

Chapter Nine:

Leazer's Principles Of Interpreting Information About Masonry

In order to pursue his objective, discovering Freemasonry to be perfectly compatible with Christianity, Leazer must:

1. Ignore many facts, as we have already demonstrated his willingness to do;
2. Deny many facts, which his Masonic friends encourage him in doing;
3. Discredit, in his own mind, those who disagree with his friends, the Masons, and
4. Establish principles of interpretation, which enable him to selectively examine Masonic publications in order to prove his point.

In turn, he will do each of these. Indeed, rather than being an objective and scholarly work, Dr. Leazer's A Study Of Freemasonry is the worst form of diatribe against "anti-Masons", and an ingratiating apologetic for Masons.

Principles of Interpretation

In A Study of Freemasonry, Dr. Leazer identifies five "principles" which he argues must be used as a filter through which to examine material about the Masonic Lodge; they are:

1. "Many Masons and their critics begin with conclusions, which they then seek to prove." (p. 11)
2. "Both Masons and their critics have created fraudulent documents to prove points..." (p. 11)
3. "Anti-Masons typically assume that Freemasonry is based on the writings of one person." (p. 13)
4. "Many writers assume that Freemasonry is a monolithic organism, which can be traced back to a single origin." (p. 15)
5. "It is usually claimed, by many Masons and critics, that Freemasonry is a secret society." (p. 17)

Each of these principles is found in Jim Tresner's Perspectives, Responses & Reflections. Dr. Leazer's wholesale adoptions of

them, in A Study of Freemasonry, demonstrates how great his reliance upon Tresner really was.

Principle Number One: The Place Of Paradigms In A Study

Dr. Leazer's first principle is, "Many Masons and their critics begin with conclusions, which they then seek to prove." (A Study Of Freemasonry, p. 11) To illustrate his point, Dr. Leazer quotes Mr. Larry Kunk, President of Ephesians 5:11, Inc., a Christian ministry in Fishers, Indiana. Mr. Kunk has prepared an excellent treatment of the plan of salvation in the Masonic Lodge entitled, What Is The Secret Doctrine of the Masonic Lodge and How Does It Relate to Their Plan of Salvation?. That document was part of the 630-page presentation which Pastor Burchett and I made to the IFW, September 17, 1992. Dr. Leazer stated:

"Larry Kunk points out 'the tendency of humans to be limited by their paradigms.' A paradigm is a model that a person believes describes the truth about something. As Kunk points out, a person can be misled by his paradigm and make a false conclusion.

Many Masonry critics begin with the paradigm that Freemasonry is an anti-Christian religion. Kunk says, 'The reader must look at Masonic writings from the perspective of someone who does not believe that Jesus is the only Son of God.' If you make up your mind before you take an objective look at Freemasonry, you will probably arrive back at your beginning point because you stay within your paradigm, namely that Freemasonry is an anti-Christian religion." (A Study of Freemasonry, p. 11)

Dr. Leazer's Paradigm

It is sad that Dr. Leazer did the same thing he accused Kunk of doing. Remember, Dr. Leazer's paradigm was stated in his August 3, 1992 letter to me, in which he said:

"I have talked with some of the most conservative Southern Baptist pastors and laypeople who are Masons. I find it difficult to believe they all have been deceived by Satan or have bowed their knees to him."

Dr. Leazer's paradigm is that he cannot believe that these people are deceived; therefore, is it any surprise that he concludes that they are not deceived, and that Freemasonry is compatible with Christianity? With his paradigm, Dr. Leazer assumes every negative statement about Masons is the fabrication of a rabid "anti-Mason", and therefore is to be discredited. With his paradigm, Dr. Leazer assumes everything that a Masonic leader or writer says is true, and can be accepted at face value.

A scholarly study would give a standard by which to measure an important concept as "some of the most conservative Southern Baptist pastors and laypeople." Also, a scholar would recognize that a man's personal theology, liberal or conservative, Christian or non-Christian, does not affect the nature of the Masonic Lodge. Thus, a scholarly study would understand that this comment is not only prejudicial, but such a comment, even if not prejudicial, would be irrelevant.

