

Appendix B:

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

Few unpublished documents receive the distribution and attention which Dr. Gordon's critique of The SBC and Freemasonry, Volume One is receiving. It was originally distributed by Dr. Larry Lewis in March of 1993, only a few days before the HMB trustees would act on "A Report On Freemasonry". It has fallen into the hands of the Masonic Lodge which is distributing it to thousands of Masons.

Why A Critique Of The SBC and Freemasonry, Volume I?

Why the IFW commissioned a critique of this booklet is still a puzzle. If the critique had been done prior to the Convention vote in June of 1992, and if it had been done to suggest to the Convention that the motion to study Freemasonry should be defeated, it would have had a valid rationale. However, after the overwhelming Convention vote, The SBC and Freemasonry, Volume I became of historical interest only. The SBC directed the HMB to study Freemasonry, not The SBC and Freemasonry, Volume I or "anti-Masons."

In a December 15, 1992, letter, Dr. Lewis said:

"Larry (Holly), as I have said so often, the IFW and the HMB are committed to preparing the most thorough, fair, and scholarly report we can, as ordered by the SBC, I assure you that there is no intention on the part of any of us, including Dr. Gary Leazer, to discredit you or your booklet in any way." (emphasis added)

On December 22, 1992, Dr. Lewis and I talked on the telephone. My notes from that telephone conversation, and my report to Reverend Charles Burchett of that conversation five minutes after it was over, was that Dr. Lewis had committed not to distribute Gordon's critique. Dr. Lewis denies having made this commitment. As I have never recorded a telephone conversation with anyone, the issue is unresolved.

In a telephone conversation with Dr. Lewis on March 9, 1993, he said, "Larry, you are not the issue and your booklet is not the issue." If that is true, and it is, why was a critique prepared and why was it released? When the trustees did not even have the report or the recommendation on Freemasonry, why did they have a copy of Gordon's critique of The SBC and Freemasonry, Volume I?

Gordon Declares Critique To Be Critical

As has been pointed out, it was at the September 17, 1992 meeting with the IFW that Dr. Gordon informed me he had been commissioned by Dr. Gary Leazer to write a critique of The SBC and Freemasonry, Volume One. He indicated, that while he had not gotten very far into the project, the critique would not be very favorable. I asked him what his major objections were to the booklet. He raised four questions about the booklet:

1. The distinction between "confidentiality" and "secrecy"
2. The usage of the word MUTHOS
3. The ignoring of the oaths of the Lodge
4. The quotations from Mackey's Encyclopedia of Freemasonry, both as to context and page references in the original.

On September 29, 1992, I wrote Dr. Gordon and attempted to answer each of his questions. The following is a summary of that letter.

Confidentiality and Secrecy

As I reviewed the discussion of "confidentiality and secrecy", in The SBC and Freemasonry, Volume I, I stand by that discussion. There is a difference between taking someone into your confidence and the swearing of someone to secrecy. Dr. Gordon stated that the problem with secrecy is the oaths. That is the very issue. No one swears an eternal oath when they agree not to share certain information inappropriately. I told Dr. Gordon that we would have to agree to disagree about this matter.

The Use Of The Word MUTHOS

Dr. Gordon objected to my usage of the word MUTHOS. It seemed to me that Thayer's, Zodhiates, Expositor's Greek New Testament, and Albert Barnes' comments from Barnes' Notes were

adequate lexical references to support my usage of this word. However, I wrote to Dr. Gordon, if that is not the case, Trench's Synonyms of the New Testament gives an excellent discussion of the distinction between MUTHOS and LOGOS. Dr. Trench's discussion supports my usage of the term. Moulton and Milligan also supports my usage of the word in their discussion of MUEO and MUTHOS.

In the Renaissance New Testament, Dr. Randolph Yeager gives the following lexical entry for MUTHOS:

"A speech, word, saying, narrative, story, Fiction, Fable, an invented untrue tale. A falsehood — II Peter 1:16; the fictions of the Jewish theosophists and Gnostics in Ephesus (I Tim. 1:4; 4:7; II Tim. 4:4) or in Crete — Titus 1:14.

