lorry and died. Sir Derek collected Mr Miln from the police station where he had been questioned for hours by officers wanting to know why he was in the car and what Mr O'Reilly had been doing. He denied everything, but admitted on two separate occasions afterwards that Mr O'Reilly had in fact been buying cocaine for him.

The relationship between Sir Derek and Mr Miln deteriorated, though the two men continued to live together. Since Mr. Gilbert's forced retirement last year from the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, the new managing director, Paul Chandler, has completely revised its financial controls. He said yesterday that none of the society's travel budget came from contributions made by the general public. Sir Derek, when challenged over the allegations, replied that he had paid by cheque for Mr. Miln's share of the hotel bills in South Africa immediately after his return. But he could not produce a record of this. He has disappeared and cannot be contacted. Dr Hope has ordered him to take medical leave for six weeks, and will review his position at the end of that time."

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

THIS SUBMISSION seeks to render the clergy accountable to the laity in the same way as these other holders of public office referred to above. It is concerned primarily with the needs of the laity, not the interests of the clergy. This is, after all, the age of transparency. The days of squirearchies are gone.

Thank you for your letter about masonry. I can confirm that I am not and have never been a Mason; it is true, I believe, that this diocese had a number of masons among the clergy of a certain generation; I don't think it is true of the younger ones, and I have resisted the appointment of known masons to certain senior posts. I have real misgivings about the compatibility of masonry and Christian profession. I was a little puzzled by your reference to the 'masonic' Order of St John–I am a member [Dr Williams is a Prelate] of the order, and have never heard anything suggesting any organic link with masonry. There may be people who belong to both, but nothing in my experience of the Order of St John bears out any community of interest.

Yours sincerely

Dictated by the Archbishop and Signed in his absence

C. ARTICLE IN THE INDEPENDENT DECEMBER 1992: JOHN MAJOR ON MASONIC DISCLOSURE

THE INDEPENDENT *** POLITICS & POLICY p7

FREEMASONS 'SHOULD TELL OF ALLEGIANCE' by PATRICIA WYNN DAVIES

"FREEMASONS occupying positions in public life should declare their allegiance, the Prime Minister said yesterday. Mr. Major said that was his personal view after Chris Mullin, the Labour MP for Sunderland South, reminded him during Prime Minister's Questions that in September 1986 in a questionnaire from Martin Short (author of Inside the Brotherhood), he had agreed that police officers, magistrates, members of Parliament, councillors and other public officials who were Freemasons should disclose their membership. 'Is that still his position?' Mr Mullin asked, urging the prime Minister to support his private-member Secret Societies (Declaration) Bill due for its Commons Second Reading on 29 January [1993]. Mr Major replied: 'It remains my personal view as I set out at that time.' He would examine Mr Mullin's Bill and his own time-table and 'see what answer I come up with'. The Bill does not seek to stop grown men wearing aprons, baring their breasts or indulging in other rituals but would sweep away the secrecy attaching to membership. A wide

THE THRUST OF THIS SUBMISSION is predicated on the undeniable loss of moral authority by 'the church' in 21st century society. The church no longer wields unchallenged spiritual power over the citizenry. It is simply one of many service providers in the community. Before it invites our custom as clients, it must be open about its claims and its core values. In this age of transparency, it must disclose relevant facts about its provision. If it claims to be the one true line to God through a divine saviour by the name of Christ, owing allegiance to none other, it must provide guarantees to its clients of its single-mindedness. In practice, when the matter arises, we, the citizenry, meet only with failed leadership, institutionalized confusion and chaos. Traditionally, decisions about Freemasonry have been clergy-centred: church leaders made their choices in the style of feudal overlords, leaving the laity to pick up the pieces of their faith as best they might. The clergy, called to their vocation by God, knew best. Take the erstwhile Dean of Norwich Cathedral:

