

Chapter Thirteen:

The Masonic Concept Of God

Section 8 in A Study Of Freemasonry is entitled "God". Here Dr. Leazer examines the Masonic conception of God. We have already seen in Section 7 that the Mason is willing to make a physical representation for the Person of God in the All-Seeing Eye. This is in direct violation of the Word of God. We have also seen how A Bridge To Light and Albert Pike deny a literal Devil. In both of these instances, we have seen how Dr. Leazer and the HMB are willing to accept poorly researched conclusions in order to support the false conclusion that the Masonic Lodge and Christianity are compatible.

One of the principle incompatibilities between Christianity and the Masonic Lodge is the Masonic teaching on the nature of God. Dr. Leazer said:

"The true name of God has been the subject of speculation for both Jews and Christians...L James Rongstad, in How to Respond to The Lodge, says that the 'rediscovered' secret name for God is 'Jah-Bul-On.'" (A Study Of Freemasonry, p. 38)

Dr. Leazer rejects Rongstad's opinion and states:

"Masons insist that this argument is fallacious and that the derivation is incorrect. They insist the spelling of words are changed by Masonry critics to support their argument. Rongstad changes the spelling Bul to Bal, which is closer to the name of the Canaanite fertility or storm god, Baal. It is a leap of faith to get 'On' from Osiris since there is no 'n' in Osiris." (A Study Of Freemasonry, p. 39)

Once again, Dr. Leazer's loyalty to Masons is demonstrated by the construction, "Masons insist...". It doesn't make any difference what "Masons insist...". Dr. Leazer is being paid to discover the truth. At every point, the influence of Masons on Dr. Leazer's study is overwhelmingly demonstrated. Leazer quotes Coil's Masonic Encyclopedia, which states:

"Jah, Bel, and On appear in the American ritual of the Royal Arch degree on the supposition that Jah was the Syriac name of God, Bel (Baal), the Chaldean, and On,

the Egyptian. But the last name...was actually the name of a city, error having arisen from the Biblical story that Pharaoh gave Joseph, for a wife, Asenath, who was the daughter of Potepherah (Gen. 41:45), priest of On, meaning priest of the city of On, not the god On." (A Study Of Freemasonry, p. 40, quoted from Coil's Masonic Encyclopedia, p. 516)

Dr. Leazer also quotes Mason Christopher Haffner to prove his point. As one reads Jim Tresner's Perspectives, Responses & Reflections, his reliance upon Haffner is obvious. Recall the discussion of Haffner's concept of the Masonic ideal, and of Tresner's endorsement of that ideal. (See p. 145) One wonders if Tressner directed Leazer to Haffner. Leazer adds:

"Haffner and other Masons insist the ritual for the Royal Arch degree, from which this identity allegedly comes, 'says nothing of the sort.'" (A Study Of Freemasonry, p. 39)

How can Dr. Leazer agree with Masons that "(the ritual) says no such thing", when he has already quoted Coil's Masonic Encyclopedia which says they do? The name Jah Bul On appears in the Royal Arch degree, as per Coil's Masonic Encyclopedia. Coil's states that the "American ritual of the Royal Arch degree (used the name Jah, Bel, and On) on the supposition that Jah was the Syriac name of God, Bel (Baal), the Chaldean, and On, the Egyptian."

Leazer seems to take comfort in the fact that Coil's states that this understanding of "On" was a mistake. Instead of being the name of a deity, Coil's insists, it was only the name of a city. But, the reality is that the writers of the Royal Arch degree of Freemasonry — the so-called Christian branch of the York Rite — believed these were names of pagan deities, and employed them for that reason.

Dr. Leazer then continues to quote Masons, when he said:

"Masons point out that the name Bul is found in the Old Testament. It is the name of the eighth month of the Jewish lunar calendar..." (A Study Of Freemasonry, p. 39)

It will not be our purpose to determine the significance of the lost name of the deity in Freemasonry. It will only be our purpose to demonstrate that Dr. Leazer did not do a sound job of research

into the matter. Mackey's Revised Encyclopedia of Freemasonry Volume II has an extensive article on "On"; it states:

"This is a significant word in Royal Arch Masonry, and has been generally explained as being the name by which Jehovah was worshiped among the Egyptians ... the founders of the Royal Arch had ... assumed it was the name of a god, and had so incorporated it with their system. ... The old Freemasons ... very naturally supposed that On was the Egyptian sun-god, their supreme deity, as the sun always was, wherever he was worshiped." (pp. 735-736)