Dr. Yeager then made the following comment, quoting a long section from The Life and Epistles of St. Paul by Conybeare and Howson:

'Heretical teachers had arisen in the very bosom of the Church, and were leading away the believers after themselves. Hymenaeus and Philetus were sowing, in a congenial soil, the seed which was destined in another century to bear so ripe a crop of error. The East and West were infusing their several elements of poison into the pure crop of gospel truth. In Asia Minor, as at Alexandria, Hellenic philosophism did not refuse to blend with Oriental theosophy; the Jewish superstitions of the Kabbala, and the wild speculations of the Persian Magi, were combined with the Greek craving for the enlightened and esoteric religion. The outward forms of superstition were ready for the vulgar multitudes; the interpretation was confined to the aristocracy of knowledge, the self-styled Gnostics (I Tim. 6:20); and we see the tendencies at work among the latter, when we learn that, like their prototypes at Corinth, they denied the future resurrection of the dead, and taught that the only true resurrection was that which took place when the soul awoke from the death of ignorance to the life of knowledge. We recognize already the germ of those heresies which convulsed the Church in the succeeding centuries; and we may imagine the grief and indignation aroused in the breast of St. Paul, when he

found the extend of the evil, and the number of Christian converts already infected by the spreading plague." (Renaissance New Testament, Volume 15, page 318-319, emphasis added)

The ancient mystery religions, the Gnostics, and their heirs, Freemasonry:

"...taught that the only true resurrection was that which took place when the soul awoke from the death of ignorance to the life of knowledge."

This is the basic thesis of the Masonic Lodge which argues that man can and will be perfected through education and knowledge. Henry Alford, in New Testament for English Readers comments on MUTHOS:

"fables (I Tim. 1:4) We can only judge from the other passages in these Epistles where the word occurs, what kind of fables are alluded to. In Titus 1:14 we have 'Jewish fables.' In our ch. 4:7, they are designated as 'profane and anile.' In II Tim. 4:4, they are spoken of absolutely, as here. If we are justified in identifying the 'fables' in Titus with these, they had a Jewish origin: but merely to take them, as Theodoret, for the Jewish traditional comments on the law, does not seem to satisfy the epithets quoted above. And consequently others have interpreted them of the gnostic mythology. It does not seem easy to define them any further, but it is plain that any transitional state from Judaism to gnosticism will satisfy the conditions here propounded without inferring that the full-blown gnosticism of the second century must be meant, and thus calling in question the genuineness of the Epistle." (Volume 3, page 1350)

Alford goes no to say that the "endless genealogies" most probably refers to the "emanations of the theosophists". In Word Meanings in the New Testament, Dr. Ralph Earle states:

"The Greek word MYTHOS, from which we get 'myth.' In the New Testament it is found four times in the Pastoral Epistles (I Tim. 1:4; 4:7; II Tim. 4:4; Titus 1:14) and in II Peter 1:16. In all five places it is rendered 'fables' in the King James Version.

The term first meant 'a speech, word, saying,' then 'a narrative, story' — whether true or fictitious — and finally 'an invention, falsehood' (Thayer) It is thus distinguished from LOGOS, 'a historical tale' (Vincent, 4:203)

Kittel's Theological Dictionary of the New Testament devotes no less than 34 pages to this word alone. Because of the vague and varied ways in which the term is used today by biblical scholars, it might be well to give it some attention.

The article in TDNT is written by Staehlin. He notes that some use 'myth' for that which is unhistorical and yet has religious value. Then he asserts: 'But if the concept of myth is brought into antithesis to both historical reality and to truth as such, and if reality and truth are thought to be essential to genuine revelation and the only possible basis of faith, myth can have no religious value' (4:765) Two results follow. Either the NT stories are 'dismissed as myths, as errors and deceptions,' or a sharp line is drawn between Gospel and myth. He notes that the latter is 'the judgment of the NT itself' which contrast myth with history (II Peter 1:16) and with truth (II Tim. 4:4; Titus 1:14) His conclusion is incisive: 'The Christian Church, insofar as it is true to itself, accepts this judgment that myth is untrue and consequently of no religious value' (ibid.) This is a welcome antidote to Bultmann!

Plato made much use of myth, but Aristotle argued that LOGOS alone has educational value; myth merely pleases (4:775) For the stoics myth was valid as a symbol (4:777). Staehlin concludes his study of myth in the Greek world by saying: 'There is, however, no fundamental repudiation on religious grounds until we come to the NT and the Christian writers of the first centuries' (4:779).

