

William Finck vs. the Paul-bashers

A Response to the Lies of H. Graber and C.
Douglas Concerning the Apostle Paul

William R. Finck, Jr.

PREFACE

This paper is adapted from a series which originally ran in Clifton Emahiser's *Watchman's Teaching Letter*, #'s 89 through 108, from September of 2005 through April of 2007. While having been edited as little as possible, some corrections and small additions have been made, and other changes were necessary in order to adapt the context to this single-document format. Yet readers of Clifton's *WTL* shall surely recognize the material in its new presentation. I had written the original articles while sitting in prison, at the Elkton Federal Correctional Institution, In October, 2005, and February, 2006, for the most part. Now that I have been released (this October 24th), own a computer, and am able to do my own word processing, I can more readily adapt my material for both traditional formats and also for the internet. It was Clifton who, from before last year, suggested that the compilation of these articles into a single publication may be a good starting point for the continuation of my work in Biblical studies upon my release. I am, of course, most indebted to Clifton for all of his support and the assistance which he has given me in my endeavors.

There are many in Christian Israel Identity who have been engaged in "Paul-bashing", a very unfortunate situation, and especially since it can be fully demonstrated that Paul of Tarsus was indeed the very first teacher of Israel Identity - while of course he himself did not call it by that name - instead referring only to his mission to "the nations". The Greek word meaning "nations" is quite errantly mistranslated "Gentiles" in most current Bible publications. It is the mistranslation of Paul's epistles which have been the primary cause of the misunderstandings which have in turn led to Paul-bashing by many Israel Identity adherents. For that reason, when I set out to translate the New Testament, which I also accomplished while sitting in prison, I started with Paul. Soon my entire New Testament shall be - Yahweh willing - freely available on the internet. It is imperative that sound doctrine begin with good translations, and cannot be built upon the mistakes of others, especially those who have been influenced by the enemies of Yahweh our God. It is quite unfortunate that men such as H. Graber and C. Douglas must even be addressed. For their own writings reveal such men to be little but unlearned buffoons. However these buffoons have followers, among whom are many men and women in Israel Identity who should know better, but have instead been quick with their tongues, while being negligent in their studies - attacking that which they don't truly understand rather than spending the time and effort required for learning the details. Among them are people whom I know personally, and whom, if for reasons other than their scholarship, I have or have had great respect for. Prayerfully, perhaps they shall one day accept correction.

-William Finck, Binghamton NY, 16th November 2008

Contents

Articles:

[OPEN LETTER RESPONDING TO H. GRABER](#)

- [<A>](#) H. Graber's Humanism
Yahshua Christ as Shepherd and Bishop of souls
- [](#) Extant physical descriptions of Paul of Tarsus are the work of early forgers;
Grabber quotes such forgers vicariously
Grabber asserts that there are conflicts between Paul and the gospels, i.e. Romans 12 and Matthew 7, but offers nothing concrete
- [<C>](#) Prophecy and the mark of inspiration; in Luke (21:5-24); in Paul (Rom. 16.20)
- [<C-2>](#) Mention, or want of mention, of Paul by other NT writers
Peter's attestation of Paul
Frequency of Paul's name in his epistles and Acts compared to that of other apostles, and of Yahshua Christ
Paul is the only other apostle mentioned by Peter
- [<D>](#) Paul's race and national identity
Paul a Pharisee; had a classical education
Judaeen religious sects and politics
Classical writings: and Hebrew sources; cited by Paul
- [<E>](#) Lying: and Paul, Romans 3:7 examined
Διάβολος (diabolos) defined
jews: undermine by infiltrating
- [<F>](#) Paul's mission to the Nations of Israel; Acts 13:46 discussed
Light of the World, Shemesh defined; the gospel: a light to the Nations, Luke 2:32 discussed
Τὰ ἔθνη (ta ethnê, the nations), defined and discussed; contrasted to λαός (laos, people), et alii; composition of synagogue attendance In Greek world
"Judaeen" vs. "jew", no blanket rejection of Judaeans by Paul
Paul did not "[magnify] himself...putting himself on the same level with Jesus Christ"; Gal. 4:14 defended and explained in light of Matt. 10:40
- [<G>](#) "Judaeen" vs. "jew" (Romans chapter 9, et alii), Grabber's confusion
Gospel: preached to Judah first (Zech. 12:7, etc.)
Paul's mission, contrasted to that of Yahshua Christ
jews: undermine by infiltrating, Gal. 2:4, Acts 20:29 and Jude 4
- [<H>](#) Paul's mission to the Nations of Israel: Gen. 17:6, 35:11, Matt. 15:24 et alii, was not to "Gentiles"
Ἔθνος (ethnos, *gentilis*, nation), defined and discussed
Paul's gospel: that of Yahshua Christ; to Israel
Endurance of Paul's work compared to other apostles
- [<I>](#) Genealogies, myths and fables: Paul's warnings against, i.e. 1 Tim. 1:4, Tit. 3:9; in classics, i.e. Hesiod's *Theogony*
Importance of history, archaeology, language to Biblical studies
Paul and importance of race: 1 Tim. 1:2, Tit. 1:4
Paul's warnings against "strivings about the law" and anti-Talmudism

- [<J>](#) Paul and the law: Graber attacks and contorts Paul's positions, Rom. 3:31
The Law: Yahshua Christ to fulfill the law and the prophets: explained at length from Old Testament prophecy concerning the law and lost Israel; "letter of" vs. "spirit of"; yoke of Levitical law, Matt. 11:30; and prophecy concerning lost Israel in fulfillment – Rom. 2:14-15 explained; children of Satan condemned by; ordinances, prescribed rituals are "works of the law"
Paul and the law: statements concerning works, justification, "doers of the law", consistency with other apostles shown by comparisons of scripture; "letter of" vs. "spirit of"
- [<J-2>](#) Paul's use of various versions of scripture in quotes of Old Testament; Graber criticizes Paul on Habakkuk 2:4
Masoretic Text, Septuagint, Aramaic Targums, paraphrase in New Testament quotes of Old Testament, Habakkuk 2:4 in particular
- [<K>](#) Yahshua Christ: "distinguished as a son of Yahweh", Rom. 1:4 translated and discussed, ὁρίζω (horizō), defined
- [<L>](#) Spirituality vs. carnality
Yahshua Christ: Yahweh in the flesh, i.e. Col. 2:9; knowing personally, or "in the flesh", 2 Cor. 5:15-19
Body as a vessel for the spirit, a "temple"
- [<M>](#) Paul's gospel: that of Yahshua Christ; use of pronouns when making references to, Graber's accusations reveal his own hypocrisy
- [<N>](#) Here Graber repeats an argument found also in section [<F>](#), where I have explained Paul's statement in Gal. 4:14: "... ye ... received me ... even as Christ Jesus", in light of Matt. 10:40
- [<O>](#) Paul's gospel: that of Yahshua Christ; the cursing of non-believers, Gal. 1:6-9, 2 Pet. 2:14-15 et alii
Peter's attestation of Paul
- [<P>](#) Paul's "Road to Damascus" event: only mentioned in Acts in the N.T.
Paul's acceptance by Peter and James
Peter's attestation of Paul
- [<Q>](#) Out-of-body experiences, visions and revelations, the "world of mystery" according to Graber, 2 Cor. 12:1-8, Rev. 4:1 discussed
Heaven: "paradise", the "third" and "seventh" heavens, other "mysteries", 2 Cor. 12:1-8, 1 Enoch discussed
- [<R>](#) Graber cites from a list of Paul-bashers, betraying the Jewish and communist sources of anti-Paulism, namely Michael Grant, Joachim Prince and George Bernard Shaw
Use of Jewish terms by an author betrays a Jewish influence of the author's perspective on Biblical topics
Fabian Socialism and One World Government
The "dragon of superstition" and the actual dragon race
- [<S>](#) Roman Catholic Church: no valid connection to any New Testament figure; Paul, Luke, Timothy, Gamaliel, Aquila, Priscilla, Clement, etc. were not "catholic"; history of, Justinian and Constantine
Celtic Church: connected to original Christian assemblies at Rome

<S-2> Graber misquotes Eusebius 6:19 and lies about the subject of the passage in question, Paul is not the subject of Eusebius 6:19!

Eusebius, quoting Porphyry at 6:19, exposes Porphyry as a liar and reveals that Porphyry was slandering Origen

<T> Paul: “all things to all men”, meaning that he was able to speak to people on their own terms, 1 Cor. 9:20-22 discussed; ability to “save” men, in context with James 5:19-20

Yahshua Christ: Author of salvation

<U> Mark: spurious endings to gospel not part of Pauline conspiracy

John: interpolations in writings, ignored by Graber

Paul’s mission to the Nations of Israel

Graber repeats various arguments from past sections, illustrated and referenced here

<V> Paul’s gospel: of the Kingdom; found with Luke

Missing Pauline epistles

Paul and the law

Paul’s message the same as Israel Identity

The law: yoke of the Levitical law, Acts 15:10; enforcement of, for Christians, 1 Cor. 5:9-13, Rev. 22:15

PAUL WAS NOT A MISOGYNIST!

Paul’s position on the role of women in society, gleaned for his epistles
jewish control over ideas debated in a liberal-feminist society is naturally anti-Christian, and so anti-Paulist

Paul’s relationship with various women consistent with both the Bible and ancient Greek, Roman, and Hebrew society (Euripides, Strabo, Diodorus Siculus, Proverbs, Isaiah all cited)

A RESPONSE TO CLAYTON DOUGLAS’ ANTI-PAUL ARTICLES, PUBLISHED IN HIS FREE AMERICAN NEWSMAGAZINE

Introduction

Proper attitude for Christians to have towards Edomite-jews

Judaism is a corruption of Hebrewism; Christianity is true Hebrewism, epistle of Ignatius cited

The Bible and the veracity of ancient manuscripts: copyists’ errors, corruptions and interpolations; ancient papyri and verification

The inspiration of Scripture in its original form

Greek and Hebrew the original languages of Scripture; New Testament written entirely in Greek; Use of Greek in ancient Judaea

New Testament quotes of Old Testament from Greek Septuagint version.

Non-canonical books: Enoch, Gospel of Thomas, et alii

Nag Hammadi scrolls, Gnostic documents, forgeries

Nicaea and choosing of books for canon

King James authorized version and apocrypha

Douglas’ lack of expertise in subject he’s writing about

Douglas and universalism; Christianity is exclusivist

Why Yahshua Christ spoke in parables: Christianity is exclusivist

The “lost” sheep and the nations of Christian Europe

- Anti-Paulism, or “Paul-bashing”, is a Jewish conception
 Anti-Christian aims of the anti-Paulists
 Gnostics, the New Testament, Gnostic forgeries
 Nietzsche, Christianity, and Nationalism
- [<1>](#) Douglas quotes from Jewish magicians, beginning a trend
- [<2>](#) Authority of government, Rom. 13 (see also section [<8>](#))
- [<3>](#) Yahshua: the given name of Christ, form and legitimacy of name
 Immanuel: a title, defined and explained
 Familiar and proper names in the New Testament
 Yahshua Christ: founder of Christianity, testimony of Josephus
 Old Testament prophecy and Christianity for “lost” Israel
 Paul’s mission to the Nations of Israel
 Paul loved by ancient Celtic Church
- [<4>](#) Douglas follows the Jews, maintains Jewish positions on the Bible
 Gospel, or biography?
 Coming of Christ in prophecy
- [<5>](#) Quantitative authorship of the New Testament: estimates for each writer
- [<6>](#) Douglas accuses Paul of “paganizing” the teachings of Christ, but offers
 nothing specific
 Yahshua Christ, apostles: N.T. authorship, contributions by
 Qualifications of a prophet, Isaiah 41:21-29: met by Paul (i.e. Rom. 16:20),
 Luke (21:20-24)
- [<7>](#) Paul’s education uniquely qualified him for his mission
 Paul’s mission to the Nations of Israel: first teacher of Israel Identity, proofs in
 epistles discussed at length, with examples from Rom. 1 & 2 Cor, et alii
 Gal. 3:15-16 explained; Eph. 3:1-9 translated and explained
 Nietzsche’s failures
- [<8>](#) Paul’s epistles consistent with the gospels; Apparent contradictions caused
 by poor translations; epistles consistent with Old Testament
 Authority of government: Romans 13:1-8 translated and explained; Prophecy
 and reasons explaining why the children of Israel should be subject to
 temporal governments, and duration of same as foretold in the Old Testament
 and in the Revelation (see also section [<41>](#))
 Yahshua Christ: and Roman authority; to return in a Second Advent, as
 foretold by Paul and the gospel writers (see also section [<38>](#))
- [<9>](#) Douglas cites three critics of Paul: John Spong, Thomas Hardy and Thomas
 Jefferson
 Spong, John: and the Episcopal Church; and homosexuality; ἀρσενοκοΐτης
 (arsenokoitês, sodomy or homosexuality) defined; Paul on
 homosexuality; and Joachim Prince; and Newark, N.J.; and “...what
 sort of man could Spong be?”
 Jefferson, Thomas: Bible scholarship of; The Jefferson Bible and its
 worthlessness in understanding Christianity
 Hardy, Thomas: a novelist
 Intellectualism in the “Information Age”