Mackey's Revised Encyclopedia of Freemasonry Volume I states of the name "Bul":

"The primitive designation of the month Marcheswan. Doctor Oliver says in his Landmarks (ii. 551), that this is one of the names of God among the ancients. It is also said to be an Assyrian word signifying Lord or Powerful." (p. 160)

The point is that Dr. Leazer accepted a single Masonic writer's opinion in rejecting the opinion of an "anti-Mason". This pattern is so typical; it is wearisome. Could not Dr. Leazer do any original, primary, basic research and share with us an objective, scholarly opinion about this matter?

The Great Architect Of The Universe

Once again, in his discussion of the Masonic name for God, Dr. Leazer follows the party line. Quoting a Masonic source, he copies their reliance upon John Calvin's designation of God as an "Architect" to justify the Lodge's naming of Him as GAOU. Leazer states:

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

Why? Why must we attribute to the Lodge's dogma, Christian ideas? Dr. Leazer gives no justification for his requirement that this Masonic concept be interpreted in the light of the Word of God! In chapter nine (see p. 125), we discussed Dr. Leazer's admonition that "readers (not be) guilty of reading something into a sentence that is not there." (A Study Of Freemasonry, p. 54) Here, Dr. Leazer violates his own caution.

In The SBC and Freemasonry, Volume II, chapter ten discusses the inadequacy of the Masonic concept of God. That discussion will not be repeated here, but it does provide the insight needed to reject Dr. Leazer's willingness to accept the blasphemous name, Great Architect Of The Universe, as a name for the God of the Bible.

A Bridge To Light Denies Existence Of The Devil

In this section, Leazer said:

"In response to this charge, the reader is reminded that Lucifer is a created being and not equal to God. The Bible, which must be the only source for our understanding about Lucifer, does not speak of Lucifer as having an all-seeing eye." (A Study Of Freemasonry, p. 44)

By Leazer's rationale, a biblical paradigm would be imposed upon every Masonic concept, thereby pretending that the Lodge is Christian. Why is it concluded that the Masonic Lodge is not saying that Lucifer is the "All Seeing Eye", simply because the Bible does not say that? Dr. Leazer's reasoning is circular and invalid. He says that if the Bible does not say something, then the Lodge must not be saying that. This is illogical.

How does Dr. Leazer "square" his idea that "the Bible must be the only source for our understanding of Lucifer" with A Bridge To Light, which said:

"...and that there is no rebellious demon of Evil, or Principle of Darkness co-existent and in eternal controversy with God..." (A Bridge To Light, p. 324)

Or, how does Dr. Leazer respond to Delmar Duane Darrah's conclusion to his chapter, "The Religious Element":

"Thus there has been evolved a religious society, which has been charitable enough to recognize good whether it be found in the Bible or the Koran, or in the Moral Code of those who have sought the higher things of life." (History and Evolution of Freemasonry, Powner Co., 1979, p. 300)

If the Bible is our only source for truth, and if all Masons are Christians, as Dr. Leazer would have us believe, and if the origins of Freemasonry are Christian as Robert Morey would convince us, where did these ideas come from? If the Bible is the

only source of truth about Lucifer, and if Masons only get their truth from the Bible, where did the Lodge get the idea that the Devil doesn't exist.

Gordon's Critique of The SBC and Freemasonry, Volume I

Dr. Leazer quotes the critique of The SBC and Freemasonry, Volume I, by Dr. William Gordon of the IFW; he states:

"Another critic cites W. L. Wilmshurst's allegorical interpretation of Matthew 2:15...Wilmshurst interprets the passage allegorically when he writes, 'Out of Egypt have I called My son' is, in one of the many senses, a biblical allusion to this passing on of the catholic Mysteries from Egypt to new and virgin regions, for their enlightenment.'" (A Study Of Freemasonry, p. 44)

As mentioned in chapter two (see pp. 31-32), Dr. Leazer often cites Masonic teachings which are offensive to "anti-Masons", but none that are offensive to him. Here is an instance where even a scholarly study could legitimately express indignation. Wilmshurst claims that the "Egyptian mysteries were 're-veiled' by Moses" and brought out of Egypt. Even William Gordon in his critique of The SBC and Freemasonry, Volume I, calls this "blasphemous." What would it take for Dr. Leazer to object to a teaching or practice of the Masonic Lodge? One is left to wonder!