In the Septuagint the word MYTHOS is found only in the apocryphal books (twice). Later rabbis made use of Greek myths as parables (4:781).

Coming to 'Mythoi in the NT,' Staehlin reiterates his earlier statement. He says: 'The position of the NT

regarding what it calls MYTHOS is quite unequivocal ...There is obviously a complete repudiation of MYTHOS. It is the means and mark of an alien proclamation, especially of the error combatted in the Pastorals' (ibid.).

What is the nature of these myths which Paul warns against? Staehlin says, 'It is highly probable that the Pastorals are concerned with the early form of a Gnosticism which flourished on the soil of Hellenistic Jewish Christianity' (4:783).

Staehlin concludes that 'myth as such has no place on biblical soil' (4:793). Against those who define it as a form of religious communication he asserts: 'In the Bible, however, we have from the first to last the account and narration of facts. This may undergo certain changes in form and consciousness from the childlikeness of many of the ancient stories to the maturity of the Johannine view of Christ. But the essential theme is the same throughout, namely, what God says and what God does' (4:703-794)." (Earle, Volume V, pp. 165-167)

This is an accurate review of the ten-volume Kittel, which I regularly use in study. This summary is a short-hand way of demonstrating that the most extensive theological dictionary does not disagree with my usage of MUTHOS.

In The New American Commentary, Drs. Lea and Griffin state:

"The false teaching mentioned in I Tim. 4:3 is Jewish in origin, and this fact leads many interpreters to label the false teaching here as Jewish myths. this appears to be the best option for interpretation. The terms used by Paul regularly appear in Hellenistic and Hellenistic-Jewish sources to refer to traditions about peoples' origin. The term 'myths; is used in a pejorative sense to contrast the legendary character of many of these stories to historical truth." (volume 34, p. 67)

In a footnote, the NAC states:

"Spicq agrees that they are Jewish apocryphal legends that 'are stories dealing with the patriarchs, heroes, and illustrious individuals.'...Hanson sees the terms

'myths and genealogies' as a form of Jewish Gnosticism and a reference ' to the accounts of the movements and couplings of the various aeons as described in this or that Gnostic system.'" (ibid.)

These quotations and those in my booklet satisfy me that my usage of MUTHOS is not only acceptable, but is correct. I asked Dr. Gordon to respond; he did with his critique.

The Oaths In The Lodge

Dr. Gordon objected that I did not deal with the oaths in the Lodge. I indicated to him in a telephone conversation that the oaths had been dealt with at length by others and I chose not to repeat that discussion. The goal of The SBC and Freemasonry, Volume I was to address the "spirit of the Lodge." That is why it dealt with the Knight Kadosh degree of the Scottish Rite. That is why it contrasted "confidentiality" and "secrecy". That is why it contrasted "toleration" and "receiving". That is why it dealt with the "god of the Lodge."

Mackey's Encyclopedia of Freemasonry

Dr. Gordon raised a question about the use of Mackey's Encyclopedia of Freemasonry in The SBC and Freemasonry, Volume I. Gordon made an issue of the page numbers and stated several times that the page references in The SBC and Freemasonry, Volume I were "three hundred pages off" from his Mackey's. I have four different versions of Mackey's Encyclopedia of Freemasonry. The quotations in my book are from The Encyclopedia of Freemasonry in Three Volumes, ninth printing 1966 by Macoy Publishing and Masonic Supply Co., Inc., Volume I, pages 166 to 168. The page references are correct.

In the Preface of The SBC and Freemasonry, it is acknowledged that the article on the Kaballa in Mackey's is a secondary source. (The SBC and Freemasonry, p. v) In the entire discussion of the Kaballa, the conclusions are attributed to the proper source. On page 21, it is stated that the quote is from an article on the Kaballa. It is stated that this is what the Jews believed. But, at the bottom of page 21, The SBC and Freemasonry properly attributes to Mackey his statement and conclusion:

"...intimately connected with the symbolic science of Freemasonry, the Kaballa..." (The SBC and Freemasonry, Volume I, p. 21)