- [<10>](#) Paul: Names of, Saul and Paul; with Sergius Paulus, Roman proconsul, on Cypress (Acts 13)
Roman names: family and gens names
- [<11>](#) Judaeian religious sects, Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes: descriptions of, by Josephus; and Judaeian politics; beginnings of the sect of the Pharisees; Essenes and race; Pharisee, defined; proselytism in Judaea; the sects as political parties
- [<12>](#) Roman-era geographical districts: Syria, Phoenicia and Palestine
Paul's Roman citizenship
Tarsus: Paul's citizenship in; founding of: by Assyrians; later by Argives; Strabo's description of, as a center of learning
Cilicia: settled by Phoenicians
Turkish conquest of Mesopotamia, Anatolia in 11th century
Armenia: once White, overrun by aliens; and the Sacae, Sacasene; the two Iberias
Paul's family and the sect of the Pharisees, his race and lineage (see also section [<40>](#))
- [<13>](#) Edomite-jew conspiracy against Christ: Douglas invents a role for Paul; Douglas invents two separate characters from one Judas Iscariot
Paul not a Roman soldier
Douglas' false notions of some "missing" scrolls of the teachings of Christ
Douglas' use of strange names for Yahshua Christ
Scholarly sources and appropriate citations
- [<14>](#) Pharisees: their influence over the economy and politics of Judaea; counterpart sect of the Sadducees; and Sadducees, Republicans and Democrats, analogies to modern American politics
Paul not a Roman soldier; his early actions against Christianity
Edomite-jew conspiracy against Christ: Douglas expands his invented role for Paul
The Temple guards in Jerusalem: private army of the high priests
- [<15>](#) Paul's "Road to Damascus" event
Yahshua Christ's post-resurrection appearances to the disciples, 1 Cor. 15:3-6 discussed
- [<16>](#) Paul's "Road to Damascus" event: Acts 9:7 and 22:9 complimentary once properly translated
The "sect of the Nazarenes", Acts 24:5, the Jewish name for Christianity
- [<17>](#) Paul: names of; not a Roman soldier
Edomite-jew conspiracy against Christ: Douglas expands his invented role for Paul; the so-called scrolls of the teachings of Christ
Paul's acceptance among apostles, at Antioch
Scholarly citing of sources in writing on the Bible or in history
Christian assemblies founded by Paul, as listed by Douglas

- [<18>](#) Paul and the law
 Christianity embraces the law, rejects legalism, rejects the “works of the law” – the rituals prescribed by ordinances
 Yahshua Christ: to fulfill the law and the prophets; prophecy concerning the law and “lost” Israel (revisiting arguments presented in section [<J>](#))
 Anti-Paulists followers of the Pharisees – proven
 Christian assemblies founded by Paul were recognized and authenticated by both Peter and by Yahshua Christ in the Revelation, namely those at Ephesus and Laodicea (see also sections [<17>](#) and [<35>](#))
 Council of Nicaea not attended by Pharisees or jews
 Persecution of Christians until time of Constantine
 Romish church and Justinian
- [<19>](#) Persecutions of Paul and Barnabbas by jews throughout the Greek world
 Edomite-jews behind all persecutions of Christians, Tertullian cited
- [<20>](#) Attestations of truth, or denials of lying, in Scripture
 Paul’s poor eyesight
- [<21>](#) Paul: not a Khazar; not a zionist; not a homosexual
 Khazars, a short history
 Zionism defined; and Rom. 16:20, 2 Thes. 2
 Homosexuality discussed; “latent” defined
- [<22>](#) Ἐγκρατεία (egkrateia, self-control), defined and discussed: Rom. 7:18 and 1 Cor. 9:27: covetousness, consumerism, sexual lust, hormones, the ego, etc. (see also section [<26>](#))
- [<23>](#) Douglas quotes John Spong, suggesting that Paul was a homosexual
 Modern liberalism: and the undermining of western civilization; some of the tactics of; Διάβολος (diabolos, “devil” or “[false] accuser”) defined; Thomas Jefferson used as an example, defended against charge of fornication
 Paul: the liberals’ problems with Paul of Tarsus; his stand against homosexuality and all sexual deviancy; jews and sexual deviants allies against Paul and Christianity
 Homosexuality: Rom. 1:26-32, 1 Cor. 6:9-10, 1 Tim. 1:9-11 all translated; ἀρσενοκοίτης (arsenokoitês, sodomy or homosexuality) defined; Paul on marriage: Heb. 13:4, 1 Tim. 3:1-13
 Spong, John: a liberal, dishonestly attempts to undermine Paul; with C. Douglas, his false testimony and the penalty of death under the law for false witnesses
 Paul’s “thorn in the flesh” was his poor eyesight
 Spong, John: a lover of homosexuals and aliens; Clifton Emahiser’s summary listing of Spong’s literature



An overview of the life of John Spong, Episcopal bishop of Newark, N.J., his life, works, philosophy and politics. Spong, a virulent critic of Paul, is exposed as an embracer of homosexuals, jews, minorities, Darwinism, Humanism, Marxism, and as an enemy of Yahweh God!

- [<24>](#) Paul's position on the role of women in society (see also the article [PAUL WAS NOT A MISOGYNIST!](#))
Status of women in early Germany
- [<25>](#) Douglas' hypocrisy with the "jewish problem"
Christian Israel: all of the children of Yahweh are one in Christ, Gal. 3:28 explained and defended; the Body of Christ, 1 Cor. 12
- [<26>](#) Self-control: need for against temptation (see also section [<22>](#))
Adamic Man: the law and carnality vs. spirituality, Rom. 7:14-15 explained and defended; the two natures of Adamic Man; controlling moral authority of spirit in Adamic race, which the other races lack
- [<27>](#) Paul: "all things to all men". 1 Cor. 9:20-22 discussed
Douglas quotes from Jewish magicians
- [<28>](#) Douglas follows the Jews, as his positions on Scripture demonstrate
The "communion" ritual and Paul's examples
Bread and wine and the Body and Blood of Christ
- [<29>](#) Πάσχα (Pascha, Passover), and Easter
The Romish church: and adoption of pagan festivals; and consumption of pork, or swine
Pork, or swine: Greek consideration of, as unclean; never recommended to be eaten by Paul
- [<30>](#) Passover and Easter
Douglas follows the Jews, Christ "lost...forever"
- [<31>](#) Peter's attestation of Paul
Warnings concerning false prophets
Douglas cites 2 Pet. 2:1, yet ignores 2 Pet. 3:15-16
Douglas follows the Jews, and a list of other misfits
- [<32>](#) Edomite-Jew conspiracy against Christ: Douglas continues to expand his invented role for Paul
Paul merely a youth at the stoning of Stephen, not a leader; νεανίας (neanias, youth) defined and explained
Yahshua Christ: designated no successor; requires no successors
Peter: position as an apostle: πέτρος and πέτρα (petros and petra, stone and rock) defined and explained; the most stubborn of the disciples
- [<33>](#) Douglas' confusion concerning gospel; claims made about supposed warnings concerning churches
Yahshua Christ: His messages to the seven "churches" found in Revelation chapters 2 and 3
- [<34>](#) Apostles: appointment of by Yahshua Christ; attempt by, to replace Judas Iscariot, Yahshua's selection of Paul instead
- [<35>](#) Paul's "Road to Damascus" event
Paul's acceptance among apostles, at Antioch
Christian assemblies founded by Paul were recognized and authenticated by both Peter and by Yahshua Christ in the Revelation, namely those at Ephesus and Laodicea (see also sections [<17>](#) and [<18>](#))

- [<36>](#) Paul's model for Christian community, and ancient society; election of leaders in and management of a Christian assembly
Baptism ritual, origins of
- [<37A>](#) Douglas' false notions of some "missing" scrolls of the teachings of Christ
- [<37B>](#) Douglas follows the jews, hypocritically accuses Paul of being a humanist
Paul and the law: Paul's idea of faith included both lawfulness and the performance of good works, Eph. 2:8-10 translated and discussed; upheld obedience to the law, Rom. 1:5, 3:31; perception of faith and works contrasted to that of James; his admonishments for the need for good works: Acts 26:20, 1 Tim. 2:9-10, 5:25, 6:17-18, 2 Tim. 3:16-17, Tit. 3:8, Rom. 2:5-9 and 1 Cor. 3:11-15 all translated and discussed in support of his position; rituals, the "works of the law" explained
Israel, sin and forgiveness, salvation
Χάρις (charis, favor) defined and explained in the context of the promises to Abraham and Rom. 11:26; favor granted to Israel exclusively
- [<38>](#) Yahshua Christ: Paul's perception of His Second Advent; and gospel testimony of; and Rev. 22:12, Rom. 2:5-9 (see also section [<8>](#))
- [<39>](#) Paul's early actions against Christianity: voting at executions, Acts 22:4-5 and 26:9-10
The deeds of lawful government, and the guilt of individual men who obey the government
Douglas follows the jews, accuses Paul of Bolshevism
- [<40>](#) Douglas enlists quotes from Jackie Patru, who in turn quotes the jew Marcus Eli Ravage in opposition to Paul: again, Douglas follows the jews!
jews: and race; are devils (John 8:31-47)
Paul's race and lineage (see also section [<12>](#))
- [<41>](#) Authority of government: Romans 13:1-8 translated and explained; Prophecy and reasons explaining why the children of Israel should be subject to temporal governments, and duration of same as foretold in the Old Testament and in the Revelation (see also section [<8>](#))
- [<42>](#) Nietzsche, Friedrich: Douglas cites in opposition to Paul; is discredited as a historian, as a classicist, and as a valid critic of Christianity
Rome: immorality and decadence in; and Christianity; in the prophecies of Daniel
Hades, Hell, Niflheim, Tartaros, Sheol; Heaven, Olympus, Valhalla: in the Bible and European mythology
- [<43>](#) Douglas accuses Paul of being the "Liar", et alii, of the Dead Sea Scrolls, and invents much other information concerning the scrolls
Qumran sect: name is a proper identification for the keepers of the Dead Sea Scrolls, since they were probably not written by Essenes
Contents and categorization of the Dead Sea Scrolls
Josephus' description of the Essenes
Communal societies in the ancient world, an example from Diodorus Siculus: the Qumran sect not truly communal
Pliny's supposed "Essene city", and the contradictory testimony of Josephus

Qumran sect: the War Scroll and apocalyptic beliefs of; not Christian, apparently ignorant of Christianity; are not Pharisees or Sadducees

Voluminosity of the Dead Sea Scrolls, most people will never read them

Methods of publication of the Dead Sea Scrolls

The Liar of the Dead Sea Scrolls: identification of, from the scrolls themselves; proof that it could not possibly have been Paul of Tarsus

The “Teacher of Righteousness” of the Dead Sea Scrolls: does not refer to Yahshua Christ, or to any other historical figure, as citations from the scrolls prove

Dead Sea Scrolls: access to restricted by the jews; history of the maintenance of; early publications of

[<44>](#) Israel, sin, cleansing of sin by Yahweh God, examples from prophecy

Douglas follows the jews: denies primary tenets of Christianity

[<45>](#) “Cause and effect” and Matt. 6:19-21, Gal. 6:7-8

[<46>](#) Israel, the crucifixion of Christ, redemption of imprisoned souls from the false accusations of Satan; Israel’s marriage relationship with Yahweh: divorce, redemption and remarriage, relationship of Old and New Covenants

[<47>](#) “Man” defined as Adamic White Man: Rom. 5:14-21, 8:28-39

The law: and obedience, James 2:10

[<48>](#) Paul and the law: obedience, faith and works, revisited

Paul’s testimony of value of the words of Christ, 1 Tim. 6:3-6

Failure of modern organized religion in respect to the Biblical law

Douglas follows the jews: Anti-Paulism another in an age-old series of attempts to destroy Christianity



Threat of Paul-bashing to the vulnerable in Israel Identity; remarks by Jeanne Snyder concerning Paul-bashing

[<49A>](#) Paul and the law: the Levitical law and the New Covenant; attitude of Christians towards the law, Rom. 3:31; the 10 Commandments; legalism of the Pharisees and Acts 15:10

[<49B>](#) Israel, sin and forgiveness, Rom. 3, Heb. 6:4-6, et alii (see also section [<37B>](#))

[<49C>](#) Βλασφημία (blasphēmia, blasphemy), defined

Paul and the law: its fulfillment in Christ

[<50>](#) The crucifixion of Yahshua Christ: in prophecy: Luke 24:13-35 and Acts 17:11

Israel: differentiated from the Edomite-jews

Douglas follows the jews: does not understand Scripture



Reasons for presentations such as these articles of Graber’s and Douglas’ and the supplied rebuttals

Empirical truths in Israel Identity

[<51>](#) Edomite-jews: behind all disorder recorded in the New Testament; behind all persecutions of Christians; propensity for rioting

Douglas follows the jews, and defends their wrongdoing

[<52>](#) Douglas’ hypocrisy concerning dialogue, effort required to respond to his articles