D. EASTERN DAILY PRESS 29.7.92:

DEAN SUPPORTS FREEMASONS

"The Dean of Norwich Cathedral has publicly backed the right of Freemasons to worship in the cathedral. The Very Rev Paul Burbridge says he has received a flood of letters condemning Freemasonry since a special cathedral service last month [to celebrate the 275th anniversary of the institution of the Grand Lodge of England] attended by many of Norfolk's masons. He said he found the reaction 'totally extraordinary' and contrary to the Christian tenets of welcoming people seeking to worship. 'I am not a Freemason myself and I am not arguing the toss whether Freemasonry is good or bad,' he said. 'My line is very simple: if people want to worship God in Norwich Cathedral, then I must in conscience say yes.' The special service had generated more letters than any other single subject during his nine years as dean of the cathedral, he said. Now he has replied to the storm of protest in an article in the Diocesan News backing the right of masons - and other groups – to join in with Christian worship. 'A lot of leading Christians have been Freemasons, which is why I find it hard to accept the notion that it is something terribly evil,' he said.

'Jesus Christ was a chap who included people – not excluded them. I am rather saddened that some of my fellow Christians should take the view that it is my job to keep them out of church.' Leading Norfolk Freemason Col Geoffrey Dicker [CBE, TD, DL, listed as tenth in the UGLE Grand Master's Council 2003-4] said he was unworried by the protests. 'The service was a tremendous success and we were delighted with it,' said Col Dicker, Provincial Grand Master for Norfolk. [The Deputy in 1996 was an Anglican vicar.] 'The fact that one or two people did not approve does not worry me at all. Whatever you do in life some people disapprove and there is more noise from people disapproving than from those who do approve.' "

TRANSPARENCY IN A MODERN SOCIETY should require that every minister of every church declare to the prospective congregation affiliations that are potentially in conflict with the Christian creed of love thy neighbour as thyself. Disclosure may or may not have a bearing on future church attendances, but, either way, the flock has an absolute right to full disclosure before it invests spiritual trust in the shepherd, who if the truth be known, may not be much of a free spirit when faced with the three-line whip of the Masonic Lodge which he on the quiet serves as chaplain and from which he derives Masonic benefits as long as he is obedient and loyal to the lodge. In any case, why should he wish to keep the fact of membership secret? Is it fear, self-interest or pride of covert empowerment? To ensure that transparency is real and not a pretence, the laity need a publicly-accessible register of interests by which to test the true mettle of the church and that of its pastors. The clergy enjoin us to regard <u>all</u> people as neighbours, and to love those neighbours as we love ourselves, going the extra mile for any one of them. But every Freemason has to agree under oath to prefer a brother over any other person. Those two moral imperatives are separate and irreconcilable. It is lawful to believe in either, but you cannot combine one with the other. They are mutually exclusive. Royal Arch Freemasons are even enjoined under oath to overlook known wrong-doing of a Brother.

CLERGY are by nature of their pastoral and community work involved from time to time in decision-making processes in the realm of education, social work, and housing. They sit on committees and sometimes chair their proceedings; they act as governors; they serve as prison, hospital and university chaplains; they provide references; they may be called as character witnesses in court. It is vital that recommendations/interventions/referrals by Clergymen should not be open to question on grounds of bias, favouritism or other improper influence. What also counts is whether (in the words of the House of Lords in an English case) there is a "public perception of the possibility of unconscious bias".

E. JACK STRAW MP HOME SECRETARY, UNITED KINGDOM, 1997 HOME AFFAIRS COMMITTEE:

"membership of secret societies such as freemasonry can raise suspicions of a lack of impartiality or objectivity. It is therefore important the public know the facts. I think it is the case that the Freemasons said they are not a secret society but a society with secrets. I think it is widely accepted that one secret they should not be keeping is who their members are in the criminal justice system."

DO NOT THE CLERGY ASPIRE TO BE REPRESENTATIVES OF A HIGHER TRIBUNAL? THEY CERTAINLY ACT AS IF THEY DO!