On page 22, Mackey's is quoted again and attribution is properly given to the Kaballists, not to Mackey personally; the text states: "...the Supreme Being, say the Kaballists...". On page 23, once again the quotes are properly attributed to the Kaballist. The only possible error is in the middle of the page 23 where it is stated, "...Mackey commented further...". Because the entire discussion is obviously about what the Kaballist are saying, no confusion should result. Immediately following this statement, attribution is given to the Kaballist:

"...argues the Kaballists..." (p. 23)

This clearly establishes the fact that The SBC and Freemasonry is not trying to say that Mackey said something which he did not say. At the bottom of page 23, however, I properly state that Mackey's applies the Kaballist theory to the Masonic order. It is Mackey who draws the conclusion, not me. On page 24, I conclude the discussion of Mackey's article on the Kaballa, with the statement: "...The Kaballist identifies him...". It is clear that I am attributing this quotation to the Kaballist, and not to Mackey. The concluding comment is true:

"In The Encyclopedia of Freemasonry, Albert Mackey established that the god of Freemasonry is Lucifer."

The Masons claim to be the heirs of the Kaballist. The Kaballist claim that their God is EN SOPH. The Bible identifies who EN SOPH is. I do not believe that I have misquoted or misinterpreted anything in this context.

Pages 26 and 27 also contain quotations from Mackey. They identify the primary source which Mackey used to write his article. No where do I find that I have failed to give careful notation of who said what. I have drawn conclusions, but conclusions, I believe, which are required by the text.

Reasons For Writing A Critique of The SBC and Freemasonry

As I indicated to Dr. Gordon, there seem to be only three reasons why the HMB would want to append a critique of my book to their report:

1. To discredit my book
2. To discredit me
3. To attempt to embarrass me

The HMB appears to be doing the very same thing which Masons argue that I have done, attribute to me things which I have not said, nor done. The SBC and Freemasonry is not the issue. If it were totally wrong, it has served its purpose. The issue is, "What do Masons believe, teach and practice." To try and make me the issue, is to commit the logic error of argument ad hominem.

Historical Background Of Gordon Critique

I became aware that Dr. Lewis had distributed Dr. Gordon's critique to the trustees of the HMB several days before their March, 1993 meeting. As a result, I hurriedly wrote a response to his critique and sent a copy of my response to each trustee at the hotel where they were meeting in Atlanta. In that critique, I gave a summary of the historical background of the Gordon Critique:

1. Dr. Gordon's critique is the result of an official assignment given to him by Dr. Gary Leazer. On page one of Dr. Gordon's critique he states: "...the IFW has decided to take a serious look at the charges made by Dr. Holly in his book." What Dr. Gordon meant to say is that the IFW has decided to take a "critical" look at Dr. Holly's book. I received a copy of Dr. Gordon's critique in January, 1993. I received a corrected and final copy of his critique February 2, 1993. If this critique were available in early February, and if the decision to distributed copies to the trustees was not a move to distract attention from A Study Of Freemasonry, "Why wasn't the critique distributed in February?"
2. On September 29, 1992, I wrote Dr. Gordon a seven-page, single-spaced type-written letter responding to his criticisms of my booklet. He later told me that he was "not impressed" with my response. The discussion above is essentially a review of that letter's contents.
3. In a December 6, 1992 letter to Dr. Lewis, I requested that he allow me to see Gordon's critique and to write a response to it, before it is quoted from in a formal report.
4. In a December 8, 1992 letter to Dr. Lewis I said:

"With a formal critique of the booklet...having been written, and with Dr. Leazer's intention to quote from that critique in the official report presented to the HMB trustees, I believe the logic error of AD HOMINEM is being committed. Except as a historical document, which played a role in the initiation of

this study, my booklet is irrelevant to the study being undertaken by the Home Mission Board.

Whether The SBC and Freemasonry is factual or erroneous is irrelevant. The issue is what does the Masonic Lodge teach? If the Board wants to make me the focus of this study, it would more appropriately address the 630-page report which I presented to the Home Mission Board in September. If it is thought that the HMB can win some favor with Masons by discrediting me, I believe that is a mistake. If it is thought that the force of the study can be diluted by focusing upon my booklet rather than upon what the Masons stand for, that is a mistake. (emphasis added)

On the other hand, numerous (former) Masons and many experts on Freemasonry have read The SBC and Freemasonry. Their unanimous conclusion is that there is not a factual error about Masonry in the booklet. The one quote attributed to Albert Pike, which is in dispute, is so noted in my booklet. For the HMB to object to my style is O.K. For the HMB to object to the three or four typographical errors in the booklet is O.K. For the HMB to object to my booklet's focusing upon the thirtieth degree of the Scottish Rite is O.K. But, if the critique which has been prepared argues that I have misrepresented what Masons are, then that critique flies in the face of reality and certainly must have something other than a scholarly intent.