- [<53A>](#) Paul's early actions against Christianity: Douglas embellishes the historical account
- [<53B>](#) Edomite-jew conspiracy against Christ: Douglas continues to expand an invented role for Paul
- [<54>](#) Paul's "Road to Damascus" event: the 3 years which followed
Paul: did not "deceive" assemblies, did not profit monetarily from gospel: 2 Cor. 12:16 translated and explained; followed Christ, and encouraged his followers to do the same, 1 Cor. 11:1
Both Paul and John addressed their followers as their "children"
- [<55A>](#) Israel, sin and atonement under the Old Covenant; the crucifixion of Christ as atonement under the New Covenant: Gal. 2:20 explained (see also section [<55C>](#))
- [<55B>](#) Edomite-jew conspiracy against Christ: Douglas continues to expand an invented role for Paul
Sadducees the leading persecutors of Christians, joined by the Pharisees
- [<55C>](#) Israel and separatism: 2 Cor. 6:16 explained
Body as a vessel for the Spirit: Gal. 2:20 further explained (see also section [<55A>](#))
Paul's relationship with the other apostles
"Saint" defined
- [<56A>](#) Paul's relationship with James: no contention between them
- [<56B>](#) Paul's relationship with James: Douglas abuses statements in James' epistle in order to contrive some supposed debate between James and Paul
Douglas' false patriotism, illiteracy
- [<57>](#) Paul: did not "steal from churches"; did not profit monetarily from gospel, but at times supported by certain assemblies, 2 Cor. 11:7-9 translated and explained
- [<58>](#) Paul and the law: faith, works and judgement, self-control and 1 Cor. 9:27 discussed, Tit. 3:8 and James 2:20 shown to concur; the Judgement Seat of Christ, 2 Cor. 5:10
- [<59>](#) Paul and the law: faith, works and salvation, revisited
Douglas likened to Chaim Weizmann at Nuremberg trials
Paul's early actions against Christianity: his remorse and many apologies for his deeds fully profiled; deeds not equivalent to murder when performed under lawful government auspices
Chronology: of Paul's arrest in Jerusalem; of some of his epistles
- [<60>](#) Dead Sea Scrolls: Habakkuk 2:5 and the prophecy's interpretation as found in the Peshet, discussed at length; Habakkuk 2:5-8 explained; relationship of the name Saul to the root of the Hebrew word sheol, which is sha'al
- [<61A>](#) Paul not a Roman soldier
Paul's early actions against Christianity
- [<61B>](#) Paul and the stoning of Stephen
- [<62>](#) Paul in Damascus, Acts 9:22, συγχύνω (sugchuno, to confound) defined
Douglas distinguishes between Judaeans and jews, for the first time in these articles

- [<63>](#) Paul: initial trepidation of apostles to accept; acceptance of, Acts 9:22-31; at Antioch, Acts 14; and at Jerusalem, Acts 15
- [<64>](#) Damascus: name never used to describe Qumran, as Douglas claims; city mentioned in Genesis, Genesis Apocryphon; not Qumran, but a city in Syria, mentioned at Acts 26:11, 20, 2 Cor. 11:32; Damascus Document: copies found in Cairo, Egypt, and also among the Dead Sea Scrolls
- [<65>](#) Douglas: preoccupied with magicians and revolutionaries; accuses Paul's message of being "Romanized", contrary to ancient records
Paul's execution
Yahshua Christ: had no "anti-Roman" teachings; Pontius Pilate found no guilt in
- [<66>](#) Paul's relationship with James: Douglas continues to contrive some supposed debate between James and Paul, without citations
James: apparently a Judaizer, Acts 20:21-24 discussed
The "one stick" prophecy of Ezek. 37:15-28 explained
- [<67>](#) Douglas accuses Paul of being the "Liar", et alii, of the Dead Sea Scrolls (see also section [<43>](#))
Qumran sect: not Nazirites, Dead Sea Scrolls and Num. 6 compared
Apostles and disciples of Christ not Nazirites
The "sect of the Nazarenes", Acts 24:5, the Jewish name for Christianity
Paul and the law, revisited
- [<68>](#) The "Liar" of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Douglas invents various and more superfluous names for this figure
Qumran Sect: not Christian, proven from scrolls
- [<69>](#) Douglas' use of the term "goyim"
Douglas follows the Jews, in the terms which he uses
- [<70A>](#) Paul and the law: Douglas completely misportrays Paul's epistles: frequency in which Paul quotes the Old Testament
Paul's epistles: do not wholly represent the gospel which he preached; missing epistles; quotes of Old Testament found in
Paul's gospel: not found in his epistles; of the kingdom; found with Luke
- [<70B>](#) Paul: did not profit monetarily from gospel; humility and fallibility; infallibility of Old Testament, gospel of Yahshua Christ; admitted fallibility of his own advice; proved himself through works (Acts 14, 19, 28)
- [<71>](#) Douglas follows the Jews, denying the sacrifice of Christ
Yahshua Christ: mission of Yahweh God as Christ in prophecy; the term "Immanuel" defined; crucifixion of Christ, and reasons for it, in prophecy; as sacrificial lamb, in gospel; body and blood of, in gospel
- [<72>](#) Paul and the law: revisited again
Douglas follows the Jews and miscreants, and is thereby confused concerning Christianity
- [<73>](#) Warnings of false apostles: by Paul; in the Revelation in support of Paul; by Peter, Peter's warnings compared to those of Paul
Douglas follows the Jews, becomes a Judaizer
- [<74>](#) Paul: did not profit monetarily from gospel: 2 Cor. 8:16-21 translated and explained

- Paul and the doctrine of predestination, Gal. 1:15 and other examples from Scripture
- [<75>](#) Paul and the law: the dietary laws and clean, unclean meats, Romans 14 and 1 Cor. 10 explained; pork, or swine, not classified as “food”, also shunned by many Greeks and pagan Greek temples as being “unclean”, Strabo cited
- [<76>](#) Paul and relationship with James: Douglas continues to expand the contrived debate
- [<77A>](#) Douglas attributes Matt. 7:1-6 to Paul, rejecting the pericope as a “Paulinism”, later using this same gospel and chapter to support arguments against Paul (for which see section [<84>](#))
- [<77B>](#) Paul and the law, revisited again: Douglas continually recycles the same arguments throughout his articles
- [<77C>](#) Douglas quotes from Matt. 5:17-20 in support of his absurd argument concerning Paul and anti-nomianism
Douglas follows the jews, betrayed by his use of Hebrew terms
- [<78>](#) Paul and relationship with James: Douglas continues to expand the contrived debate, quoting Stephen’s words found at Acts 7:51-56, and asserting that the words belong to James, and are in reference to Paul!
Douglas follows the jews, seeks to corrupt Christianity
- [<79A>](#) Paul and relationship with James: Douglas continues to expand the contrived debate, misquotes *The Recognitions of Clement*; wrongly accuses Paul in the death of James, refuted from historical sources and the chronology of Paul’s ministry
- [<79B>](#) The deaths of James the lesser and James the greater: Douglas wrongly blames the Pharisees, is refuted by both history and Scripture
- [<80>](#) Paul did not profit monetarily from gospel, necessarily revisited again because Douglas constantly repeats himself
- [<81A>](#) Paul on Malta: the Maltese honor him as a god, compared to the similar incident with Paul and Barnabbas at Lystra (Acts 14:11-12); Herod Agrippa I, his fate when esteemed as a god by the people, attested in Acts and by Josephus139
Malta: economic position and history of the island, Diodorus Siculus cited139
- [<81B>](#) Douglas misquotes Scripture to support his perverted view of the use of the term “gods”
The children of Yahweh as gods: John 10:34, Deut. 14:1, and the 82nd Psalm discussed
Paul on Malta: the serpent in the bundle of sticks
- [<82>](#) Paul’s mission to the nations of Israel: Eph. 2:14 explained
Paul and the law: τέλος (telos, fulfillment) defined; Rom. 10:4 explained
- [<83>](#) Paul and the law: on obedience, Rom. 6:16 & 19 translated, explained and compared to Matt. 6:24; ἀνομία (anomia, lawlessness) defined
- [<84>](#) Paul and the law: the Edomite-jew as the “man of lawlessness”, 2 Thes. 2:3-4 & 3:2 translated and explained
Douglas follows the jews, and covers for their wrongdoing

Douglas quotes Matt. 7:21-23 as the words of Christ, but had previously claimed that Matt. 7:1-6 were the words of Paul (see section [<77A>](#))!

[<85>](#) Paul and the law: faith and works, revisited again

“Judeo-Christianity” an oxymoron

[<86>](#) Douglas repeats many of his slanders against Paul, all already addressed here; Douglas further abuses the Dead Sea Scrolls in another attempt to slander Paul

Douglas follows the jews, while at the same time he imagines himself to be defending Christianity

MISCONCEPTIONS CONCERNING PAUL AND THE ‘CHURCH’



The organized Roman Catholic church cannot be credited to (or blamed on) Paul of Tarsus, it developed much later, from the time of Justinian Roman (or often here, Romish) church and the second beast of the Revelation; the two beasts of the Revelation and the punishment of Israel Roman church bureaucracy modeled on ancient Roman Empire both politically and religiously



Ἐκκλησία (ekklesia, assembly, often “church” in Bible translations), defined and explained

Activities of early Christian assemblies, in contrast to Roman church rituals

Yahshua Christ the only head over Christian assemblies: needs no successor or substitute; no popery or vicarship licensed by Scripture

The children of Israel are the anointed and the ἐκκλησία: Col. 1:24 translate and explained

Simon Peter: πέτρος (petros, stone) defined and explained; Peter’s commission not above that of the other apostles, Matt. 16:19, 18:18

Romish church claim to succession of popes from Peter and Paul is invalid; Romish temple built on a graveyard; invalid assertion of authority over assemblies of the oikoumenê

Assemblies at Rome not addressed in the Revelation



Ἀπόστολος (apostolos, ambassador), defined and explained; no successors to the office named or needed

Συνεργός (sunergos, fellow-worker), defined and explained; Paul had colleagues, not subordinates

Lack of a formal church hierarchy in New Testament

Paul’s epistles read by and equally accessible to all

Paul left no successor, i.e. Acts 20:17-28; individual ἐπίσκοποι (episkopoi, over-seers) left with the charge of each assembly

Paul refused to rule over assemblies, i.e. 2 Cor. 1:24; each individual assembly autonomous

Ἐπίσκοπος (episkopos, overseer), defined and explained along with related verbs

Πρεσβύτερος (presbuteros, elder), related words, defined and explained

Διάκονος (diakonos, minister or servant), and related words defined and explained



Χειροτονέω (cheirotoneō, to vote for or elect), defined and explained; officers of a Christian assembly elected by the people, not ordained by some outside authority

Structure of a Christian assembly outlined by Paul's epistles and in Acts also verified by language and statements found with James and Peter



Επίσκοπος, overseer, and πρεσβύτερος, elder, esteemed to be one and the same office; functions of the office

Διάκονος, minister, functions of, and limitations for women

Ultimate authority for assembly is Scripture; only authority over assembly is Scripture

Function of assembly in judgement of criminal and legal matters; rejection of secular authority in dispute settlement; 1 Cor. 5:12-13 translated and explained; 1 Cor. 6:1-11 translated and explained

Secular authorities unrighteous, must be rejected, but also obeyed

Authority of Scripture over assembly

Compensation of officers serving the assembly

Officers serving assembly must be married, other required qualifications, 1 Tim. 3:1-13 translated



No prescription for Roman church officials in Paul's epistles

Romish church organization and sacramentalism are vestiges of Babylonian paganism, desired to retain control over people

Proper structure of a Christian assembly and historical experience with bygone models

Tax exemption and government control over "churches"; mystery Babylon vs. true Christianity

<END>

OPEN LETTER RESPONDING TO H. GRABER

In the autumn of 2003, a dear friend of mine sent me a copy of the December 1985, vol. II, #12, *Kingdom Courier* by one H. Graber, 5393 Carleton Rd., Mariposa, CA 95338. This document is a reflection of most of the trash being printed nowadays – and even in Israel Identity circles – to discredit Paul of Tarsus. My friend is, unfortunately, deceived by people such as H. Graber, Scott Nelson, and others, into rejecting the excellent and legitimate writings of Paul, for none other than a want of understanding. In November of 2003 I wrote a lengthy response to Graber's document, and both are reproduced below in their entirety, except that my response, originally in the form of a personal letter, has been edited somewhat for general consumption and for the format here. In my letter dated 19th Nov. 03, I stated:

Dear Friend, Greetings! Today I am writing you to respond to some of the statements in the December, 1985 *Kingdom Courier* you sent me, the article being entitled "The Gospel Of Jesus Christ! Versus The Doctrine Of The Apostle Paul!" And I must say, if the so-called 'Dr.' H. Graber truly wanted to "seek the truth and insure [his] eternal destiny" as he so boldly states, I'm sure he has found a destiny other than he hoped to attain: for his work is weighed in the balance, and found wanting. This letter will demonstrate that Mr. Graber is a liar, and a fraud. I am not going to address every aspect of Graber's eight page document, though I will discuss many of his statements, and certainly more of it than would be sufficient to support my claims concerning his character and scholarship. So that you may more easily follow my answers to Graber's statements, I will include a marked copy of his document with my letter, and the marks will correspond to those which will precede my several responses, i.e. <A>, etc.

[So that the reader will not become confused, all of Graber's remarks will be in italics, and the article being addressed has been divided into marked sections presenting first Graber's statements followed by my responses, which are from necessity slightly different than my original responses to my friend]:

<Section A> H. Graber states: "*Indeed I am aware of the controversy this message will percipitate [sic], but if there is one iota of TRUTH in this exposition, then I propose that the professed Christian must establish justification for the discrepencies [sic] between the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and the doctrine of the apostle Paul! It is not my purpose to generate controversy, but, rather to seek the truth and insure my eternal destiny. If we manufacture any justification for the doctrine of the apostle Paul, then we must concede that Jesus Christ erred in the presentation of His Gospel, while He walked this earth. Or we must acknowledge that Jesus Christ changed His Divine Plan after His resurrection and ascention [sic], and this premise must then acknowledge that Paul was spiritually inspired of God, to document his divergent doctrine.*

"I shall be eternally greatfull [sic] to Dr. W. G. Finlay of South Africa, for his expose [sic. exposé] of this matter, which inspired me to verify his presentation in both scriptures and secular history. It will be impossible for me to present all the details of this picture of betrayal in this short treatise, but I shall endeavor to present the fundamental basis for this message, to serve as a rational guide for any sincere Christian to expand upon by their own research and study."