As to Dr. Leazer's quoting of Gordon's critique in stating that Wilmshurst does not identify Lucifer as the god of the Lodge, that will be dealt with in Appendix B, which addresses Gordon's critique.

The Kabbala and Freemasonry

Dr. Leazer questions the relationship of Freemasonry and the Kabbala. He said:

"Some critics quote Mackey in an effort to show an 'intimate connection' between the Kabbala and Freemasonry..." (A Study Of Freemasonry, p. 44)

Dr. Leazer appeals again to Gordon's critique to avoid the issue of Freemasonry and the Kabbala. In reviewing The SBC and Freemasonry, Volume I, Gordon almost made a thesis of the page

numbers of the quotations from Mackey's Encyclopedia of Freemasonry concerning the Kabbala. By inference, Dr. Leazer suggests that there is no relationship between the two. The truth is otherwise.

In The Encyclopedia of Freemasonry (In Three Volumes, ninth printing 1966 by Macoy Publishing and Masonic Supply Co., Inc., Volume I), Albert Mackey stated:

"...it (the Cabala) is intimately connected with the symbolic science of Freemasonry, the Cabala may be defined to be a system of philosophy which embraces certain mystical interpretations of Scripture, and metaphysical and spiritual beings...Much use is made of it in the advanced degrees, and entire Rites have been constructed on its principles. Hence it demands a place in any general work on Freemasonry...The ten Sephiroth, represented in their order of ascent from the lowest to the highest, from the foundation to the Crown, forcibly remind us of the system of Mystical Ladders which pervaded all the ancient as well as the modern initiations; the Brahmanic Ladder of the Indian mysteries; the Ladder of Mithras, used in the Persian mysteries; the Scandinavian Ladder of the Gothic mysteries, and in the Masonic mysteries the Ladder of Kadosh; and lastly, the Theological Ladder of the Symbolical Degrees..." (pp. 166-168, emphasis added)

These three volumes show an original copyright of 1909 by The Masonic History Company. That copyright was renewed in 1912 and 1929. A "New Edition, Revised and Enlarged" was copyrighted in 1946 by The Masonic History Company. A fifth printing was made in 1950, a sixth in 1953, a seventh in 1956, an eighth in 1958, and a ninth in 1966 by the Macoy Publishing and Masonic Supply Co., Inc.

Albert Mackey, Albert Pike, and A Bridge to Light affirm the relationship between the Kabbala and Freemasonry. The question for Dr. Leazer is why he would attempt to relieve the Masons of responsibility for their occultism in order to "sell" Masonry to the SBC as compatible with Christianity? One has to believe, either he did it knowingly and wittingly (which I trust is not the case), or he did it ignorantly because of his prejudice and bias, which prevented him from discovering the truth about Masonry.

A Bridge To Light Affirms Relationship Between Masonry and Kaballa

In commenting on the thirtieth degree of Scottish Rite Freemasonry, the Knight Kadosh degree, A Bridge To Life affirms the "intimate" relationship between the Kabbala and the Masonic Order; it states:

"Corresponding to the rounds representing the seven Liberal Arts and Sciences, the Mystic Ladder has seven rounds of a more esoteric or mystical significance. Pike approximately corresponds some of them to parts of the Sephirothic Tree of Life from the Kabalah...The esoteric significance must remain as part of our ritual, confided only to faithful breasts."
(A Bridge To Light, pp. 286-287, emphasis added)

Remember, this is A Bridge To Light, the book which Leazer said was to replace Morals and Dogma. This is the book which supposedly is to show how compatible Freemasonry is with Christianity. Once again, the reader needs to recognize that A Bridge To Light brazenly declares that Masons are not about to tell their secrets to Dr. Leazer or anyone else, who has not entered into a blood covenant with the Lodge.