It is my request that the IFW and the HMB redirect their focus from me and my booklet to the Masonic Lodge and their teachings. It is my counsel that the HMB's only hope of not precipitating a disaster in Houston is to bring a strong, factual and conclusive report to the SBC on the occultism of the Masonic Lodge."

5. Dr. Lewis responded to my letter on December 15, 1992; he said:

"I received your FAX dated December 8 expressing your concern regarding the HMB report on Freemasonry and your particular concern that the report not disparage you or your booklet, The Southern Baptist Convention and Freemasonry.

Larry, as I have said so often, the IFW and the HMB are committing to preparing the most thorough, fair, and scholarly report we can, as ordered by the SBC, I assure that there is no

intention on the part of any of us, including Dr. Gary Leazer, to discredit you or your booklet in any way." (emphasis added)

6. On December 22, 1992, Dr. Lewis and I talked on the telephone. At that time, it is my recollection that Dr. Lewis committed not to release Gordon's critique.

Questions About the Timing of the release of the Critique:

One of the critical questions about Gordon's critique concerns the timing of its release. The following are some of the issues surrounding that release:

1. If Dr. Lewis' release of this critique were an organized and anticipated part of the study on Freemasonry, why was it held until one week before the trustees would leave for the board meeting? Why was the critique not mailed to the trustees immediately after it was given to the Administrative Committee in February?
2. At the very least, even if his recollection is accurate and he did not make a commitment not to release the critique, why did Dr. Lewis not invite me to respond to the critique before distributing it?
3. If there is no attempt to discredit me why did the Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Dr. Ron Phillips, release the critique to the press on Monday, March 8, saying with that release, "You have to read this before you publish an interview with Dr. Holly."?
4. In my telephone conversation with Dr. Lewis on March 9, 1993, he said, "Larry, you are not the issue and your booklet is not the issue." If that is true, and it is, why release the critique? When the trustees did not even have the report or the recommendation on Freemasonry, why did they have a copy of Gordon's critique?
5. In our December 6, 1992 telephone conversation, Dr. Leazer committed to me that the Gordon critique would not be attached to the formal report which would be distributed to the HMB trustees. How does the distribution of that critique to the trustees prior to their receiving the report not violate that commitment?
6. Is it significant that Dr. Lewis sent out the critique only after I released a copy of Dr. Leazer's January 17, 1993 letter to the press? Dr. Lewis has questioned my ethics and integrity in releasing "private correspondence" to the press. If Dr. Leazer's

letter had dealt with personal matters then Dr. Lewis could question the ethics of my releasing that letter. If Dr. Leazer's letter had revealed some moral or personal failure on the part of Dr. Leazer, and the letter had been released in order to discredit him, and thereby indirectly to attempt to discredit his study, then questions of the ethics of releasing the letter could be raised.

But, Dr. Leazer's letter dealt with his professional responsibilities, not personal matters. Dr. Leazer's letter dealt with how he conducted himself professionally, or unprofessionally if you will. It was not only therefore important to release that letter, it was imperative that that letter be released. Could it be that Dr. Lewis released the critique of my letter in order to discredit me and therefore to attempt to diminish the reaction to Dr. Leazer and to himself?

These are the events surrounding Dr. William Gordon's critique of The SBC and Freemasonry and Dr. Lewis' use of it. The next chapter will deal with the critique itself.

Analysis Of Gordon's Critique

In the time I had from discovering that Dr. Lewis had sent Dr. Gordon's critique to all of the HMB trustees, I prepared a brief response. That response began:

"As a general concept, it seems that Dr. Gordon overstates his case. His objection to everything in my booklet causes me to think, 'Methinks he protests too much.' I wonder if there is not another agenda. Only Drs. Leazer and Gordon know the details of the assignment given to Dr. Gordon, but it seems that a great deal of time and effort were given to discrediting my book, while no attention was given to discussing the 630-page report which I presented to the IFW and which comprises a major part of The SBC and Freemasonry Volume II, which today, March 11, 1993 is being mailed to 2,500 Southern Baptist leaders.