Leazer Misquotes Kunk

But, unfortunately for Dr. Leazer's support of Freemasonry, he misquotes Kunk by taking his statement out of context. Kunk said:

"Masonic writers do not have an orthodox paradigm of Jesus, God, Satan, salvation, baptism, deity, etc. They intentionally clothe their writings in Christian terminology in order that Christians will be limited by their paradigms. In order to understand the nature of Freemasonry, the reader must look at Masonic writings from the perspective of someone who does not believe that Jesus is the only Son of God. When reading the Masonic quotes, try to switch paradigms and see how the meanings change. Until the reader has developed a Masonic paradigm, he cannot fully understand Masonry. Many Masons do not properly understand Masonry because they have not become aware of how they are being misled by their paradigms." (Unpublished manuscript, emphasis added)

Dr. Leazer quoted Mr. Kunk, but eliminated the first eight words of his sentence. Those words are critical. Their elimination makes Kunk look like he's trying to distort what Masons are saying, rather than trying to understand correctly what they believe and mean. Why would Dr. Leazer do that? He never does it with Masons, but only with those whom he would seem to designate "little insignificant" and "anti-Masonic".

Read Mr. Kunk's sentence as he wrote it: "In order to understand the nature of Freemasonry, the reader must look at Masonic writings from the perspective of someone who does not believe that Jesus is the only Son of God." Now, read it as Dr. Leazer quotes it: "'The reader must look at Masonic writings from the perspective of someone who does not believe that Jesus is the only Son of God.'" Do you see the difference? Dr. Leazer began with a conclusion, and he seems willing to distort anything that anyone said in order to prove it. Leazer portrays Kunk as recommending the distortion of Masonic writers, when, in fact, Kunk is offering help in not distorting them.

Dr. Leazer Proves Mr. Kunk's Point

In reality, Kunk said, "If you read Masonic literature from your Christian perspective, i.e., from your Christian paradigm, you will misunderstand what the Lodge is teaching." In chapter thirteen of this study (see pp. 191f), we will examine Dr. Leazer's statement:

"The Masonic Great Architect of the Universe must be interpreted in light of the Bible." (A Study Of Freemasonry, p. 43)

Interpreting Masonic ideas by the Word of God will lead to wrong conclusions, because in so doing, Dr. Leazer falsely imposes Christian doctrine on the Lodge's anti-Christian teaching. If there is an imperative for "interpret(ing Masonic concepts) in light of the Bible", Dr. Leazer not only has failed to demonstrate it; he hasn't even addressed the question objectively.

In this, Dr. Leazer is guilty of what he warned others about; he said:

**"Readers must be careful that they are not guilty of reading something into a sentence that is not there."
(A Study Of Freemasonry, p. 54)**

Dr. Leazer repeatedly accuses "anti-Masons" of doing this, without giving proof; it is he who does the very thing about which he warns us. In chapter sixteen, we will discuss Dr. Leazer's assertion that the Masonic idea that salvation comes from "purity of life and conduct" means that salvation comes only from faith in and obedience to the Lamb of God, Jesus Christ." (A Study Of Freemasonry, p. 52) Such a concept appears nowhere in official

Masonic writings, and is a case of Dr. Leazer "reading something into a sentence that is not there." Dr. Leazer simply adds a Christian concept to a Masonic teaching, and declares the Lodge Christian. That is not scholarship.

In chapter eleven (see pp. 164ff), we show how Dr. Leazer commits the same offense against scholarship when he determines that good Masons are Christians, but Masons who make the Lodge the most important institution in their lives are non-Christians. Dr. Leazer offers no support for such an idea other than his preconception that "some of the finest and most conservative" Christians that he knows, are Masons. Surely, if this is the case, his reasoning goes, there couldn't be anything wrong with the Lodge. This is a circular argument: If all Masons are Christians, bad Masons must not be Christians. That is a statement of an apologist, not of a scholar.

Dr. Leazer is guilty of "reading something into a sentence that is not there" when he associates the "All Seeing Eye" of Freemasonry with the Psalmist's testimony of the omnipotence and omnipresence of God. (A Study Of Freemasonry, p. 33) In chapter twelve (see pp. 181ff), we show that the psalmist makes no visible representation of God. He addresses the attributes of God without trying to reduce them to physical manifestations. The psalmist was constrained by the Word of God, which warned him about making an idol. The Mason is not!! For Dr. Leazer to give this Masonic idea a biblical interpretation is a distortion of the Bible and of Freemasonry.