In reply to section <A>: To begin, I will quote a statement of Graber's from the end of his original document (page 8, paragraph 9): "... we are all indavidually [sic], the captains of our own destiny!" This statement alone exposes Graber as a humanist, and not a Christian, and also as a hypocrite, for in the following paragraph Graber claims: "I shall glean my spiritual sustenance from Matthew, John, Peter and James ..." yet who does Peter say is the Shepherd and Bishop of our souls, but Yahshua Christ (1 Peter 2:25)? We are not the "captains" of our own destiny; we are purchased by Yahweh, and our lives are not our own! Paul teaches this (Eph. 1:14, 1 Cor. 6:20, 7:23) as does Peter (2 Peter 2:1), which is the meaning of redemption in the first place (i.e. Isa. 43:1)! So who is a liar, but H. Graber? Pretending to be a teacher in Israel, he "doeth the work of Yahweh deceitfully" (Jer. 48:10) and conceives and utters "from the heart words of falsehood" (Isa. 59:13). But there is much more!

<Section B> H. Graber states: "*The book, 'The Great Lion of God' by Taylor Caldwell, gives one a preview of Saul of Tarsus as a Pharisee, depicting a totally perverse and reprobate Jew, steeped in the traditions of Judaism. Further, he is depicted as a [sic.] short, stocky, and of strong stature, with a very unpleasant countenance. This is the character that admits his zealousness in killing Christians, (Gal. 1:13-14, Acts 22:4). Here I would like to ask you to read the words of Jesus Christ in His 'Sermon on the Mount', in Matt. 7:1-29, and then read Paul's (Sermon on the Mount?), in Rom. 12:1-21. Certainly the divergent doctrine of Paul is evident in this comparison.*"

In reply to section : Last year [2002] I wrote to the original recipient of this letter, in response to an anti-Paul document he had sent to me, which discussed the alleged description of Paul echoed here by Graber above, and quoted from a book by Taylor Caldwell. For those interested, they will find that this alleged physical description of Paul is derived from the writings of a second century forger of scripture, one who contrived the so-called *Acts of Paul and Thecla* in order to pollute Christianity with his false doctrines. Now all of this was evident in an encyclopedia article which this same person had sent to me, and which information is readily available (see, for instance, *Word Pictures in the New Testament* by A. Robertson at 2 Cor. 10:10-11). This spurious description of Paul was repeated in another forgery using the name of Lucian in the fourth century. Because such a description of Paul is used by multiple forgers, and enemies of the truth and of Christianity, I would safely confer that the truth concerning Paul's appearance is quite the opposite of what the forgers would have us believe! The authors of these alleged physical descriptions of Paul are discredited as frauds and forgers. Any historian is only as good as his sources. If H. Graber and T. Caldwell want to promote the works of a liar, then they themselves are become liars in doing so! I asked this person to also please refer to my discussion of this topic from our past correspondence, if he still had it, and which I regret not having available as I write this.

In this paragraph Graber also condemns Paul's words at Romans 12, in comparison with Matthew 7. He makes no specific statements, however, (what a wonderful 'scholar') and I'm not going to stab at shadows, except to say that I find no fault at all in Paul's discourse here, in comparison with the **entire** Sermon on the Mount of our Redeemer, which begins at Matthew 5, and includes Matthew 6! By comparing

apples and oranges, and removing words from their contexts, Graber exposes himself as an underminer and dissembler.

<Section C> H. Graber states: *“Now let us consider the purported Divine commission of apostleship bestowed upon Saul/Paul, as documented by the professed apostle Luke, in Acts chapter 9. There is NO evidence in scriptures or secular history of this miraculous event, except THE CLAIM OF PAUL HIMSELF! as documented by his companion Luke, in the book of Acts. Here let us consider the authors of the New Testament [sic] books. We know that Jesus Christ commissioned His Disciples to perform His commands, and Jesus personally selected Matthew, Peter, John, James, Phillip [sic.], Bartholomew, Simon, Thaddaeus, Andrew, Thomas and Judas Iscariot, a devil, and Jesus knew it. Of these twelve, only four wrote books that we have in the New Testament [sic.], Matthew, John, Peter, and James, a total of (9) books, all authored between AD 63 and AD 96, except Matthew, which is dated AD 37. These are the works of the Disciples of Jesus Christ. NOW, let us consider the books written by professed apostles in the New Testament [sic.], ALL authored between AD 54 and AD 69. These books (17) total, were all authored by Mark, Luke, and Paul, with Paul being the author of (14) of them. Here we note what seems an enigma to me. If Paul was this great man of God, that he is expounded to be by all professed Christianity (except a few) today, Why was his name mentioned only (1) time (by Peter) in all the works of the Disciples, who wrote during the time, and much later than Paul? **<Section C-2>** Conversely [sic], why did Paul not mention Matthew even ONE TIME in his works, considering that he was the author of the Gospel of Jesus Christ? Paul mentions John (1) time, Peter (5) times, and James (4) times in all of his prolific writings. HOWEVER, when we consider the three professed apostles, Mark, Luke, and Paul, we find that Mark did not mention Paul even one time, but Luke, Paul’s companion, mentioned Paul’s name (133) times, and Paul mentions his own name (30) times. By way of observation, it appears like Luke is the Publicity Agent (Hollywood style) for Paul. I believe here we have two professed apostles that seem to be working hand in glove, to promote a new star on the horizon of Christianity. I believe that the following exposition will support this contention.”*

In reply to section **<C>**: In response to this paragraph I will make only a general statement in support of both Luke and Paul. The mark of an inspired writer of the words of Yahweh is the revelation of prophecy later fulfilled. Luke’s gospel contains prophecy that, although the same general sketch of the forthcoming destruction of Jerusalem was also painted by Matthew (24) and Mark (13), Luke (here I speak of Luke 21:5 to 21:24) states some things in a different way than his colleagues. One may walk through Josephus’ *Wars*, the history of the destruction of Jerusalem, and see that Luke’s version, which states some things more specifically than the other two (i.e. 21:20) **was fulfilled exactly as Luke wrote it**. There are many other writings in Luke (and in Acts) which only a man inspired of Yahweh could possibly write. However, men like Graber, who are of false and deceitful hearts, do not have the capacity to recognize such things. There are also many prophetic statements made by Paul, among them Romans 16:20, of which a proper study would reveal that Paul also was inspired by Yahweh!

Now here, and at **<Section C-2>**, Graber makes some very insidious statements and questions. For instance, he demands to know why Matthew never mentioned Paul.

It doesn't seem to matter to Graber that Matthew's gospel ends its account before the first Pentecost, mentioned at Acts 2, **long** before Paul's involvement in Christianity. Is Graber a fool, or a purposeful deceiver? His question is the equivalent of asking why Matthew didn't mention the birth of Constantine or the founding of these United States! Then Graber admits that Paul was mentioned by Peter, and then regardless of Peter's testimony of Paul, Graber claims to "... glean his spiritual sustenance from ... Peter ..."! H. Graber: liar and hypocrite! Graber states "we find that Mark did not mention Paul even one time", yet again, Mark's gospel ends long before Paul's involvement! My friend and correspondent, you and I met in 1998. Would you mention me in a narrative of your life, if your narrative closed with 1995? Of course not! A child should notice Graber's duplicity here! Now Graber raises a lot of smoke, claiming that Luke "mentioned Paul's name (133) times" yet he fails to state (or rather admit) that not one of these mentions are in the gospel of Luke! Here it should be evident: H. Graber is a deceiver and a liar!

In the one short letter we have of his, James does not mention Paul, but James does not mention any of his other contemporaries either! Who is a liar, but H. Graber? In two letters, the only other apostle Peter mentions is Paul! Here Graber's own arguments proved just the opposite of what Graber intends! And proved that Graber is a liar! John mentions none of his colleagues in his three epistles, and of course he wouldn't mention Paul by name in his gospel, for the same reason given above. Jude mentions only James, his brother, surely to prevent us from confusing himself with the other New Testament men with the name 'Ιούδας (there were three). So who is a liar, but H. Graber? And a fool!

We have 14 of Paul's epistles. Of these, four are very long, and the other ten are nearly all as long, or longer, than any of the seven epistles we have written by other apostles. For sake of comparison, Paul's epistles consume 179 pages in the NA27, where the other seven epistles consume but 44 pages. Paul mentions his own name 30 times in letters written on a personal basis (Graber's count) from Paul to various assemblies, approximately once per six pages of text. James mentions his own name once, Peter his own name twice, and Jude mentions his own name once, for a total of about one per 10 pages, but only because the humble John does not mention his own name! Hopefully you see how inane this argument is. It adds up to one thing: Graber is an idiot!

The Book of Acts is basically an account of those deeds of Peter and Paul written by Luke. Peter's name occurs 58 times in Acts, Paul's 133 (as Graber states) to which I must add 23 mentions as "Saul." This should not be considered excessive, since Luke spent much more time with Paul than he did with Peter. Now to be fair, the gospel of Matthew is basically an account of the deeds of Yahshua Christ, and His name (Yahshua) appears in Matthew approximately 152 times, and in John 240 times (according to the *Moulton-Geden* concordance). Now Matthew contains 87 pages of Greek text in the NA27, and John 74, but Acts 89. So Paul's name is certainly not mentioned excessively. Therefore, let no man attempt to fool you with such deceptions. Paul mentions His name (Yahshua) approximately 230 times! H. Graber is a liar!

<Section D> H. Graber states: “*Who is the professed apostle Paul? In scriptures Paul tells us that he is an Israelite, (Rom. 11:1). Then he tells us that he IS a Pharisee, (Phil. 3:5). Luke tells us that Paul is a Jew, (Acts 21:39, & 22:3). History tells us that after the Babylonian captivity of the House of Judah, only a small remnant returned to Jerusalem, which were mostly Jews and not Israelites. Jesus warned His people concerning the LIE that even today has blinded the world. We read in Rev. 2:9, & 3:9, ‘I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews (Judeans) and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan.’ So one must ask the question, Was Paul a Jew (Yehuwdaiy), or an Israelite? We know that in secular life, Paul was a rabid Jew, Pharisee, and Lawyer, and we are told that he was steeped in the principles of judaism! Also he was an avid student of the Philosophers of his days at the University, such as Plato and Socrates.*”

In reply to section **<D>**: Here Graber engages in deception by purposefully confusing the context in which certain terms are used. Where Paul says he is an Israelite (of the tribe of Benjamin), he lies not, identifying himself by race. Where Paul says he is a Judaeon (right, in the original Greek, neither Paul nor Luke, nor any other Biblical writer, use the term ‘jew’, as Graber so idiotically alleges), or where Luke calls Paul a Judaeon, they lie not, but are using the term to describe Paul’s national identity, in terms understood in the Greco-Roman world, even though Paul was born at Tarsus and therefore also a Roman citizen. In a similar manner, I may elect to call myself an American (my citizenship), a Saxon or Celto-Saxon (my race) or even a German (the land my fathers came from). Would I be lying? Of course not, and neither is Paul, or Luke! H. Graber is the only liar here!

Paul was a Pharisee. Does that make him evil, as Graber implies? Nicodemus was a Pharisee, was he evil? Joseph of Arimathea was on the council, the Sanhedrin! He was not evil! There were many good Pharisees, and many bad. Today’s equivalents are Republicans, and there are many of them, too, good and bad. (Democrats are more like the Sadducees.) Graber, the liar, uses ‘Pharisee’ as a scare-word, and it surely should not be used in such a manner. It was a political party, and if you wanted any sort of voice in the community, you joined one of the parties. Was Paul a lawyer? Certainly not! He was a tentmaker by trade (Acts 18:3) and nowhere does it state that he was a lawyer. Pharisee, scribe and lawyer were all quite different things. Just read Matthew 23. H. Graber? He is a liar!

Was Paul learned in the learning of the Greeks? Yes! And this should be a source of pride to Identity students, since most of the Greeks were Israelites. It is also a source of refutation to the jews, who today would want you to believe that Judaea was isolated from Greco-Roman language, culture and learning: a huge lie. A separate and lengthy topic, I could surely write a twofold paper, first illustrating parallels in ancient Greek and Old Testament literature, and secondly on the New Testament parallels with ancient Greek literature. Paul quotes Aratus, Euripides, Epimenides, Menander, and uses illustrations derived from Homer, Pythagoras, and others. As I said, most of the Greeks were Israelites. Of course, I suspect H. Graber may not be!

<Section E> H. Graber states: “Now let us consider specific Pauline doctrine that is divergent from the Gospel of Jesus Christ:

“LIES: We read in Rom. 3:17, ‘For if the truth of God hath more abounded through my lie unto his glory; why yet am I also judged as a sinner?’ Here Paul is justifying lies, if they serve a moral purpose. This sounds like the anti-christian Plato’s philosophy from ‘The Republic’ quote, ‘Such a dangerous weapon as falsehood may not be employed by any but rulers, and then only for great and good purposes.’ Is this what Paul is saying in Rom. 3:7? The Gospel of Jesus Christ tells us in 1 John. 2:27, ‘But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is the truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him.’ If Paul was indeed anointed of Jesus Christ, how could he lie?”

In reply to section **<E>**: I must ask, how did Mr. Graber become “Dr. ”, not having any basic reading skills? You can read Romans 3:7 from the A.V., as Graber does, yet here it is from my own translation: “Indeed if the truth of Yahweh were increased by my lie for His honor, why then am I still judged as wrongful?” Is Paul here promoting lying, as Graber claims? Certainly not! Paul is saying that to lie, even if one believes that he is helping or honoring Yahweh by lying, is still sinful! Who is a liar, but Mr. Graber? Paul lies not!