Why A Critique Of The SBC and Freemasonry?

In the introduction of his critique, Dr. Gordon states:

"Dr. Holly has sold several thousand copies of his book The SBC and Freemasonry in which he makes several

serious charges concerning Freemasonry. Due to the significant role Dr. Holly and his book have played in leading the SBC to commission this study on Freemasonry, the IFW has decided to take a serious look at the charges made by Dr. Holly in his book." ("A Critique Of James L. Holly, The SBC and Freemasonry", p. 1)

The implication that there was a profit motive in the writing and distribution of The SBC and Freemasonry is undignified. The 64-page booklet was sold for one dollar each, and five thousand copies were initially given away. The HMB has sold a 75-page booklet, on a cost recovery basis, for six dollars plus postage, and none were given away.

It turns out that Dr. Gordon nor Dr. Leazer took "a serious look at the charges made by (my) book"; they only took a critical look at my book. At no point, do we find Dr. Leazer investigating, i.e., "taking a serious look at the charges made" about the Masonic Lodge. Dr. Gordon, employed by and accountable to Dr. Leazer, doesn't do much better.

It is worth asking the question: Why was this critique not available until later December, 1992 or early January, 1993, if it were going to be used as a part of the IFW's study of Freemasonry, when the study had been virtually completed by then? What role did Dr. Lewis and Dr. Leazer expect the critique to play in that it was prepared simultaneously and apparently independently of the study of Freemasonry? What possible use could the critique have except as an attempt to distract the trustees from the study to the initiatory of the study.

Freemasonry is Preventing Revival In The SBC

In his critique Dr. Gordon said:

"...Holly argues that the problem of Freemasonry is bigger than God's ability to bring revival to the SBC."
("A Critique Of James L. Holly, The SBC and Freemasonry", p. 2)

It is silly to say that I argue this. Simply identifying one of the impediments to revival does not argue that God is limited by that impediment; it does argue that God Himself established conditions upon His people receiving revival from God. The SBC and Freemasonry actually said:

"There are many hindrances to revival in the SBC. Freemasonry is only one of them. It is, however, not only one of the most obvious, it may be the key one. If Southern Baptists want revival, they can have it. God only awaits our fulfilling the fourth requirement of revival listed in II Chronicles 7:14 to pour out spiritual renewal upon us." (The SBC and Freemasonry, Volume I, p. vi)

This does not warrant Dr. Gordon's intemperate response. Dr. Gordon's argument that God sent revival to the South in the 1850's despite the presence of slavery ignores the way God deals with His people. The great "prayer revival" of 1855- 1859 was, many think, a result of two factors:

1. The anti-masonic movement of 1826-1856 in which the Masonic Lodge lost 75% of its membership, and
2. God's mercy and compassion in reaching out to His people to stir them up to repentance before He brought judgment upon the South in the Civil War. When God's people ignored Him and continued pridefully in their wicked ways of slavery, God, Who had reached out to them in compassion, reached out to them in chastisement.

Dr. Gordon's argument that God brought revival inspite of slavery ignores this dynamic.

Freemasonry Is Wrecking SBC Churches

Dr. Gordon said:

"This reviewer does not doubt that Holly could list, individual cases where Masons may have been responsible for causing problems in a church. However, individual cases cannot be used to bring the type of accusation that he makes against Masons in general. For example, one could cite cases of people with red hair who have caused problems in churches. However, one could not from these examples legitimately arrive at the conclusion that people with red hair cause problems in churches." ("A Critique of The SBC and Freemasonry", p. 3)

It is tragic that many of the leaders of the SBC, including many of the leaders of the HMB, both staff and trustee, privately admit that there is a serious problem with the Masonic Lodge in Southern Baptist churches. They then publicly deny this, because they don't want any trouble with the Masons in their churches. The staff members at the IFW have admitted to me and to others that "there is a serious problem with the Masonic Lodge", but publicly they either deny this, ignore it, or attempt to conceal it.