Dr. Leazer, elsewhere, excuses the Masonic Lodge of its unbiblical concept of God by declaring that the Bible does not refer to Lucifer as "an all-seeing eye." (A Study Of Freemasonry, p. 44) Dr. Leazer then, curiously, argues that the Lodge could not be saying that Lucifer is god because the Bible doesn't say that. The circular argument of Dr. Leazer is invalid because he is "reading into a sentence something which is not there." The teachings of the Masonic Lodge cannot have Christian paradigms imposed upon them, because the teachings of the Masonic Lodge are unbiblical and anti-Christian.

In chapter seventeen (see p. 251), we discuss Dr. Leazer's committing of the same offense when he said:

"...While recommended to Masons, we cannot conclude that Masons are expected to accept every thought in A Bridge To Light." (A Study Of Freemasonry, p. 57)

What a gratuitous conclusion! The word "recommend" means "to endorse as fit, worthy, or competent; to make acceptable." (Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary) The Scottish Rite recommends A Bridge To Light, but does expect Masons to believe it? How did Dr. Leazer determine that the Scottish Rite's recommendation of A Bridge To Light was limited? Who told this to him? Would he quote the statement in A Bridge To Light in which the Masonic Lodge disowns a single teaching in A Bridge To Light?

Repeatedly, in his attempt to prove his concept of the compatibility of Freemasonry and Christianity, Dr. Leazer reads into Masonic statements Christian concepts and ideas which are not there. That is not scholarship, and A Study Of Freemasonry is not scholarly.

Masons Often Use Christian Vocabulary But An Occultic Dictionary

Put another way, a paradigm is like a dictionary. Two groups may use the same vocabulary, but if they use different dictionaries, they give different definitions to the words which they use. Masons do not use a Christian dictionary, as is evidenced throughout their writings. This is illustrated by Henry Wilson Coil in his Masonic Encyclopedia. He said:

"Monotheism has been espoused as the sole religious dogma of Freemasonry by some authors, the most prominent of whom is probably Dr. Roscoe Pound, and it has occasionally been advocated with such warmth as to indicate especial merit or sanctity as against all other concepts of Deity, though such authors fail to state why. This, obviously, violates Masonic principles, for it requires belief in a specific kind of Supreme Deity and ..." (p. 517, column one and two)"

When a Christian says, "God...", he uses a dictionary which addresses the One True God of the Bible. When a Mason says, "Supreme Architect of the Universe...", he is speaking of the Masonic god who is not the God of the Bible. Masons do not use the same dictionary as Christians. Mr. Kunk knows that. Dr. Leazer knows that; why does he not think it necessary for the SBC to know that?

In The Lost Word Its Hidden Meaning, George H. Steinmetz stated:

"God —...Used here, reluctantly, for want of a better short descriptive word, 'God' will be understood to mean that Supreme, Impersonal Intelligence which we credit with being the directing force of the Universe. In Freemasonry this handicap is partially overcome for us by the descriptive phrase: 'Supreme Architect of the Universe.'" (The Lost Word Its Hidden Meaning, Macoy Publishing and Masonic Supply Co. Inc., 1953, p. 5)

Remember that the publications of the Macoy Publishing and Masonic Supply Co. have been endorsed by Masonic authorities as accurate about the Lodge. This is the problem for Dr. Leazer. Masonry is an organization which requires a belief in God, has a concept of God, and teaches a concept of God, and that concept is not compatible with the biblical revelation of God.

Paradigms Need Not Be Determinative

Dr. Leazer concludes principle number one with the statements:

"If someone believes that Freemasonry is a religion, he can find numerous quotes to support his paradigm. If someone believes that Freemasonry is not a religion, he can also find numerous quotes to support his paradigm. It is difficult to conclude which paradigm is correct." (A Study of Freemasonry, p. 11)

First, it is unnecessary to determine which paradigm is correct. Even if the options given by Dr. Leazer were paradigms — and they are not — it would be irrelevant. The motion passed at the SBC said nothing about determining if Freemasonry is a religion; the motion directed the IFW to determine if Freemasonry is compatible with Christianity. If Dr. Leazer is answering the question, "Is Freemasonry a religion?", he, in fact, is answering a question which no one has asked. Whether Freemasonry is a religion or not is irrelevant; the only question before the HMB is, "Is Freemasonry compatible with Christianity?"