The definition of διάβολος, one of the words translated “devil” in the A.V., is “accuser”, and more fully is one who throws up (δια-βολος is literally “by a throw”) false accusations, hence in my translations I write “False Accuser”. This alone best describes H. Graber, for I have already shown this is his device, several times over. Διάβολος is the word for ALL of the critics of Paul, whose actual goal is to undermine Christianity, while calling themselves Christians! This, reader, is their second oldest trick. They undermined Judaea by calling themselves Judah. They undermined America by calling themselves Americans. Today they divide Christian Identity, being called “One-Seedliners”! The ignorant among us, which are usually the majority, fall time and again to these devices.

With this in mind, I will yet take the time to dissect H. Graber’s false accusations, if for nothing else but that hopefully by this I may help strengthen the knowledge and awareness of a few, that they “be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked” such as Graber and Scott Nelson, his fellow liar.

<Section F> H. Graber states: **“THE MESSIAH:** We read, concerning Paul in Acts 13:46-47, ‘Then Paul and Barnabas waxed bold, and said, It was necessary [sic.] that the word of God should first have been spoken to you: (meaning the Jews) but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles. For so hath the Lord commanded us, saying, I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation unto the ends of the earth.’ If the apostle Paul is to be for salvation unto the ends of the earth, that means that Jesus Christ has abdicated His Messiahship! If we are to believe these scriptures, and the apostle Paul, then Paul is our Messiah. Paul further magnifies himself in Gal. 4:14, ‘And my temptation which was in my flesh ye despised not, nor rejected; but received me as an angel of God, even Jesus Christ.’ What arrogance! Paul putting himself on the same level with Jesus Christ. We read the words of Jesus in John 4:25-26, ‘The woman saith

unto him, I know that Messiah cometh, which is called Christ: when he is come, he will tell us all things. Jesus saith unto her, I that speak unto thee am he.’ Who do you accept as the MESSIAH, Jesus Christ or the apostle Paul?”

In reply to section <F>: I have been thinking to write a paper for some time now concerning all of the mistranslation and misconception in and of the book of Acts. [NOTE: Since writing this, I have completed an entire and original translation of Luke’s work, both Acts of the Apostles and the Gospel of Luke, with over 2500 footnotes and several appendices – *WRF*]. When I do, Acts 13:46-47 will certainly be one of the pericopes discussed. At Acts 13:47 Paul quotes Isaiah (see Isaiah 42:6, 49:6 and 51:4), whose prophecy is surely related to the promises found at 1 Kings 11:36 (and 2 Chron. 21:7) and which Paul certainly understood – knowing the prophecy better than Mr. Graber – that he had a part in fulfilling (see Acts 26:17-18). Every message needs a messenger. If one claims to know where lost Israel was at the time of Christ, one must accept Paul as that messenger, for no one else delivered Yahshua’s message to the Nations (not the “Gentiles”), but Paul! The Gauls, Greeks, Romans and Spaniards that Paul visited, along with the Scythians and others he mentioned, were all Israelites, and Paul knew it.

We are the light of the world (Matt. 5:14-16). We are the children of Light (John 12:36, 1 John 1:5-7). Shemesh, or “sun” in Hebrew, also means “people of Shem” in Hebrew. This is not an accident. Peter also knew the prophet’s comparison of the Word to light (2 Pet. 1:19), but was not the writer that Paul evidently was. Luke (2:32) knew the source of the light, and surely Paul did too, though in the A.V. Luke 2:32 is poorly translated, for the Nations (not ‘Gentiles’) and the glory of Israel are in the Greek both one and the same. If Graber understands not the prophecy concerning the light of the gospel, it is only because there is no light in him (John 11:10)!

Now to discuss Acts 13:46. Paul gives this discourse in Pisidian Antioch, which contained a colony of Romans (Strabo 12.18.4), amidst a land settled throughout history by Phrygians (who were Thracians according to Strabo and others, hence descendants of Japheth – Gen. 10:2), Pisidians (a people which Strabo relates to the Leleges and Cilicians, Strabo 12.7.3, who in turn are shown to be related to the Trojans and had Trojan kings, Strabo 13.1.7, 13.1.51, 13.3.1 et al., and in turn the Cilicians are related to the Phoenicians by Rawlinson in his edition of Herodotus, from comments Herodotus made; Israelites all!), and later the area was overrun by the Keltic-Israelite Galatians, and later colonized by Greeks as well as Romans. So enough background on the environs of Pisidian Antioch, a “multi-cultural” region, **but consisting entirely of Adamic** cultures. When Paul first addressed these people he states (13:16) “Men of Israel, **and ye that fear God**”, a device which indicates the presence of non-Israelite Adamites (compare Peter at Acts 2:14) and his entire address is for and about Israelites. See also Acts 13:26, where by no means is Paul attempting to change the original commission (Matt. 15:24).

Now at Acts 13:46, after the Judaeans (not the “jews”, which is not in the original Greek anywhere, although today we call the non-believing Judaeans, racially Canaanites and Edomites, by the name of “jew”) rejected Paul’s message, Paul says “... lo, we turn to τὰ ἔθνη” and I will discuss the Greek words τὰ ἔθνη in a moment.

First, it should be obvious that Paul’s scope here is local. This is not, as the catholics would have you think, a sudden and general rejection by Paul of Judaeans everywhere; God having changed His mind and His people. Oh the deception! By no means should Acts 13:46 be cross-referenced, as so many fools do, to Matthew 21:43.

Instead, Matthew 21:43 should be cross-referenced to Micah 4:7-8 and to Daniel 2:44, which the catholics usually neglect to do, not having the Truth! Paul's rejection of Judaeans here applies only to those Judaeans at the time and place (the synagogue at Pisidian Antioch) in which Paul makes the statement. This is obvious, since days later at Iconium, 75 miles east of Antioch Paul visits another synagogue (Acts 14:1) and "a great multitude of the Judaeans and also of the Greeks believed." Here it is proven: anyone who follows the catholic (meaning "universalist") theology is a fool, and anyone who parrots it is a liar! H. Graber is a fool and a liar!

Now for the words τὰ ἔθνη in this passage: Anyone who ever reads the Greek word ἔθνος, of which ἔθνη is plural, and utters the made-up catholic word "gentile", is a moron! Let us look at the secular definition of ἔθνος as given by Liddell & Scott: "a number of people accustomed to live together, a company, a body of men ... of animals, swarms, flocks ... after Homer, a nation, people ... in the N.T. the nations ..." Now not always can this word be translated "nations." See Acts 8:9 and Romans 10:19 in the A.V., where ἔθνος is translated "people." Compare Mark 11:17 to its source at Isaiah 56:7, where the A.V. **should** have translated the word "people", but did not. There are other examples of this, and many more in the Septuagint. Here the A.V. should have rendered this part of Acts 13:46 "lo, we turn to the people", and left behind in the Greek would be the diversity of the synagogue audience, Thracians, Kelts, Greeks, Romans and Judaeans, but all Adamites, which Paul's use of τὰ ἔθνη surely indicates. Other Greek words meaning "people" or "multitude" among which are λαός, ἄλγος, πλθος, ἀλής or ὄχλος, simply would not have the same precise meaning. Graber is ignorant, and his ignorance is accomplice to his lies.

To continue by examining another part of this paragraph at <F>, I will discuss Graber's lies concerning Galatians 4:14. Quoting my own translation of this verse: "And of my trial in the flesh you did not despise or loathe, but as a messenger of Yahweh you accepted me, like Yahshua Christ." It may be proven (start by reading 4:15) that Paul's "trial in the flesh" was his failed eyesight (see also Gal. 6:11), and he was here commending the Galatians for treating him respectably, even though he had such a disability. Paul is not elevating himself to the position of Christ, but rather is commending the Galatians for abiding by the words of Christ, expressed at Matthew 10:40: "**He that receiveth you receiveth me**"! Paul is being fair in his assessment. Is Mr. Graber? Who is a liar, but H. Graber? It is obvious that Graber does not know his Scripture yet makes many accusations. The jews did the same thing to Christ!

<Section G> H. Graber states: "**WORD OF GOD FIRST TO THE JEWS:** *In the above scriptures, Acts 13:46-47, Paul says that it was necessary [sic.] that the word of God should first be preached to the Jews (Yehuwdiy). (Here we must understand that the words Jew and Israel are not synonymous.) We read in I Cor. 9:20, 'And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews;' We have no evidence in the Bible that Jesus Christ ever done [sic.] this, to the contrary, Jesus said, speaking of the Jews in Matt. 13:10-13, 'And the disciples came, and said unto him, Why speakest thou unto them in parables? He answered and said unto them, Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given. For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance: but whosoever hath*

not; from him shall be taken away even that he hath. Therefore speak I to them in parables: because they seeing see not; and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand.’ Also in Matt. [sic. 13:] 34-35, ‘All these things spake Jesus unto the multitude in parables; and without a parable spake he not unto them: That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, saying, I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundations of the world.’ Does this sound like Jesus Christ was trying to gain the Yehuwdiy (Jews)? Of course not, Jesus knew that the Jews are the children of the devil as He tells us in John 8:44. We read in Jude: 4, ‘For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.’ Certainly Jesus Christ knew who the Yehuwdiy are, and I believe that the learned Paul did too.”

In reply to section <G>: There is much deception on Graber’s part here! First Graber continues, in good catholic tradition, to confuse the Greek word Ἰουδαῖος, or properly “Judaean”, with the term “Jew.” Then, because Graber himself is confused, he accuses Paul of wanting to preach to Canaanites and Edomites! Now, Paul explains thoroughly the difference between Jacob and Esau (see Romans 9:1-13), and is very aware of those children of Cain masquerading as Judah (Acts 13:6-10, 19:13, 2 Thes. 2). Why does Graber not criticize John, who recorded our Redeemer as saying: “Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship: for salvation is of (τῶν Ἰουδαίων) the Judaeans” (where the A.V. has “of the Jews”). Does Graber hold John to a different standard than Luke? Seemingly! Does Graber expect that the same word has some mysteriously different meaning if uttered by Yahshua rather than Paul? Surely! Who is a liar, but Mr. Graber?

I could write at length on why Paul felt that he had to bring the gospel to those Israelites (who at that time were calling themselves Judaeans) under the law first, who were mostly of true Judah and Benjamin, and then to those lost Israelites, the Nations of Genesis 17:6 and 35:11, though that is far beyond the scope of my purpose here. To read 1 Kings 11:36 and Zech. 12:7 should be sufficient for the time being.

[KJV 1 Kings 11:36 And unto his son will I give one tribe, that David my servant may have a light alway before me in Jerusalem, the city which I have chosen me to put my name there.

KJV Zechariah 12:7 The LORD also shall save the tents of Judah first, that the glory of the house of David and the glory of the inhabitants of Jerusalem do not magnify themselves against Judah.]

To address Graber’s duplicity in the paragraph marked <G> of his twisted document: Paul spoke amongst the dispersion of Israel, lost and Judaeans alike, in plain language. Yahshua spoke amongst the Judaeans of Palestine in parables. Paul’s mission was to live long enough to adequately spread the message of Redemption among lost Israel. Yahshua Christ’s mission was to announce that same gospel which Paul spread, He being its originator, and then to die at the hands of His enemies, and to live again, accomplishing our Redemption. Two different missions require two different methods. Paul also used many parables and analogies in his letters, which surely Graber and his ilk do not understand, because if they did they wouldn’t be critical of Paul!

Graber quotes Jude 4: “For certain men crept in unawares ...” yet ignores the nearly identical words of Paul at Gal. 2:4 “And that because of false brethren unawares

brought in ..." and Acts 20:29: "... after my departing [from Asia Minor] shall grievous wolves enter in among you ..." Who is a deceiver, but H. Graber? And a liar too!

<Section H> H. Graber states: "**THE GENTILES**: We note that Paul tells us in Acts 13:46-47, that, 'the Lord commanded us saying, I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles,' And we also read in Rom. 11:13, 'For I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office.' Let us also read Rom. 15:16, 'That I should be the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering the gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost.' There is no place in scriptures or secular history that tells us where Paul received this authority, except by his own claim and that of his companion Luke, who was a gentile. NOW, let us read what Jesus had to say in this matter. We read, Jesus commanding His Disciples, in Matt. 10:5-6, 'These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them saying, Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not: But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.' (The white caucasian [sic], anglo-saxon [sic], celtic [sic], germanic [sic, should be capitalized] people of the world, the TRUE Israelites of the Bible!) We also read in Matt. 15:24, 'But he answered and said, I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.' Very clearly, by the words of Jesus Himself, He tells us that He did not come for the Gentiles. WHY? Because Jesus came for salvation for His children that had the original sin imputed upon them, and thereby had become prisoners of Satan after death. The original sin was only imputed upon the seed of Adam, and not upon the Gentiles or Jews! I am sure the learned apostle Paul knew this. SO WHO ARE YOU GOING TO BELIEVE, JESUS OR THE PROFFESSED [sic.] APOSTLE PAUL?"