F. THE MASONIC ANTIENT CHARGES STATE THAT: "you are .. to prefer a poor Brother, that is a good man and true BEFORE any other poor People in the same Circumstance." This obligation binds all Freemasons - including clergy, lawyers and public servants - of every degree.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

THE MASONIC OBLIGATION does not derive from a vague ethos shared by a latterday Moral Re-armament Society. It stems from bloodcurdling oaths sworn before a man who may be a total stranger to the first degree apprentice. The Worshipful Master comes bearing no kite mark of eligibility branded on his forehead, is subject to no quality control and is not accredited as an Investor in People! Yet before this possibly inert icon, the apprentice must bare the knee and swear under severe penalties to keep secret all that takes place in the lodge. By so doing, he swears away his conscience in advance, embracing a code of silence even before he knows the secrets. One of those secrets is the membership list. What if the apprentice is a clergyman and one of those members holds the key to church preferment?

THE BROTHERHOOD may represent to some an ideal of virtue, by force of oath and at the point of a dagger and the curl of a noose, but it is a travesty of justice to impose it on everybody. Yet the church down the ages has clasped the cabalistic male-only enclave to its bosom. Perhaps clerics have judged enforced virtue to be an easier option than 'saving souls' through faith, free and unsullied by worldly self-interest. That's a 7:52 commitment. You can't as a minister of religion hope to achieve soul-saving on a grand scale and still have a day-off on Mondays. There may not be all that much money in soul-saving, either, and the church with its upkeep, offices, CCTV and toilets, not to mention clergy houses, is nothing without money.

G. 8.2.52: HM THE QUEEN TAKES AN OATH 'TO ASSURE THE SECURITY OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND'. SHE IS ALSO DEFENDER OF FAITH IN RESPECT OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. Her obligations require that the church should not be secretly infiltrated by non-Christian creeds but as one of the Queen's cousins is in 2006 England's Grand Master and another is a Provincial Grand Master, it is difficult to see how the Queen can act impartially in regard to the Freemasons.

H. 1987: GENERAL SYNOD REPORT "FREEMASONRY & CHRISTIANITY: ARE THEY COMPATIBLE?" stated that "some Christians have found the impact of Masonic rituals disturbing and a few perceive them as positively evil." The non-Masonic members of the committee declared a "number of very fundamental reasons to question the compatibility of Freemasonry with Christianity". The report concluded that Masonic rituals were "blasphemous" because "God's name must not be taken in vain, nor can it be replaced by an amalgam of the names of pagan deities."

I. 1989: A CHURCH OF SCOTLAND REPORT CALLS FOR MEMBERS TO RECONSIDER MASONIC INVOLVEMENT VOLUNTARILY.

J. 2003: THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND 1989 REPORT IS CONDEMNED BY ITS OWN CLERGY HOLDING GRAND LODGE RANK.

K. 23.11.04: THE RT. REV. GRAHAM JAMES' CHAPLAIN/DIOCESAN COMMUNICATIONS OFFICER: said that a Cathedral service in June 1992 (see 1992 EDP report "Dean supports Freemasons" above) was "not a service 'celebrating Freemasonry' but rather a service .. to which Freemasons were welcome to attend (sic)". The service was in truth to celebrate the 275th anniversary of the institution of UGLE and the long service of the Grand Master, HRH The Duke of Kent, and was one of many such Cathedral celebrations orchestrated by UGLE in England that June.

L. 29.3.05: THE VICAR OF ST. PETER MANCROFT CHURCH, NORWICH rebuffed my letter about explicit links between his church and a Masonic Lodge by passing my letter to the Lodge whose address he was evidently able to locate. On 6.4.05, he asked me to respect the fact that he did not view as "harmful" the long association between the Lodge and his church.

M. 27.4.05: THE ARCHBISHOP'S DEPUTY SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS told me not to quote the 15.11.02 Independent head-line "New Archbishop: Masons have no place in the Church". The article was based on his reply (quoted above) to my open letter and derived generous input from the Archbishop's full co-operation.

N. THE SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH HAS NEVER INVESTIGATED FREEMASONRY ISSUES.

O. 4.9.05: ANGLICAN CANON JOSEPH MORROW BD OSTJ, THE SCOTTISH GRAND MASTER told The Daily Mail he would make the Freemasons a more open society. Ten days on, Scotland's Grand Lodge announced his resignation. Neither Primus nor Archbishop questioned his installation on 25.11.04. The Moderator of the Church of Scotland was silent on the issue as she has been silent on this submission.

P. THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND CANON i/c THE CATHEDRAL CHURCH OF OLD ABERDEEN (16.12.2005): "THE GIVING OF ALLEGIANCE – ABSOLUTE TO BOTH GOD AND LODGE – SEEMED AND SEEMS TO ME TO BE INCOMPATIBLE."

Q. PETITION TO THE SCOTTISH PARLIAMENT PE927 (HEARING DATE 22.2.06) BY HUGH SINCLAIR

on behalf of the Movement for a Register of Freemasons, calling for the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Executive to introduce legislation requiring the Church of Scotland to require its clergy to declare, in a public register, membership of the Freemasons or any society having a secret oath-bound membership.

WHAT I HAVE TRIED TO PROVIDE IN THIS SUBMISSION is evidence of the uneasy and embarrassed partnership that exists between the church and the Freemasons with some illustrations of the extreme lengths to which clergy will go in order to preserve their special relationship. The most appropriate caption would be "Duck and Dive". Whatever the motivation underlying this apparent collusion may be, a publicly accessible Register of ministers of religion who belong to the Freemasons or other secret societies would transfer empowerment to the laity and reduce the anachronistic patriarchal status of the church. Those clergy who wish to remain in fraternal societies will be free to do so. My 2005 Petition PE848 (re the fledgling Scottish Grand Master Canon Morrow) sought to ban clergy in the Scottish Episcopal Church from Masonic membership (to prevent such disgraces recurring). A ban is morally justified and, indeed, some major Provinces of the Anglican Communion worldwide expressly forbid priests belonging to the Freemasons. (Doubtless some don't.) Nevertheless, a Register of Masonic membership offers a degree of protection and choice to the laity. Ordinary citizens are entitled to know if clergy acting in a pastoral, professional or representative capacity owe a secret allegiance which may impair their independence of judgment, advice or action. A Register will provide an x-ray of such secret obligations.

HUGH SINCLAIR 20.3.2006

I wish to acknowledge the help provided by a member of MFRFM in providing access to the United Grand Lodge of England Yearbook 2003-4

One or more attachments from the following accompany this email:

- 1. from the independent 4.12.92: the masonic secretary-general of the general synod
- 2. dr rowan williams writes about freemasonry in the church, 9.8.02
- 3. article in the independent 1992: freemasons 'should tell of allegiance' (john major)
- 4. eastern daily press 29.7.92: dean supports Freemasons
- 5. letter from the bishop of ripon & leeds 11.12.02
- 6. vicar = deputy grand master, norfolk

THE MASONIC ANTIENT CHARGES STATE THAT "YOU ARE .. TO PREFER A POOR BROTHER, THAT IS A GOOD MAN AND TRUE before ANY OTHER POOR PEOPLE IN THE SAME CIRCUMSTANCE." This obligation binds all Freemasons - including clergy, lawyers and public servants - of every degree.

MFRFM seeks. to argue for a public register of Freemasons

MOVEMENT FOR A REGISTER OF FREEMASONS

FOUNDER: HUGH SINCLAIR M.A. (OXON.) ALN COURT ELLINGTON NE615LR

Press self-censorship limits the reporting of matters masonic so please consider forwarding contents to others

Footnote: Reported in the Times 20th February 2006 (also in the Daily Telegraph at length): WOMEN CLERGY VETO, BARSHAM, SUFFOLK: "The Ven. Geoffrey Arrand, Archdeacon of Suffolk, defended the refusal by the parochial church council of Barsham to accept a woman priest. He said: 'I understand why they are doing it, but that is not the same thing as saying I agree with them.' The vacancy is advertised for men only."

The 2006/7 edition of Crockford's names one of the priests in the same Wainford group of parishes in the diocese of St. Edmundsbury as the Rev. Norman Harold Simister. A Norman Harold Simister holds several ranks of high office in the United Grand Lodge of England, Craft and Royal Arch.