Freemasons Worship Lucifer As God

Dr. Gordon said:

"Perhaps the most serious accusation that Holly brings against Freemasonry is that it worships Lucifer as god." ("A Critique of The SBC and Freemasonry", p. 6)

Dr. Gordon takes great pains to reproduce Robert Morey's evidence of Albert Pike's "Lucifer is god" quote which I used. That has been dealt with earlier in this critique of Dr. Leazer's A Study Of Freemasonry and will not be repeated here. Dr. Gordon quotes extensively from Robert Morey's book, The Origin and Teachings of Freemasonry. There is little comfort for Dr. Gordon or for the Masons in the writings of Dr. Robert Morey, however.

On pages eleven and twelve of The Southern Baptist Convention and Freemasonry Volume II, I quote Dr. Morey's September, 1992 letter in which he states that Albert Pike was an eastern occultist. Dr. Morey is not a Mason. He wrote his book as an expose of Freemasonry. His intent was to write in such a way as to appear to be interested in reforming the Lodge, to get Masons to examine their craft. In a letter to this author, Dr. Morey said:

"Given its present occultic teachings, no Christian in good conscience should be a Mason, I was a Southern Baptist...I hope that the Southern Baptists get their house in order so that people like me would feel free to return."

If I had had access to Dr. Morey's book before publishing my booklet, I would not have used the quote from Pike. In that all I had were objections by Masons, I used the quote and acknowledged that it had been questioned. Yet, Dr. Gordon must face the fact that even the Roman Catholic Church has identified the god of the Lodge as Lucifer. (See pp. 19 and 95, The SBC and Freemasonry Volume II)

Mackey's Encyclopedia of Freemasonry

Gordon quotes from my booklet and then states:

"It is important to note that Mackey's Encyclopedia does not state that this is the Masonic understanding of God." ("A Critique Of The SBC and Freemasonry", p. 10)

Throughout Volume One, I clearly indicate that the article being quoted from Mackey is what the Kabbalist believes. In fact, in the Preface to this volume, I state:

"Except in the case of the quotes from the Jewish Kaballa in Mackey's Encyclopedia of Freemasonry, quotations are not from secondary sources." (p. v)

Dr. Gordon gave a great deal of attention to me personally and in his footnote on page ten that the page numbers in the edition of Mackey's Encyclopedia, which he had, were different from the page numbers which I cite. He told me personally that he found all of the quotations which I used and that they were accurate, but he was very upset that the page numbers were different. Why, if my quotations are accurate, is there such a concern stated about the page numbers?

The entire question of Mackey's Encyclopedia, the Kaballa and Lucifer has to do with the question of who is the god of the Lodge. Pike, Mackey, Clausen, Wilmshurst, Boudreau and many others affirm that Freemasonry is the heir of the Jewish Kaballa. The Bible identifies Lucifer as "the man that make(s) the earth to tremble, that did shake kingdoms." (Isaiah 14:16. The legend of the Kabbalist identifies its founder as "he who caused the earth to quake and the kingdoms to shake." (see pp. 24 and 17, The SBC and Freemasonry Volume I)

The legend of EN SOPH, the legend of the founder of the Kabbalist, the doctrine of the aeons and immanations of the degrees of the Masonic Lodge, to my judgment, are subtle but profound affirmations that Lucifer is the god of the Lodge. Granted Pike was not brazen enough to say so, but here, following a thread through the esoteric writings of the Masonic Lodge, it is possible to identify who the god of the Lodge is. It is possible to deny what I have said; it is not possible to argue that I distort what is clearly said by and correctly attributed to Masons, Kabbalists and the Word of God.

King James Bible Erred In Identifying Lucifer As Devil

In the light of this, Mr. Robinson's February, 1993 statements in A Pilgrim's Path: One Man's Road To the Masonic Temple takes on new and important significance. He said:

"...Some of the error in it (The King James version of the Bible) was quite deliberate, including the biblical designation of Lucifer as Satan, along with the concordant story of a fallen angel. It is difficult to anticipate the reactions of some believers on being told that there are gross mistakes in the King James Version...So 'Lucifer' is nothing more than an ancient Latin name for the morning star, the bringer of light....And so there are those who do not ready (Sic) beyond the King James version of the Bible, who say 'Lucifer is Satan: so says the Word of God,' while others with knowledge of the Latin and Hebrew texts say 'No, Lucifer is the classical Roman name for the morning star, and now Jesus is the morning star.'" (pp. 47-48) (emphasis added)

The god of the Masonic Lodge is not the Lord God of Host. Attempting to discredit me does not change that.