Yet, one of Leazer's sources, Dr. Robert Morey's The Origins and Teachings of Freemasonry states:

"For every masonic writer who says that Freemasonry is not a religion, there are five masonic writers who claim that it is a pagan religion. While they may

disagree as to which pagan religion, they all agree that Christianity is wrong and its teachings must not be allowed in the Lodge." (p. 115)

Often Dr. Leazer's sources contradict his conclusions, but the SBC would never know that, because Dr. Leazer selectively quotes from his sources. An important point is made by Dr. Morey which Dr. Leazer would have been well advised to understand. Frequently, Dr. Leazer will argue that because there is not universal agreement among Masons, no opinion is possible about the nature of Masonic teaching. The fact is that there is more similarity in Masonic teaching than there is dissimilarity. The similarity is as Dr. Morey states: "While they may disagree as to which pagan religion, they all agree that Christianity is wrong and its teachings must not be allowed in the Lodge."

Philosophical or Religious Paradigm: Worldview

The issue of a paradigm, as Mr. Kunk rightly understands, is much more fundamental than one's attitude toward a certain idea. In fact, the issue is so fundamental that it addresses those non-cognitive, that is, not consciously thought out, ways in which we react to and evaluate things. One's "philosophical or religious paradigm" has to do with one's worldview. Few Christians have ever given any thought to their own worldview. Few ministers have ever preached a sermon on, "A Christian worldview."

If one has a biblical worldview, one knows that he is a creature of God's providence, is accountable to God for his life, is in need of mercy, as he is unable to "fend for himself", and is also in need of others, as no man is an island unto himself. Much of the fight over abortion in America stems from opponents who clash over an issue which is approached from two worldviews. One worldview declares that man is the special creation of a Personal, Knowable God; the other worldview declares that man is the product of an impassive, mechanical process called evolution. There can be no reconciliation without capitulation on the part of one worldview or the other.

The same is true with Freemasonry. The incompatibility of Christianity and Freemasonry is so fundamental, there can be no reconciliation or rapprochement between the two. One aspect of this difference of worldview is discussed in chapter fourteen of this study (see p. 211), where it is shown that Albert Pike denies that God is the Creator of the world.

Many Southern Baptists have so much trouble dealing with the question of Freemasonry, because they have never established their own worldview, and therefore have no basis of evaluating how alien the Masonic worldview is to God's revelation of Himself. One would have thought Dr. Leazer would have addressed the issue of world view as one of the fundamental criteria by which to determine if Freemasonry is compatible with Christianity. In a scholarly study, why didn't he?

Dr. Leazer does acknowledge that he is aware of the importance of worldview; in A Study of Freemasonry, he said:

"Some Masonic writers have been non-Christians who write from a non-Christian worldview." (p. 13)

It would have been helpful for Dr. Leazer to have focused less on his opposition to "anti-Masons", even to the point of distorting their work, and to have focused more on the worldview of the Masonic Lodge, a worldview which is consistently and decidedly anti-Christian. Who are these Masonic writers? Do they meet any of the criterion of being "general societies which Lodges commonly follow"? Why do we not have examples of these given in Dr. Leazer's scholarly study?

Paradigm, Prejudice Or Platitudes

Dr. Leazer seems to show a naive understanding of the word "paradigm". Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary defines "paradigm" as: "Example, pattern; especially: an outstandingly clear or typical example or archetype." The Webster's Third New International Dictionary adds the concept of "a typical, conditioned response."

Dr. Leazer implies that Mr. Kunk used "paradigm" in the latter sense, which is virtually a synonym for "prejudice." However, Kunk used "paradigm" in the sense of a fundamental worldview through which a person filters all data which he or she processes. A paradigm is not inherently bad. The Bible has a paradigm, which is repeatedly stated; several illustrations of the Bible's paradigm are:

"In the beginning God..." (Genesis 1:1)

"I am He that declared the end from the beginning and from ancient times those things which are not..." (Isaiah 46:10)

"In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God and the Word was God." (John 1:1)

"Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is One..." (Deut. 6:4)

God began time with a conclusion, and throughout time His purpose is to punctuate and to accentuate that conclusion. That is a paradigm, but that is not a problem. Paradigms only become problems when they produce prejudice.

Dr. Leazer confuses "prejudice" with "paradigm". If someone is irrationally — not based on fact, reality or reason — convinced that Freemasonry is or is not a religion, they don't have a "paradigm"; they have a "prejudice". If, however, someone gives a clear, non-ambiguous example to illustrate that Freemasonry is a religion, then they have a "paradigm".