There are other references to the Kabbala in A Bridge to Light. This quotation, from a book which Leazer and Masonic leaders agree is accurate and authoritative, is very similar to what is stated in The SBC and Freemasonry, Volume I. Dr. Leazer quotes my booklet in A Study of Freemasonry:

"The ENSOPH, therefore was compelled to create the world in an indirect manner, by ten emanations from the infinite light which he was and in which he dwelt. These ten emanations are the ten Sephiroth." (A Study Of Freemasonry, pp. 44-45)

This is remarkably parallel to the quotation from A Bridge To Light. Remember, Dr. Leazer admits, as do Masons, that books published by "various Grand Lodges and other official bodies" are "written authorities in Freemasonry". (A Study Of Freemasonry, p. 14) Also, the Scottish Rite is a "general society", which Leazer admits, "Masons tend to follow". (A Study Of Freemasonry, p. 5) Yet, even in the face of A Bridge To Light's affirmation of my booklet, Dr. Leazer persisted in his rejection of the occultism of the

Lodge. Repeatedly, A Bridge To Light affirms the relationship between the Kabbala and the Masonic Lodge.

Freemasonry and the Kabbala

When the index to the seven-volume Mackey's History of Freemasonry is consulted, only one reference to the Kabbala is found, and that is on page 349 (p. 350 in Mackey's Revised History Of Freemasonry). The article indexed as a reference to the Kabbala by Mackey's History of Freemasonry is entitled, "The Rosicrucians and the Freemasons." Here, true to Mackey's Encyclopedia, which I quoted in The SBC and Freemasonry, Volume I, Mackey said:

"No doubt in some of what are called the High Degrees there is a very evident use of a Hermetic element. This can not be denied. The fact will be most apparent to anyone who examines their rituals." (Mackey's Revised History Of Freemasonry, Volume II, p. 350, emphasis added)

A careful reading of this article does not demonstrate an actual reference to the Kabbala, which means that in Mackey's Revised History Of Freemasonry there is not one direct reference to the Kabbala.

Hermetic Element In Higher Masonic Degrees

Mackey's statement: "No doubt in some of what are called the High Degrees there is a very evident use of a Hermetic element" actually addresses the Ancient Mysteries. Encyclopedia Britannica has the following comment about the "Hermetic writings":

"...also called Hermetica, works of revelation on occult, theological, and philosophical subjects ascribed to the Egyptian god Thoth...In the Hellenistic age...the works ascribed to Hermes Trismegistos were primarily on astrology...and magic...The aim of Hermeticism, like that of Gnosticism (a contemporary religious-philosophical movement), was the deification or rebirth of man through the knowledge (gnosis) of the one transcendent God, the world, and men..." (The New Encyclopedia Britannica in 30 Volumes, Micropaedia, Volume IV, p. 1049, emphasis added)

As was seen in the discussion of the Master Mason degree in chapter twelve (see pp. 182ff), Freemasonry has never given up

this "Hermetic element", of "the deification or rebirth of man through ... knowledge...". This is not compatible with Christianity, and the SBC needs to declare this to the world. If such an assertion offends a Masonic defender, he has only to read A Bridge To Light to discover that perfection, for the Mason, indeed comes by knowledge.

Leazer's Quoting Of S. Brent Morris

In somewhat of a confusing manner, Dr. Leazer jumps from the superficial discussion of the relationship of the Kabbala and Freemasonry to making the following statement:

"Mackey repudiated the idea of Masonic descent from 'the Ancient Mysteries' ..." (A Study Of Freemasonry, p. 45)

Leazer then quotes from the secondary source of S. Brent Morris' article, "The Letter 'G'," published in The Plumbline of the Scottish Rite Research Society. (Remember, Morris is the man whose integrity has been questioned by Black Freemasons, see p. 99). It is unclear from A Study Of Freemasonry whether Dr. Leazer confuses the Kaballa and the Ancient Mysteries. He does jump from the discussion of the former to the discussion of the latter without any transition, suggesting that he may believe that he is talking about the same idea. Leazer seemed to quote Morris in the context of refuting the suggestion that there is a close association between Freemasonry and the Kaballa. If that is the case, he misuses Morris, for the article which Morris quotes has nothing to do with the Kaballa.

"Freemasonry and the Ancient Mysteries"

Morris quotes from an article entitled, "Freemasonry and the Ancient Mysteries", in Mackey's History Of Freemasonry. Morris quotes only the part of Mackey's article in which he denied any relationship between the Ancient Mysteries and Freemasonry. Morris quoted:

"It has been a favorite theory with several German, French, and British scholars to trace the origin of Freemasonry to the Mysteries of the Pagans, while others, repudiating the idea that the modern association should have sprung from them, still find analogies so remarkable between the two systems as to lead

them to suppose that the Mysteries were an offshoot from the pure Freemasonry of the Patriarches.