In reply to section **<H>**: Here is Graber's biggest and most obvious lie! First, Graber criticizes Paul for going to so-called 'Gentiles' – a word that no true scholar should even use, and then Graber admits that "the True Israelites of the Bible" are the "white Caucasian, Anglo-Saxon, Celtic, Germanic people of the world" [though he must have missed or slept through his third-grade school-classes on the days when he would have been taught that these words should be capitalized.] Well, here Graber is right, but fails to mention that Paul wrote to the Galatians, better written "Gauls" (see my Galatians translation and the accompanying notes), and also mentioned the Scythians. It is the Galatians (synonymous with Kelts) and Scythians who are the parent races of all the "Anglo-Saxon, Celtic, Germanic people", as is demonstrated by history. But Paul also went throughout Asia Minor, in his time inhabited mostly by Trojans, Phoenicians, Romans, Danaan and Dorian Greeks, all Israelites who left Israel during the 1,000 years between the sojourn in Egypt and the Assyrian deportations, and also by Thracian and Ionian Japhethites and Kelts (Galatians). And Paul also went to Greece, inhabited by Phoenicians, Danaan and Dorian Greeks (all Israelites) and Ionian Greeks (Javan, son of Japheth), and Paul went to Italy, inhabited by those same Greeks and Phoenicians and Trojan-Romans, and Paul desired to go to Spain, inhabited by Phoenicians, Tartessians (Japhethites) and Kelts (deported Israel), and except for these tribes of Japheth (see Genesis 9:27) and the Semitic Lydians of Asia Minor (from whom were also the Etruscans of Italy), all of the people Paul went to and wrote to were also Israelites and all took part and have a share in the promises to Jacob, Isaac and Abraham. Only **since** Paul's time have these southern European nations been invaded

and mongrelized. When Paul was there – as archaeology fully proves – they were all “white Caucasian nations.” H. Graber, again: a liar and a deceiver! I wonder, does the “H” stand for Hymie, or Huckster? **Paul never uttered the silly non-word “gentiles”!** Rather, Paul used only the Greek words τὰ ἔθνη (ta ethnê) “the nations”, and knew that he was going to those same nations of Genesis 17:6 and 35:11, which nearly every one of his epistles proves in multiple ways.

I call “gentile” a non-word because in our language it is just that: not an English word. Rather, “gentile” was borrowed from the Latin language, and assigned a corrupted meaning, “Non-Jew”, which it never bore in Latin! The English translators chose the Latin gentilis, “gentile”, for their corrupt translation of the original Greek word ἔθνος (ethnos, nation) because Jerome, when he made the Latin Vulgate, used the word gentilis to translate ἔθνος into Latin. Jerome, however, may well have had more wisdom than the later English translators, since gentilis is defined “family, hereditary; tribal; national ... clansman, kinsman” by *The New College Latin & English Dictionary*, and describes a people with some degree of relationship to each other. The *Junior Classic Latin Dictionary* published by Wilcox & Follett Company in 1945 defines gentilis: “of the same clan or race”, surely a word consistent with all scripture (Amos 3:2, Matt. 15:24 et al.) and nothing like the corrupted catholic interpretation of the word! To be honest, ἔθνος must be translated into a like English term when translating the Greek scriptures into English, and no borrowed and corrupted third-language term should be used, especially when that word’s true sense is ignored completely!

Now if Paul did not bring the gospel of Yahshua Christ to the promised nations of Jacob Israel (with books and parchments – i.e. 2 Tim. 4:13), then who did, the other apostles? If so, where are their letters, besides the seven brief epistles which we have? Although surely they all had their own function to perform, and I criticize them not, it was Paul whose work was best remembered and preserved, and it was Paul who risked his neck in Anatolia, Thrace, Macedon, Greece and Rome, **and his writings are still reaching out to the Israel-nations of today.** Paul went nowhere but unto where history separately tells us the Israel-sheep were! There was no Paul in Egypt, China, India, Arabia or Ethiopia, places much safer and out of the way of jewish persecution, and far better to pollute Christianity if that were one’s mission. Anyone who criticizes Paul is a liar! H. Graber is a liar!

<Section I> H. Graber states: “**GENEAOLOGY** [sic.]: *The apostle Paul tells us in I Tim. 1:4, ‘Neither give heed to fables and endless genealogies [sic], which minister questions rather than godly edifying which is in faith: so do.’ Again we read in Titus 3:9, ‘But avoid foolish questions, and genealogies [sic], and contentions, and strivings about the law; for they are unprofitable and vain.’ IF this be true, why did Almighty God give us the examples in the Old Testament [sic], and why was the genealogy [sic] of Jesus Christ documented in Matthew chapter 1, reckoning Jesus Christ back to Adam? Did Jesus ever tell us that genealogies [sic] were vain? The Old Testament [sic] gives us (12) times that the children of God were reckoned by genealogy [sic], and purged of any and all adulterated seed. Read Ezra 2:62, ‘These sought their register among those that were reckoned by genealogy [sic], but they were not found: therefore were they, as polluted, put from the priesthood.’ People that do not understand IDENTITY, cannot comprehend this truth.”*

In reply to section <1>: On to this next paragraph (which was originally on page 3 in Graber's polluted document), and Paul's exhortations to Titus and Timothy concerning "fables and endless genealogies" (1 Tim. 1:4) and "foolish questions and genealogies" (Titus 3:9), these were **NOT**, as Graber the deceiver insinuates, admonitions by Paul to forgo or ignore concerns over one's racial purity. To the contrary, Paul calls Titus "a purely bred child according to the common belief" (Titus 1:4, my translation) which is all Titus had to go by, his being Greek (a "lost" Israelite) and no true genealogical records being in his possession! Paul also addressed Timothy as a "purely bred child in faith" (1 Tim. 1:2, my translation) and Timothy being half-Greek and half-Judaeen (Acts 16:1) the average Greek or Judaeen, being ignorant of Greek roots, may have considered him a bastard.

To comprehend Paul's admonitions concerning genealogies, we must understand that Paul is writing to Greeks, men schooled in Greek thought and literature, and is writing on Greek terms (which is what he is explaining at 1 Cor. 9:20-21 and which Graber understands not, that Paul being educated in both Judaism **and** Greek literature, had the ability to speak to each on their own terms!) If anyone has read Homer, Hesiod, and the many other Greek poets and playwrights, and otherwise respectable Historians such as Strabo, Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus who often repeat such fables, only then can one comprehend and appreciate the Greek idea of genealogy, and Paul's admonitions here. Paul is certainly not condemning the likes of Esdras, and the Levitical record keepers of ancient Israel, but rather he is condemning Hesiod and the likes of his *Theogony*, and the many similar works which account for the races of men in various genealogies where those races are said to have descended from various pagan gods and goddesses such as Zeus, Apollo, Athena, Heracles, etc. Such accounts were quite intricate, repeated by poet and historian alike, and absolutely vain.

Who, then, can comprehend the Bible without understanding these things? Nobody! To properly understand the Bible, one must study language, history and archaeology, and the other literature of the periods of the Bible. Not to do so is to be susceptible to the lies of men such as H. Graber and Scott Nelson!

As for "contentions and strivings about the law" Paul warns Titus not to get caught up in the same such deceit which we find in the Talmud, a reflection of thought in Judaism of the period, and a perverted web of deceit and evil indeed! It is obvious that Graber, by his criticism of the statement, cannot or is not willing to distinguish between "strivings about the law" and the law itself! Graber is as deceitful as those who wrote the Talmud!

This closes the sixteenth page of (my original handwritten) comments which by now I hope you agree have entirely discredited Mr. Graber. Yet I'm just coming to the bottom of page 3 of his document, I have 5 pages to address yet, and address them I will, even if I must write twice sixteen pages again. I only hope the reader will be able to share this with others, who may be weak in the faith, and caught up in Graber's deceit, and that they benefit somewhat by it. I also hope the reader will see through these empty and vain attacks upon the Truth which are engineered by Graber and his ilk. Anyone with only a surface knowledge of the Scripture is easily taken away by purveyors of deceit. A great difference there is, between hard study and casual reading, and then the source materials one uses make a world of difference also.

<Section J> H. Graber states: “**THE LAW:** *The doctrine of the professed apostle Paul very emphatically negates the Laws of God. BY WHAT AUTHORITY? We read in Rom. 1:17, ‘For therein is righteousness [sic] of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, the just shall live by faith.’ (Not the law) <Section J-2> Here we need to point out how Paul many times misquotes the Prophets of the Old Testament [sic]. <Section J continued> This is quoted from Hab. 2:4, which reads, ‘the just shall live by his faith.’ Again Paul says in Rom. 6:14, ‘For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace.’ Certainly we can understand this, because the law was not given to the Gentiles, but neither did Jesus Christ offer salvation to the Gentiles, because they do not need it, for the original sin was not imputed upon them. Eph. 2:15, ‘Having abolished in his flesh the enmity [sic], even the law of commandments contained in ordinances;’ Rom. 4:15-16, ‘Because the law worketh wrath: for where no law is there is no transgression. Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all.’ Paul is telling us that if we repeal the laws of God, then there can be no sin. That is the same as if we repealed all criminal law, then we would have no crime! WHAT DOES JESUS TELL US CONCERNING THE LAW OF GOD? Jesus tells us in Matt, 5:17-18, ‘Think not that I am come to destroy, but to fulfil [sic]. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.’ (emphasis added) Has heaven and earth passed, or did Jesus change His mind? We also read in John 14:15, ‘If ye love me, keep my commandments,’ And again, in I John 2:4, ‘He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him.’ WHO DO YOU BELIEVE, JESUS OR THE PROFESSED APOSTLE PAUL? Paul tells us over and over again that the law was negated by the cross. If that is true, Why did Jesus Christ not give us one word of evidence that this is so?”*

In reply to section **<J>**: Beginning with the first few lines of the paragraph (which occupied the last three lines of page 3, and continued into page 4 of Graber’s original document), Graber makes a treacherous attack upon Paul’s views concerning the law. Graber states that “Paul very emphatically negates the Laws of God”, which is a vile lie, for Paul clearly states at Romans 3:31 (from the A.V.): “Do we make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea we establish the law.” Graber is very short of understanding, and so that you may see what I speak of here, I will take the time to explain a few things concerning the law under the New Covenant.

First, as can be witnessed by history, the Levitical laws in the Pentateuch, based upon but not a perfect image of Yahweh’s law (i.e. Matt. 19:8) certainly had their purpose, and still do: for we see today the greater part of the enemies of Yahweh, the seed of the serpent, have trapped themselves in the Old Testament law – and not having the Faith of the Anointed – they have voluntarily condemned themselves! Both Paul and James, as you will see, make allusions to this. Both Jew and Muslim claim to believe and accept the Old Testament, and all (and they are nearly all descendants of Cain) are condemned by it!

Now it is certain that Yahshua Christ came not to destroy, but to fulfill, both the law **and the prophets**. Now, let us see just what the prophets say concerning the New Covenant, which all agree that Yahshua Christ, Yahweh Himself, compacted with the children of Israel:

- Jer. 31:31-33: “Behold, the days come, saith Yahweh, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers ... which my covenant they brake ... But this *shall be* the covenant that I will make ... I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts ...”
- Isa. 51:7: “Hearken unto me, ye that know righteousness, the people in whose heart is my law ...”
- Jer. 32:39-40: “And I will give them one heart, and one way ... And I will make an everlasting covenant with them ... I will put my fear in their hearts ...”
- Ezek. 11:19-20: “And I will give them one heart, and I will put a new spirit within you; and I will take the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them an heart of flesh: That they may walk in my statutes, and keep mine ordinances ...”
- Deut. 30:6: “And Yahweh thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed ...”
- Jer. 4:4: “Circumcise yourselves to Yahweh, and take away the foreskins of your heart ...”

Now it should be evident, that if the laws of Yahweh were to be written in our hearts [a promise made only to Israel] then there is no longer a need for the written Levitical law, for the matters of the Law, encapsulated in the 10 commandments which Yahweh Himself illustrated (i.e. Mark 10, Luke 18), are common sense to OUR RACE! Paul explains these things in Hebrews 7, and in Romans 7:6 and 2:29 where he explains that we keep the law in spirit, and not in letter. The Jews pretend to keep the law in letter, yet their Talmud is filled with many devices of “reasoning” and vile ways to get around the law! Know that even in modern litigation according to the laws of man, that courts often cite the difference between the “letter of the law” and the “spirit of the law” and realize that Paul is explaining that same thing here to the Romans.

So it should be obvious, that the removal of the yoke of the Levitical law is a matter of prophecy along with the New Covenant – [Yahshua says “For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light”, Matt. 11:30] – and Paul explains this very thing over and over, but using different methods for Romans and Hebrews, since they have different perspectives. Where Paul writes at Romans 2:14-15 “For when the Nations, which have not the law, **do by nature** the things contained in the law ... which show **the work of the law written in their hearts**” is Paul not demonstrating that the Romans – themselves a part of “lost” Israel – are indeed Israelites to whom such a promise was made? Compare this to the words of the prophets quoted above! And where Paul tells the Corinthians at 2 Corinthians 3:2-3 “Ye are our epistle written in our hearts, known and read of all men: manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart.” Is Paul not showing the fulfillment of the words of the prophets: that the New Covenant was being brought to Israel, whom the Dorian Greeks also descended from (as I can demonstrate in history and archaeology)? Read Paul’s quote of Jer. 31:33 to the Hebrews at 10:16. If one studies prophecy, one must come to the conclusion that the children of Israel are NOT bound to the written law, yet they should seek to obey it voluntarily. This is what Paul explains. The children of Satan have bound themselves to the written law, and **never** being able to fulfill it, they have condemned themselves!

Now this I can go further to demonstrate, but what I have written here should be sufficient. The children of Israel following the law in Spirit, and not in letter (the written law), is in itself a fulfillment of the law and the prophets, which Christ came to accomplish, and did! To deny such is to deny Him. Paul does not deny Christ: H. Graber does! Yet I will discuss a few more things concerning Paul and the law.