Repeatedly, throughout the discussion of the Masonic issue and throughout The SBC and Freemasonry, Volumes I and II, we give "paradigms" of the incompatibility of Christianity and Freemasonry. Dr. Leazer attempts to confuse us with Masonic platitudes, but fortunately, at last, Dr. Lewis has motivated a "serious challenge" to Dr. Leazer's A Study Of Freemasonry and Dr. Lewis' "A Report On Freemasonry", which reveals their inadequacy.

Principle Number Two: Fraudulent Documents

Dr. Leazer's second principle of examining Masonic materials is that "Both Masons and their critics have created fraudulent documents to prove points..." (A Study of Freemasonry, p. 11) There is no question that such has been the case. The principle evidence which Dr. Leazer has is the use by this author and others of the Albert Pike quote from La Femme et L'Enfant Dans La Franc-Maconnerie Universelle.

Because the quote, in which Pike purportedly identifies Lucifer as the god of the Lodge, overtly states what everything else in Masonry covertly suggests, it was believable. I became aware of the potentially fraudulent nature of this quote when the printer of The SBC and Freemasonry, Vol. I, which also printed Robert Morey's book, The Origins and Teachings of Freemasonry, sent me a copy. Unfortunately for the Masonic Lodge, and for Dr. Leazer's defense of them, the refutation of this quotation does nothing to rehabilitate the writings of Albert Pike, whom Morey

affirms was an Hindu occultist. Also, it does nothing for the Luciferian sentiments of Albert Pike, as those beliefs are documented elsewhere for all to read.

It is curious, however, that with all of the supposedly fraudulent documents available, this is the only one which Dr. Leazer can point out that John Ankerberg, Ed Decker, Jack Harris and I have used. It would seem to be more charitable, particularly in the face of the deficiencies of his own work, for Dr. Leazer to have allowed for the possibility that we did not know that this document was a fraud.

Once again, Dr. Leazer's study is flawed in its design and in its details; Leazer stated:

"Critics of Freemasonry often are guilty of faulty research. The use of logical fallacies to prove false premises is common. One is led to conclude that even though most Masonry critics claim to do original research, many quotes and ideas are borrowed from earlier critics." (A Study Of Freemasonry, p. 13, emphasis added)

One would think that anything of which "anti-Masons" are "often guilty of", and/or "use...common(ly)" would be easy to illustrate from their work. But, Dr. Leazer's preoccupation with "anti-Masons", in a study which is purportedly designed to discover the truth about the Lodge, results in accusation without documentation, which is hardly a scholarly approach to his task. Dr. Leazer is so totally convinced of his argument — he is so totally committed to his paradigm — for him, it does not require documentation. That is not scholarship.

Of course, Dr. Leazer's accusation against others is particularly embarrassing when one considers how totally he has relied upon secondary sources in A Study Of Freemasonry. Dr. Leazer does not make one significant and original contribution to the study of the compatibility of Christianity and Freemasonry. He only parrots what others have said!

It is particularly the case that Dr. Leazer's "quotes and ideas are borrowed from" Jim Tresner. Dr. Lewis and the HMB Trustees would be amazed at Dr. Leazer's criticism of others, if they obtained and read Tresner's Perspectives, Responses & Reflections.

The fact that Dr. Leazer no longer works for the Board is irrelevant. The trustees and Dr. Lewis "sold" the SBC false evidence and faulty conclusions based on Leazer's "research".

Until that is corrected, the HMB will not be rid of Gary Leazer. Why will Dr. Lewis and the HMB trustees not face the fact they did a poor job, and correct this mistake?

Leazer's Ingratiating Attitude Toward Lodge

Dr. Leazer's ingratiating attitude toward the Masonic Lodge is evident, also; he said: "The Grand Lodges do not prohibit Masons from reading any books, no matter what the books teach about Freemasonry." (A Study Of Freemasonry, p. 13) Other than continuing to cast the Lodge in a favorable light, this statement by Dr. Leazer does not seem to address any aspect of the fundamental question before the HMB, which is, "Are the teachings and practices of Freemasonry compatible with Christianity?" In a footnote on that same page, Dr. Leazer said:

"When Walton Hannah's anti-Mason book, Darkness Visible: A Revelation and Interpretation of Freemasonry (London: Augustine Press, 1952) could not be located, a Mason loaned his personal copy." (p. 13, footnote)

What possible relevance does this anecdote have to do with a scholarly study on the subject of the compatibility of Freemasonry and Christianity? It does show the extremes to which Dr. Leazer is willing to go in order to show Masons in a favorable light, but it doesn't address the question given to the HMB by the SBC. Yet, it also raises the question as to why Dr. Leazer did not examine the documents which even Masons agreed are authoritative?