Greek and The SBC and Freemasonry, Volume I

Dr. Gordon goes to great lengths to argue that I abuse the Greek language in Volume One, but then states, "...even if Thayer is correct in his interpretation (this reviewer believes he is correct)..." Dr. Gordon makes a strong argument about the use of the word MUTHOS and about the using of Thayer's as a source; he then states that he agrees with Thayer's. Why give the implication that he is objecting and then agree?

Dr. Gordon's seemingly obsessive desire to discredit my booklet has him state, "(Holly) cites an unnamed source that defines 'occultic' as follows." The "unnamed source is a standard college dictionary. Dr. Gordon goes on to say, "The above definition is accurate", but the damage to my credibility is done by his pejorative comment "an unnamed source." Why would he do this?

In my September, 1992 letter to Dr. Gordon I included numerous references to lexicon and commentaries which supported my use of the Greek words MUTHOS, MUO and MUSTERION. He said that he was not impressed. I do not use these words to show

that God condemns secrecy, but to show that God condemns the mysteries, the Gnostics, the lie that man can become a god.

On pages nineteen and following in his critique, Dr. Gordon states "Holly's misuse of the Greek continues with his discussion of 'MUSTERION'." Dr. Gordon argues that because I do not discuss the positive uses of the word that my usage of the word is in error. Yet, once again, after condemning me, he states, "While the New Testament occasionally uses the term 'Musterion' in a negative sense, the vast majority of the time it uses it in a very positive way." (Gordon's critique, p. 19)

Dr. Gordon agrees that the word MUSTERION is used as I use it, and then he objects to my using it in that way. Why? Is it necessary to cite every occurrence and every usage of a word every time you comment on a Biblical principle? Of course not, unless of course the IFW of the HMB is trying to discredit your writings.

In my September, 1992 letter to Dr. Gordon, I summarized additional lexical information about MUTHOS. That material is summarized above. Since writing this letter to Dr. Gordon, I have continued to add Biblical material to my library. The Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament edited by Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider discussed MUTHOS on page 445 and totally supports my usage of the word.

Freemasonry is Guilty of Anti-Sectarianism

Once again, Dr. Gordon condemns me then commends me. He states:

"(Holly) fails to cite either a Masonic or secular source for this definition of 'sectarianism.' (Gordon critique, p. 24)

He then states:

"There are, however, influential Masons who have held to the understanding of sectarianism that Holly cites." (Gordon critique, p. 25)

You can't have it both ways, Dr. Gordon, either I have distorted the teachings of Masonry or I haven't. If I made the error of not documenting my statement then state that, but do not imply that I deceive anyone. My usage of the Masonic concept of "anti-sectarianism" is so common in Masonic writings as to cause one to overlook the need to prove it.

Freemasonry is Guilty of Toleration

Dr. Gordon's agenda is obvious here as he condemns and then says, "Holly seems to understand this when he correctly observes...". How condescending, "Holly seems to understand." Yet, Dr. Gordon reluctantly agrees that what I have said is true.

Confidentiality and Secrecy

Dr. Gordon objects to my distinction between these two concepts. We will just have to disagree. I do not do anything in secrecy, but much of my medical practice is confidential. There is a difference in motive, attitude and intent between the two. Anyone that ignores that distinction, doesn't understand either concept.

Conclusion

Dr. Gordon said:

"...In spite of these shortcomings, it is the opinion of this reviewer that (Holly) has demonstrated that there have been, (and still are), influential Masons who use Freemasonry as a vehicle to spread their pagan understanding of God and religion. What needs to be looked at more closely is whether these influential Masons speak for Freemasonry or only for themselves. But this research falls under the scope of the report commissioned by the SBC and not this review."
("A Critique of The SBC and Freemasonry", p. 28)

It is obvious that Dr. Gordon does not like The SBC and Freemasonry. It is obvious that the Interfaith Witness Department does not like the responsibility for studying the Masonic Lodge. What is not obvious is why the HMB released to the trustees and through the trustee chairman to the press, this biased, inadequate, and unbalanced critique of my book.