At Colossians 2:14 Paul states that **the ordinances**, not the entire law, were nailed to the cross. These are all of the rituals, sacrifices, oblations and such. Daniel 9:27 prophecies that when Yahshua confirms the covenant, “the sacrifices and the oblation [He shall cause] to cease.” These are what Paul calls elsewhere “the works of the law”, which in Ferrar Fenton’s translation (and in my own) you will find translated “the rituals of the law”, which are precisely what Paul means. That these were done away with are also a matter of the law and the prophets, and it was **NOT** written on our hearts to continue them! Of course, the catholics have a schedule of rituals that they have substituted, none with any foundation in Scripture (not even water baptism!). So enough of this, now we will see that James and Paul agree on the law!

An examination of the epistle of James, compared to Paul’s epistles, demonstrates that James and Paul were in complete cohesion regarding the law, and so was Peter. Here I will demonstrate such.

- Romans 2:13 (see 2:14-15 quoted above): “For not the hearers of the law *are* just before Yahweh, but the doers of the law shall be justified.”
- James 1:22-24: “But be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves. For if any be a hearer of the word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass: For he beholdeth himself, and goeth his way, and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was.”
- Galatians 2:4: “And that because of false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ ...”
- Galatians 5:1: “Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage.”
- Galatians 5:13-14: “For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only *use* not liberty for an occasion to the flesh [i.e., to follow lust], but by love serve one another. For all the law is fulfilled in one word, *even* in this; ‘Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself’.”
- 1 Peter 2:15-16: “For so is the will of Yahweh, that with well doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men: As free, and not using *your* liberty for a cloke of maliciousness, but as the servants of Yahweh.”
- 2 Peter 2:1, 19: “But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying Yahweh that bought them ... While they promise them liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption: for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage.”
- James 1:25: “But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth *therein*, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed.”
- James 2:10: “For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one *point*, he is guilty of all.”

- Romans 2:25: “For circumcision verily profiteth, if thou keep the law: but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision.”
- Galatians 5:2-3: “Behold ... if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing ... every man that is circumcised ... he is a debtor to do the whole law.”
- James 2:12: There is a problem with the A.V. translation of this verse. The word μέλλοντες is treated as a Substantive and translated “they that shall be”, which is only necessitated if the word were preceded by an Article, which it is not. Also, the A.V. places an Article before “law” which does not exist in the Greek, hence here is my own translation: “**Thusly you speak, and thusly you do: as going to be judged by a law of liberty.**”
- Romans 14:10: “But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ.”
- James 4:11-12: “Speak not evil one of another, brethren. He that speaketh evil of *his* brother, and judgeth his brother, speaketh evil of the law, and judgeth the law: but if thou judge the law, thou art not a doer of the law, but a judge. There is one lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy: who art thou that judgest another?”

So with this it must be evident, Paul taught liberty from the **letter** of the Old Testament law, and to follow it in **deed** and in **Spirit**, and these same things were foretold by the prophets, and also taught by James and by Peter! And who can read this, then deny such? Now compare Luke’s account of James’ and Peter’s opinions concerning Paul’s teaching and the law at Acts 15, and now that you see that this by no means conflicts with Paul’s epistles, with James’ or Peter’s epistles, with the prophets, or with the gospels, what may one say? Surely Paul said much more concerning the law, and it should be examined, but none of it is with fault. Paul may only be attacked in ignorance, or by those caught up in the deceit and devices of Yahweh’s enemies: among whom I count H. Graber, and Scott Nelson!

Now we shall go on to review the statement which H. Graber made at [<Section J>](#): “**THE LAW:** *The doctrine of the professed apostle Paul very emphatically negates the Laws of God. BY WHAT AUTHORITY? We read in Rom. 1:17, ‘For therein is righteousness [sic] of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, the just shall live by faith.’ (Not the law) ...*” [<Section J-2>](#)

In reply to section [<J-2>](#): Among other things in this paragraph, discussed above at [<J>](#), Paul is accused by Graber of “many times” misquoting the Old Testament, a blatant lie once one sees that: (a) the majority of Paul’s quotes agree with the Septuagint rather than the A.V. (b) often Paul is simply paraphrasing rather than quoting (c) quote marks were not used in Greek, they belong to modern translators (d) the Old testament texts have not come down to us in perfect form, some New Testament quotes disagree with both the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint, and some of those do agree instead with the Aramaic Targums! (e) these circumstances exist in **every** New Testament book, not only in Paul (or Luke or Mark). Here Graber’s duplicity is quite obvious, for he is a liar and a fraud! The LXX version of Habakkuk 2:4 (by Brenton, and a fair rendering of the LXX Greek): “... but the just shall live by my [Yahweh’s] faith.” Who is a deceiver, but H. Graber? There is not any contradiction between Paul and Yahshua Christ, whom Paul follows!

<Section K> H. Graber states: “ **DIVERGENT PAULINE DOCTRINE:** *Let us document some more of the apostle Paul’s confusing and contradictory doctrine. Paul tells us in Rom. 1:4, ‘And declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead:’ (emphasis added) Here Paul tells us that Jesus was not the Son of God until [sic] he qualified himself by the spirit of holiness, and after His resurrection. Matthew tells us that Jesus was born the Son of God, by the virgin Mary, WHO DO YOU BELIEVE, MATTHEW OR PAUL?”*

In reply to section **<K>**: Romans 1:4 is a difficult verse to translate, and here in this paragraph (which was the second paragraph on page 4 of his original document), Graber criticizes Paul only by the bad translation of this verse in the A.V. In April of 2000, translating Romans, I rendered 1:4: “Who has been distinguished as a son of Yahweh in the ability through the sanctity of the Spirit to rise up from the dead; Yahshua Christ our prince”, and I stand by the sense of that translation today. The Greek verb ὀρίζω (horizo) may by no means be translated “declare” as the A.V. has done here, the word meaning “to mark out or bound, ... fig. to appoint, decree, specify ...” Paul is indicating that the resurrection of Christ made the assertion that Christ is the Son of Yahweh an indisputable fact, i.e. He was the Son of God, and resurrection was the first device Paul uses to present that fact to the Romans. As usual, Graber’s condemnation of Paul is shown to be vanity.

<Section L> H. Graber states: “ *Paul tells us in II Cor. 5:15-19, ‘And that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again. Wherefore henceforth know no man after the flesh: yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more. (emphasis added) Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new. And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the words of reconciliation.’ Here Paul completely removes Jesus Christ from recognition, by saying, now that Jesus has accomplished this miracle on the cross, we know him no more, and we are now reconciled to God. Paul does not acknowledge that Jesus Christ and God are one and the same being. John 10:30, ‘I and the Father are one.’ John 14:9, ‘he that hath seen me hath seen the Father;’ WHAT PAUL IS SAYING IS, THAT NOW THAT JESUS’ TASK IS FINISHED, NOW WE SHOULD LOOK TO GOD.”*

In reply to section **<L>**: At 2 Corinthians 5:15-19 Paul explains that we should not live “after” (i.e. according to or in relation to) the flesh, but after the Spirit instead. In other words, we should seek the spiritual rewards of life and not the carnal ones. We should seek to know Yahweh spiritually, and not as a man (Christ) even if any who had read Paul’s letter had known him in that manner (were among those in Palestine who had seen Him). Graber says “Paul does not acknowledge that Jesus Christ and God are one and the same being”, a blatant lie! Graber had just quoted Paul as saying “that God was in Christ”, the exact equivalent of such an acknowledgment! Paul explains elsewhere (and quotes the Old Testament doing so) that the body is just a vessel (i.e. or also a temple) for the Spirit, the “real us” so to speak. Does Graber have no understanding whatsoever? Paul says of Christ “For in Him dwells all the fullness of the

Divinity bodily” (Colossians 2:9, my translation), surely acknowledging that Yahshua and Yahweh are one. Who is a liar, but H. Graber?

<Section M> H. Graber states: “*Paul tells us in Rom. 2:16, ‘In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to My gospel.’ (emphasis added) BY WHOSE GOSPEL? Here Paul admits that he is not preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom, but rather his own gospel.*”

In reply to section **<M>**: In this fourth paragraph (on page 4 of Graber’s original document), we have an argument four times as childish as those which precede! Paul says at Romans 2:16 “... according to my gospel”, and that is without dispute, and Paul also calls this same gospel which he describes to the Romans: “of God” (1:1), “of His son” (1:9), “of Christ” (1:16), “of peace” (10:15, quoting Isaiah, and at 10:16 Isaiah is quoted as saying “Yahweh, who hath believed **OUR** report?” (Isa. 53:1, emphasis mine), “of God” again at 15:16, “of Christ” again at 15:19 and 15:29, “my gospel” again at 16:25, and simply “the gospel” at 1:15, 10:16, 11:28 and 15:20. So have we here five different gospels? Certainly not! But it is one gospel which Paul presents. And surely Graber points no finger at Isaiah for claiming a share of it (Isaiah 53:1 is quoted at Romans 10:16 and by John at 12:38)! Oh the hypocrisy! Here, as in the previous paragraph discussed above, Graber is throwing everything including the kitchen sink onto the pile of counts with which he creates an indictment against Paul, hoping to make something stick, just like a government prosecutor, and a typical False Accuser indeed! Paul is preaching the gospel of the Kingdom, and doing so to the Kingdom people!

<Section N> H. Graber states: “*Paul tells us in Gal. 4:14, ‘And my temptation which was in my flesh ye despised not, nor rejected; but received me even as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus.’ WHAT ARROGANCE! Paul puts himself on a pedestal, equal with Jesus Christ!*”

In reply to section **<N>**: Graber’s lies here in this paragraph are a repeat from the fifth paragraph of his original *Kingdom Courier’s* second page, here designated **<F>**, in my reply. Graber repeats himself in an attempt to magnify Paul’s supposed “arrogance”, but only magnifies his own ignorance!

<Section O> H. Graber states: “*Paul tells us in Gal. 1:6-9, ‘I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel: (meaning the gospel of Paul) Which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.’ Paul claims that his doctrine is infallable [sic], and the Galatians [sic] must accept it or be accursed. IS THE GOSPEL OF PAUL THE SAME AS THE GOSPEL OF JESUS CHRIST?*”

In reply to section **<O>**: This last paragraph on page 4 from Graber’s paper (which runs into the beginning of page 5 of his original document), discusses Galatians 1:6-9. Graber claims that Paul is forcing his own gospel, and not Christ’s, upon the Galatians. Paul says differently at 1:7, assuring that this gospel he preaches is the

gospel of Christ. As I hope to have demonstrated over the past 25 hand written pages of this response to Graber, it may be a wiser choice to believe Paul, indeed! Is it proper to curse or consider cursed those who would deny the gospel of Christ? Of course it is! Peter calls those who “have forsaken the right way” cursed children (2 Pet. 2:14-15). Christ Himself says of the goats “depart from me, ye cursed” (Matt. 25:41). Was Paul’s doctrine infallible? An honest study of Paul’s letters reveal no fault on Paul’s part when compared with the four gospels, though in places Paul’s mere humanness is surely revealed, and as Paul at times himself admits. Paul’s letters are NOT his gospel (which is surely found with Luke), but rather are an explanation of the various questions posed by the various Christian assemblies, an exposition of various topics from Scripture, and an application of Scripture to some of the problems of the time. Remember that Peter himself had full respect for Paul’s writings (2 Peter 3:15-16), something that Graber, who so proudly gleans his “spiritual sustenance from ... Peter”, yet doesn’t seem to comprehend! H. Graber, hypocrite, liar, dissembler, and, I suspect, kike!

<Section P> H. Graber states: *“CONCERNING THE APOSTLE PAUL, we read the words of Luke, Paul’s constant companion during their ministry, in Acts chapter 9, telling us of the miraculous conversion of Saul of Tarsus, where he purportedly received his commission as an apostle of Jesus Christ. The problem with this scenario is that there is absolutely no evidence of this event, except THE WORDS OF PAUL HIMSELF, via his Publicity Agent. This event is presented again in the 22nd and 27th chapters of Acts. There is no other Bible record of this event, and not a word to be found in secular history, except the claim of Paul himself. We know that Jesus selected His twelve Disciples, and commissioned them to preach the Gospel of the Kingdom, but Jesus did not select, or do we have any record of Him commissioning any of the professed apostles. Even as Luke and Paul profess to be apostles of Christ, I likewise make that claim. Am I telling the truth? Are Luke and Paul telling us the truth? Jesus Christ tells us in Matt. 7:16, ‘Ye shall know them by their fruits.’ And again in I John 4:1, ‘BELOVED, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world’.”*

In reply to section **<P>**: In this second paragraph on page 5 of Graber’s original document, Graber states that there is no evidence of Paul’s Road to Damascus event outside of the Bible, which of course is true – yet there is no evidence of or mention of many things Biblical outside of the Bible, Graber’s argument here is inane. The event would not be mentioned outside of Acts for the same reasons that Paul was not mentioned in the gospels or catholic letters – except for 2 Peter, which I address at **<C>** in this response. Returning to 2 Peter, by saying the things which Peter said of Paul, we may assuredly infer that Peter accepted Paul’s accounts, including that of the “Road to Damascus” event. That James accepted Paul’s person also infers such. So here Graber offers a different approach to the same argument which fails him in paragraph four on page 1 of his original document. And who is the liar, but H. Graber?