Leazer states that Masons were willing to give him what he asked for. One wishes to ask him why he did not ask for the most important documents which are missing from this report, i.e., primary Masonic publications? It may be that Dr. Leazer would have discovered that his Masonic friends were far more willing to provide "anti-Masonic" books, which they considered ridiculous, than they were to provide Masonic materials, which they know reveal the truth about the Lodge.

Principle Number Three: One Man Responsible For Masonry

Dr. Leazer is as condescending toward "anti-Masons" as he is ingratiating to Masons. His third principle, which provides a filter

through which to examine questions about Freemasonry is, "Anti-Masons typically assume that Freemasonry is based on the writings of one person." (A Study Of Freemasonry, p. 13) Dr. Leazer's prejudice leads him to make many statements that he cannot defend, and therefore does not attempt to defend with evidence. Dr. Leazer does not present the statement of a single "anti-Masonic" writer who would illustrate this principle.

That Pike is an important person in Freemasonry is demonstrated in The SBC and Freemasonry, Volume I, Part III, "Masonic Authorities", pp. 7-9, and in The SBC and Freemasonry, Volume II, chapter four, "Official Masonic Books", pp. 30-43, and chapter seven, "Questions About Freemasonry — Part I: Research About Masonry and the Lodge's Esteem of Albert Pike", and again in The SBC and Freemasonry, Volume III, pp. 134ff.

Dr. Leazer's Methodology Re-stated

In a July 16, 1992, Baptist Press release, Dr. Leazer was reported as having said:

"...he hopes to find whether modern Masons agree with the interpretations offered by Holly and other critics of Masonic writers from the 19th Century. 'Most of these (anti-Masonic) writers have used Albert Pike, Albert Mackey and others who basically are writers of 100 or so years ago,' Leazer said."

I wrote Dr. Leazer on August 12, 1992 and said:

"My book (SBC and Freemasonry, Volume I) had little to do with 'my position' or 'Pike's position.' It had everything to do with what Masons are doing right now, today. Yet, you make no mention of that....

If your study is going to determine if modern Masons agree with Albert Pike, then that it is not a proper design of the study. Albert Pike's revered position among Masons is well established. You will find many Southern Baptist Masons who will denounce Albert Pike, but the Lodge will not. The Grand Secretary of the Masonic Lodge in Georgia only two weeks ago, in a taped- telephone conversation, affirmed Pike's esteemed position among Masons."

Apparently, Dr. Leazer ignored this, and continued in his diatribe to create a straw man, i.e., "Anti-Masons typically assume

that Freemasonry is based on the writings of one person" (A Study of Freemasonry, p. 13), and then proceeded to dismantle this figment of his own imagination.

Albert Pike Is Not The Issue: Freemasonry Is!!

I told Dr. Leazer in my letter:

"Pike is not the issue. If it will facilitate designing this study in a proper way, I will stipulate from the beginning, that we will not bring Pike into the discussion. Pike is not the issue. He graphically and brazenly declares the issue, but Freemasonry's incompatibility with the Christian faith does not require Morals and Dogma to be established."

Again, Dr. Leazer ignored reality in order to support his pro-Masonic fantasy. I then showed Dr. Leazer how little of Albert Pike's material is used in The SBC and Freemasonry, Volume I:

"In your Baptist Press statement you say 'most of these (anti-Masonic) writers have used Albert Pike'. Dr. Leazer, if you have examined my booklet, you will know that Albert Pike is mentioned on only five pages, and that only one and one-half pages is devoted to quotations from Pike. That is in a 64 page booklet. Less than two percent of the material is from Albert Pike. **Eliminate Pike; Freemasonry is still the spirit of anti-Christ.**" (emphasis added)

Albert Pike Is Honored By The Lodge Even Today

However, even as little as I used Pike, and as willing as I am to eliminate him from the discussion, what Dr. Leazer must deal with is the Masons' attitude toward Pike. I said in my letter:

"Yet, as you eliminate Pike, Dr. Leazer, you must deal with the statements of many modern Masons such as Alan Boudreau, PhD., Curator and Librarian Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of the State of New York. In 1980, Dr. Boudreau said:

'Freemasonry has had many great scholars who devoted their time and talents to the philosophical exposition of the character of the Craft, the meaning of Craft symbols, and

the religious aspects of the Fraternity: Albert Pike, Robert Freke Gould, Fort Newton, Albert Gallatin Mackey, and W. L. Wilmshurst.'