In my opinion there is not the slightest foundation in historical evidence to support either theory, although I admit the existence of many analogies between the two systems, which can, however, be easily explained without admitting any connection in the way of origin and descent between them." (A Study Of Freemasonry, p. 45, quoting S. Brent Morris, The Plumbline of the Scottish Rite Research Society, p. 185)

Remember, this is Leazer quoting Morris, who is quoting Mackey's. A brief review of Mackey's original article is instructive for anyone who wishes to "know the truth" about the Masonic lie. The following are quotations from this article:

"These mysteries, although they differed in name and in some of the details of initiation, were essentially alike in general form and design." (Mackey's Revised History Of Freemasonry, Volume I, p. 187)

This sounds remarkably like Robert Morey's comment about the similarities among Masons in The Origins and Teachings of Freemasonry. Unlike what Dr. Leazer would have Southern Baptists believe, the remarkable thing is the similarities among Masons, not their differences. Mackey's continued:

"Teaching and impressing this secret was in fact the explanation of the secret doctrine for which the Mysteries in every country had been instituted and the ceremony containing it was performed in the most sacred and private place of the temple or place of initiation." (Mackey's Revised History Of Freemasonry, Volume I, p. 191, emphasis added)

"The sufferings of Osiris, his death, his resurrection, and his later office as judge of the dead in a future state, formed the foundation principles of the Egyptian religion. They taught the secret doctrine of a future life." (Mackey's Revised History Of Freemasonry, Volume I, p. 195, emphasis added)

Dr. Leazer refused to examine the question of the "secret doctrine" of the Masonic Lodge, for if the Lodge has a "secret doctrine", it can't just be a fraternity. In that Dr. Leazer's

preconceived notion was that Masonry is only a fraternity, he couldn't examine this question. Also, his friend Jim Tresner, in Perspectives, Responses & Refections ridicules the idea that Freemasonry has a "secret doctrine." Leazer's A Study of Freemasonry never contradicts Tresner.

Mackey certainly introduces the issue of a "secret doctrine" in Freemasonry. A Bridge To Light certainly discusses the question. Morals and Dogma teaches a "secret doctrine." Why did Dr. Leazer ignore this critical subject? Mackey's article on the mysteries continued:

"In all of the Mysteries the ceremonies of initiation were of a funereal type. They allegorized, in a dramatic form, the sufferings, the death, and the resurrection of some god or hero." (Mackey's Revised History Of Freemasonry, Volume I, p. 195)

The Master-Mason degree is a "death, burial and resurrection" drama. It is based on the Mystery religions. If there is any doubt, read on.

"Analogies or similarities certainly exist between the ancient Mysteries and Freemasonry upon which the theory of the descent of the one from the other has been based." (Mackey's Revised History Of Freemasonry, Volume I, p. 204, emphasis added)

"Both the Mysteries of the ancients and the Freemasonry of the moderns were religious institutions ...Freemasonry also teaches the doctrine of a future life." (Mackey's Revised History Of Freemasonry, Volume I, pp. 204-205)

"The plan of the Third or Master's degree of Freemasonry is, as respects the subject and the development of the plot and the conduct of the scenes, the same as the drama of the ancient Mysteries." (Mackey's Revised History Of Freemasonry, Volume I, p. 207, emphasis added)

"However, we cannot easily deny that the founders of the Speculative system of Freemasonry in forming their ritual, especially of the Third Degree, gained many suggestions as to the form and character of their funereal legend from a study of the rites of the ancient initiations if they did not indeed fall heir to

them by actual descent." (Mackey's Revised History Of Freemasonry, Volume I, p. 210, emphasis added)

Dr. Mackey denies a lineal descent of Freemasonry from the Ancient Mysteries, yet, he continues to document their identity. Under "Mysteries, Ancient" in Mackey's Revised Encyclopedia of Freemasonry, Volume 2, pp. 689-692, a long article appears; in part, it states:

"...the truest theory is that which would discard all successive links in a supposed chain of descent for the Mysteries to Freemasonry, and would attribute their close resemblance to a natural coincidence of human thought. The legend of the Third Degree, and the legends of the Eleusinian, the Cabiric, the Dionysian, the Adonic, and all the other Mysteries, are identical in their object to teach the reality of a future life; and this lesson is taught in all by the use of the same symbolism, and substantially, the same scenic representation ...