This affirmation does not sound like 'modern (Masonic) writers' have any problem with Pike and Mackey. Not only does he affirm these Masonic scholars, he affirms the 'religious aspects of the Fraternity.'"

The Curator And Librarian Of The Grand Lodge Of New York

In an effort to be balanced and fair, I tried to contact Dr. Boudreau to see if perhaps he had changed his mind; I told Dr. Leazer:

"This morning, Wednesday, August 12, 1992, I called the Grand Masonic Lodge, Empire State (New York State). I asked for Dr. Boudreau. He has retired. I spoke with Ms. Kathleen Haley, acting curator and librarian. I asked her, 'If I read Albert Pike, Albert Mackey and W. L. Wilmshurst, will I get a proper understanding of Freemasonry?' She said, 'Generally, the men you have named are fairly respected authors.' She added, 'Macoy Publishers has a series called Little Masonic Library which is a good introduction to Freemasonry.' She added, 'Anything published by Macoy is accurate about Freemasonry.'"

I then related to Dr. Leazer that I own that set of books. Originally published in 1924, this series was re-issued in 1977. Volume Five of this set contains the article entitled "The Meaning of Masonry" by none other than Albert Pike. I told Dr. Leazer that the preface to this volume states: "...this part of the address is one of the clearest and noblest expressions of the Meaning of Masonry ever uttered or imagined."

The biographical sketch which accompanies this article states:

"'Albert Pike...was the master genius of Masonry in America, both as scholar and artist. No other mind of equal power ever toiled so long in the service of the Craft in this New World. No other has left a nobler fame in our annals...So passed Pike. No purer, nobler man has stood at the altar of Freemasonry or left his story in our traditions. He was the most eminent

Mason in the world, alike for his high rank, his rich culture, and his enduring service. Nor will our Craft ever permit to grow dim the memory of that stately, wise, and gracious teacher — a Mason to whom the world was a Temple, a poet to whom the world was a song."

Abandon Morals And Dogma? Never!!

I reminded Dr. Leazer that this book was re-published in 1977 by the Macoy Publishing Company. It is a modern affirmation of Pike. The statement, "Nor will our Craft ever permit to grow dim the memory of that stately, wise, and gracious teacher — a Mason to whom the world was a Temple, a poet to whom the world was a song", has been proved true again and again.

Remember the statement of Sovereign Grand Commander Kleinknecht of the Southern Jurisdiction of the Scottish Rites of America, in "Albert Pike: Debit or Credit?", published in the November, 1992 issue of the Scottish Rite Journal; he said:

"Correctly understood; Albert Pike's Morals and Dogma provides our Brethren a stimulus to thought, a source of inspiration, and even an aid to Scottish Rite growth. Pike's great work is not a book of an hour, a decade, or a century. It is a book for all time...so long as we remember the great books and the great men who created them, books are forever, immortal landmarks guiding us to new life and greater accomplishments.

Abandon Morals and Dogma? Never!" (pp. 5-6, emphasis added)

Remember also the words of the author of A Bridge to Light, who stated:

"A Bridge to Light was designed to act as a bridge between the ceremonies of the degrees and their lectures in Morals and Dogma ...There may be the same need for repetition in studying the lectures in Morals and Dogma." (p. 4)

Recall the words of former Sovereign Grand Commander Clausen in his Commentaries On Morals and Dogma; he said:

"These summaries and commentaries are designed to increase the participation and input of our members — not to supplant Morals and Dogma — but to stimulate its research as a source of knowledge and inspiration." (emphasis added, p. xix)

No "anti-Mason" depends totally upon Pike; no "anti-Mason" imagines that Pike alone is responsible for Freemasonry. But, Masons adore Albert Pike, and they revere his writings. Why Leazer wants to distort what "anti-Masons" claim, and to try to excuse Masons from what they clearly teach, is a question only he can answer. But, the SBC has the right and the responsibility to ask his supervisors, Dr. Larry Lewis and Dr. Darrell Robinson, why they didn't acknowledge the truth, when it was pointed out to them?