The word "mystery" must here be strictly reserved for these ancient religious rites of the Greeks and Romans." (p. 691)

Mackey admits of the "close resemblance" of Freemasonry and the Ancient Mysteries. And, he admits of their "identical...object to teach the reality of a future life." It will not be surprising, no matter how much they deny it, to discover that an organization which has at its very core the idea of resurrection and a future life, also declares how to achieve that "eternal life."

Mackey's Role In Perpetuating Idea Of Masonry's Connection With Ancient Mysteries

Coil's Masonic Encyclopedia identifies Mackey as one of the principle Masonic authorities who perpetuated the idea of a direct relationship between the Ancient Mysteries and modern Freemasonry. Coil's Masonic Encyclopedia comments on the contradictory testimony of Mackey's writings. In one place, Mackey virtually proves the lineal descent of Freemasonry from the Ancient Mysteries, and in another place simply denies that relationship. Coil's addresses this dilemma stating:

"Mackey afterwards disavowed all such ancient paganistic notions of what he called 'several German, French, and British scholars,' **strangely omitting himself as one of the principal disseminators of those ideas.**" (Coil's Masonic Encyclopedia, p. 516, emphasis added)

Whether Dr. Leazer confuses the Kabbala and the Ancient Mysteries is unclear from A Study Of Freemasonry. The fact that Morris selectively quotes from Mackey is clear. Why Dr. Leazer would not reveal all that Mackey said about the Ancient Mystery religions, is open to question. Even a cursory reading of Morris' primary source would have shown Dr. Leazer that his quoting of Morris' secondary article did not support Leazer's argument concerning the Kabbala. It also would have let Dr. Leazer know how close the Ancient Mystery religions and Freemasonry are in their practices and beliefs. A cursory reading of Mackey's article, "Freemasonry and the Ancient Mysteries", would have let Dr. Leazer know that he needed to look further than the single testimony of one Masonic writer for the truth about the nature of Freemasonry.

Lowest-Common-Denominator-god

Dr. Leazer quoted Vladimir S. Borichevsky and Stephen N. Jula's "Masonry or Christ?"; Leazer said:

"It has been said that Masons have rejected God for 'the lowest-common-denominator god.'" (A Study Of Freemasonry, p. 43)

But, once again, the words of "anti-Masons" are not researched, they are only rejected. Leazer added the comment:

"It is true that God is not defined by Freemasonry; each Mason is given the freedom to define God for himself. Neither is God defined in the phrase 'In God We Trust' on the backs of Federal Reserve Notes. As Christians, we interpret that phrase as referring to God, who was revealed in Jesus Christ. But if that were somehow made official by an act of Congress, Jews, Muslims, and other non-Christian American citizens would immediately challenge the act. The Christian church is free to define who God is. But we

must allow non-Christians the freedom to also (sic) define who God is." (A Study Of Freemasonry, p. 43)

On page 23 of A Study Of Freemasonry, Dr. Leazer has told us that "...most Masons (in this country) are Christians". Now we are told that "non-Christians (must be allowed) the freedom to...define who God is." Is Dr. Leazer saying that the Masonic Lodge is "non-Christian"?

As Dr. Leazer's analogies of the Masonic Lodge and the VFW and DAR were ridiculous, and as his analogy of the Masonic Lodge and the Boy Scouts was ludicrous, so, now, Dr. Leazer's analogy between a democratic republic and its freedom of religion and a secretive and elitist organization begs the question.

It would be wrong in a democratic republic to attempt to legislate religious belief. Yet, the SBC can establish what identification with the SBC means, as far what the denomination stands for is concerned. It is not wrong for the SBC to say to the Masonic Lodge, "You require a belief in God. We ask you, 'Which God?'"

It is not necessary to believe in God, to be a citizen of the United States of America, nor should it be. Therefore, it would be wrong to have an officially adopted "state" definition of God. It is necessary to believe in God to be a Mason. Therefore, it is right to ask Masons, "Which God?, What kind of God?"

In chapter nine (see pp. 126-127), we discussed the possibility of two groups using the same vocabulary, but having a different dictionary. We illustrated that principle with Henry Wilson Coil's discussion of the nature of God from his Masonic Encyclopedia. That discussion summarizes the problem which Dr. Leazer's A Study Of Freemasonry has in this section on the Masonic concept of God. Coil 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 excludes such widely held creeds as Trinitarian Christianity... (Coil's Masonic Encyclopedia, 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.**

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, 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.