<Section Q> H. Graber states: *“Paul seems to have been obsessed with the world of mystery. First we are told of his mysterious conversion, and then we read in II Cor. 12:1-8, ‘It is not expedient for me doubtless to glory. I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord. I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, (whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;) such an one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man, (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;) How that he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which is not lawful for man to utter.’ The mysterious claim of Paul having a connection with some entity of the third heaven, means he was not in communication with Jesus Christ, Who is sitting on the right hand of God, which is the seventh heaven. (The Book of Enoch) To the contrary, we find that the third heaven is described as ‘between corruptibility and incorruptibility’, with the Northern side manifesting ‘magic making, enchantments and devilish witchcrafts,’ In light of what we have presented thus far, I ask the question, Was Paul motivated and inspired by the Spirit of Jesus Christ?”*

In reply to section **<Q>**: I will try to keep this brief. It is clear in the Revelation that John had the same type of “out-of-body” experience which Paul describes here, as it is mentioned at Rev. 4:1. If Graber does not understand such, it certainly is not Paul’s fault. Paul’s account in 2 Corinthians 12 does NOT necessarily conflict with the account in Enoch which Graber presents here (which I find not in my Charles edition of 1 Enoch, Graber may be referencing the Enoch found in *The Lost Books of the Bible and the Forgotten Books of Eden*).

It amazes me that Graber would argue that “Jesus Christ ... is sitting on the right hand of God, which is the seventh heaven” as if He could not move from that position these 2,000 earth years if He so willed! Does Graber think his readers are idiots, to even utter such a ridiculous argument? Additionally, Paul mentions several different “mysteries” in his letters, yet is hardly “obsessed” with anything but the truth, being the revelation of each of those mysteries (i.e. the revealing of the Edomite-Canaanite-jews as the children of Satan: 2 Thes. 2:3-8, 1 Cor, 2:6-8; or the fact that Israel is favored simply because of genetic reasons: Eph. 1:3-9; et al.) A mystery is basically something not fully understood. It is apparent to me that the entire Bible is a mystery to H. Graber, and he realizes it not!

<Section R> H. Graber states: **“THE RECORD OF SECULAR AUTHORS** : *Now I shall document a few quotes from secular authors, concerning the professed apostle Paul.*

“From ‘Paul the Man’ by Michael Grant, quote, ‘Far from claiming to have known Jesus personally, when he was alive, he (Paul) is asserting a knowledge about him (Jesus) superior in quality to anything that mere eye witnesses of his life on earth could ever claim for themselves, (such as Matthew, John, Peter, or James) for he had not been among their number, and was anxious to assert superiority over them. He does not therefore think of himself as a disciple of the historic Jesus, as indeed he had not been, but a man commissioned by Him after His death, and events, and a timeing [sic] which relegated the actual details of His teaching during His former earthly life to comparative unimportance in Paul’s eyes,’

“From ‘Paul the Man’ by Michael Grant, quote, ‘What is most surprising of all those familiar with modern ideas of Christianity, is to discover that Paul, although he recognized that Jesus had come to earth in human form, believed that He had never been the Messiah in His lifetime, but only became this when He was declared the Son of God. He was proclaimed the Son of God by a mighty act, in which He rose from the dead.’ (Ref. Rom. 1:4)

“From ‘Androcles and the Lion’ by George Bernard Shaw, quote, ‘Howbeit, Paul succeeded in stealing the image of Christ crucified for the figurehead of his salvationist vessel, with it’s [sic] Adam posing [sic] as the natural man. It’s [sic] doctrine of original sin and it’s [sic] damnation avoidable only by faith in the sacrifice [sic] on the cross. In fact, no sooner had Jesus knocked over the dragon of superstition, then Paul boldly set it on it’s [sic] legs again in the name of Jesus.’ (Ref. Acts 13:46-47, Gal. 4:14, Rom. 4:5)

“From ‘Paul the Man’ by Michael Grant, quote, ‘True, Paul denies that he is actually identifying the Torah with sinfulness, is the law identical with sin? Of course not! Never the less [sic] he goes much farther with his criticism of the law, apparently [sic] than Jesus ever did, and by so doing, he denies the need, or importance of the only ethical code the Jews possessed [sic]. Indeed he is actually declaring, that this code does more harm than good. True that impression is contradicted, seemingly by careful moral direction which he offers in other passages. Yet his description [sic] of the Jewish law remains on record. To justify this sensational rejection, he brings forth other points as well. One of them calculates to appeal directly to those versed in Jewish tradition, that Abraham who was the traditional founder of Israel and it’s [sic] monotheism, and was regarded as the righteous man. Managed perfectly well to win the good will of God, before the Mosaic law ever existed. So the law cannot be regarded as indispensable [sic] for the purpose, and it’s [sic] demotion is merely a return to the original covenant granted by God to Moses’ ancestor Abraham, but frustrated by subsequent generations.’ (Ref. Rom. 4:15-16, Rom. 4:1-5)

“From ‘Paul the Man’ by Michael Grant, quote, ‘The faith which Paul himself came to hold, and desired others to hold with him, was, faith in the crucifixion [sic] and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and the consequences of those events for mankind. This was by far the most important part of his beliefs and preachings and teachings, and it means that they scarcely [sic] be compared at all with those of Jesus. For even if Jesus in His last days came to foresee His own violent death as in some way redemptive, this idea had not manifestly stood in the forefront of His ministry, which through His career had centered on the dawning and shortly to be consummated [sic] Kingdom of God. It was scarcely [sic] surprising then, that Paul showed so little interest in Jesus’ life. For what the two men preached was quite different, and the Christianity we have today is largely Paul’s creation.’ (Ref. Gal. 1:6-9, Rom. 2:16)

*“From Dr. Joachim Prince, **President of the American Jewish Congress**, quote, ‘Saul of Tarsus is the real founder of the Christian Church, and the true architect [sic] of christian [sic] theology.’ ‘Consciously [sic] or unconsciously [sic] Paul worked to establish the church in Rome and not Jerusalem. Suffice it to say, there is much history to support the claim, that it was not Peter that established the Roman Catholic Church, but rather the **PROFESSED APOSTLE PAUL**.’” [Bold emphasis mine.]*

In reply to section <R>: From the fourth paragraph of page 5 to the third of page 6 of Graber's original *Kingdom Courier* publication, Graber supplies what he calls "The Record of Secular Authors" concerning Paul of Tarsus (as if his narrow selection met so wide an objective), choosing quotes from Michael Grant, George Bernard Shaw, and Joachim Prince.

From Michael Grant, Graber offers a statement concerning Romans 1:4, much like that which Graber offered as his own on page 4, paragraph 2 of his publication (which I addressed previously at <K> of this reply). Grant refers to the Books of Moses as the "Torah" and to the Levitical Law as the "Jewish law", makes the same mistake as judaized-churchianity by regarding Paul as having rejected the law, and draws false conclusions from his ill-guided perspectives. It is clear to me that Michael Grant is writing from a mainstream "jewish" perspective, even if he is not a jew himself (though I do not discount that possibility). To this I might ask, "Can a devil open the eyes of the blind?"

Speaking of which, Joachim Prince (who Graber quotes at page 6, paragraph 3 of his *Kingdom Courier*) certainly is a devil! Why is Graber quoting jews concerning Christianity? Can Graber be a Christian, while honoring the opinions of Satan? This alone exposes Graber as a fraud, respecting the lies of the anti-christ! For there is **NO TRUTH** in them (John 8:44, 1 John 4:3)! Yet here Graber offers still more deceit.

In the last paragraph on page 5 of my copy of his document, Graber quotes George Bernard Shaw concerning Paul. I will address Shaw's statement below. First, note that in the fourth paragraph of page 7 of his (original) document (found here at <Section T> below) Graber accuses Paul of being a socialist and a humanist, and of seeding a "One World Government." Now I have already exposed Graber's own humanism on page 1 of this hand written reply, [see <A> above], however let us check out Mr. Shaw, from the *American Heritage College Dictionary*: "Shaw, George Bernard ... Irish born British playwright and critic who was a founder of the Fabian Society ..." and that society?: "Fabian ... 2. Of, relating to, or being a member of the Fabian Society, which was committed to gradual means of spreading socialist principles ..." Oh the deceit! Graber, accusing Paul of being an evil, short, swarthy, jew, quotes such people as he attacks Paul. Graber, accusing Paul of being a socialist, at the same time quotes socialists! Graber, accusing Paul of being a humanist, is himself exposed as holding humanist beliefs! No wonder Paul said in Romans: "On which account you are inexcusable, O man, all who judge, since by your judging another you are condemning yourself: indeed you practice the things which are judged." So I must ask again, who is a liar, but H. (Huckster?, Hymie?) Graber?

Now as for the content of Shaw's quoted remark, (to which Graber adds a reference, citing three of Paul's verses which have nothing to do with that content,) Shaw claims that Yahshua "Knocked over the dragon of superstition." Superstition! Now we who are bearers of the Truth know that Yahshua Christ exposed a walking, talking, genetic dragon, Satan, the children of the accuser (John 8:44, Matt. 13:37-43. Luke 11:39-52 et al.), and Paul followed Yahshua Christ's example, for which see Acts 13:8-10, 19:13, 20:28-30, Romans 9:1-13, 16:20, 2 Cor. 6:14-18, 2 Thes. 2:3-12 and 1 Tim 6:3-4 (my own translations of Paul are much clearer than the A.V. – especially at Rom. 9 and 2 Thes 2). Paul of Tarsus was clearly an ambassador of Yahshua Christ, Yahweh Himself! Who is H. Graber an ambassador of? The Socialist, Shaw? The jew,

Joachim Prince? The just as good, if-not-a-jew, Michael Grant? **These are the men that Graber follows, and has a high regard for!!!**

<Section S> H. Graber states: *“In light of all this information, we can conclude from scriptures and secular history, that Paul worked in concert with many to establish the Catholic Church. Among them of course, his companion, the professed apostle Luke, Clement I, Barnabas, Silas, Judas Barsabas, Timothy, Justus, Gallio, Pricilla [sic] and Aquila, Gaius, Aristarchus, Alexander, and Gamaliel.*

“The historic information on many of these characters is sketchy, but I shall endeavor to present what I can find, in order to present the scenario surrounding the apostle Paul, and his professed apostleship for Jesus Christ. The information is taken from divers sources, such as the Encyclopedia Americana, The Harvard Classics, The Bible, and related documentation.

“LUKE, ‘Eustabius [sic Eusebius] states that Luke was born at Antioch, and Paul seems to imply that he was a Gentile. There has been much discussion on the question as to the existance [sic] in ‘Luke’ of a Jewish or of a Gentile bias. Those who find it markedly Jewish in tone, incline to distrust the tradition ascribing it’s [sic] composition to the Gentile physician; those who regard it as the Pauline gospel, naturally find it easier to associate it with the companion of the apostle to the Gentiles.’ I believe that if Luke was a Gentile, that he would have an affinity for Paul, because it was Paul that proclaimed salvation for the Gentiles. Even today we see this same affinity of the Gentiles to the Jewish Pied Pipers of ‘equal opportunity’, ‘human rights’, ‘anti-discrimination’, etc. etc..

“TIMOTHEUS, He is listed as a disciple of St. Paul, and not of Jesus Christ. He was born of a Gentile father and a Jewish mother.

“GAMALIEL, He was a Jewish lawyer, President of the Sanhedrin under the corrupt reigns of Tiberius, Caligula, and Claudius.

“ALEXANDER, Supporter of the doctrine of Paul and his endeavors in establishing the Catholic Church, and later became a Pope of the church.

“ALL the other close associates are listed as either Jew or Gentile, some of them noted for their adherence [sic] to Platonism, which seems to agree with the apostle Paul’s doctrine. We also note that Paul spent much time in synagogues, contrary to the ministry of Jesus Christ and His Disciples. We should also mention that another character that supported the apostle Paul, was Clement, who also later became a Pope, Clement I.

<Section S-2>: *“Speaking of Paul and the people surrounding Paul, we read in Eustabius [sic Eusebius] #6 [sic 6.19 from Eusebius, The History Of the Church, translation by G. A. Williamson, published by Penguin Books © 1965, revisions 1989, pages 195-196. Why doesn’t Graber properly identify his source?], ‘In their eagerness to find, not a way to reject depravity [sic the depravity] in [sic of] the Jewish scriptures, but a means to explain [sic of explaining] it away, they resorted to interpretations which cannot be reconciled or harmonized with scriptures, and which provides [sic provide] not so much a defence of the original authors, as a foolsome [sic fulsome, which means ‘offensive’] advertisement for the interpreters [sic interpreters]. Inigmas [sic ‘Enigmas’] is the pompous name they have given [sic they give] to the perfectly plain statements of Moses, gloryfying [sic glorifying] them as oracles full of hidden mysteries, and*

bewitching the critical factor [sic faculty] by their extravagant [sic extravagant] nonsense. [My God! - Can't H. Graber read? C.A.E.]

“It is my understanding from the foregoing research, that indeed it depicts a scenario of betrayal. I ask myself, How can such a man as the professed apostle Paul, indeed be an apostle of Jesus Christ, in light of what his doctrine expounds, and what historians have to say of him? How can I justify Paul's hand in the creation of the Roman Catholic Church nothing more or less than an extention [sic extension] of Babylonian Judaism. (The Two Babylons, by Alexander Hislop.) Jewish influence in the Roman Catholic Church is historically evident from it's [sic] earliest foundations. The Jewish Pierleoni family had (3) Popes on the Throne. Gregory VI (John Pierleoni), who bought the Throne for 6000 pounds sterling. Gregory VII (Hildabrandt [sic Hildebrand] Pierleoni), and Anacletus II (Pietro Pierleoni). It was the Roman Catholic Church that sent a group of Monks from Italy to Jerusalem, to establish the monestary [sic] of 'The Order of Zion', which I believe is today manifest in the 'Learned Elders of Zion'. These are the forces of evil in the world today that are bent upon establishing a Zionist 'One World Government'.”

In reply to section <S>: I am not going to specifically address most of Graber's poorly documented slanderous remarks concerning certain New Testament figures here. Some of them have already been addressed in various places in the preceding pages, directly or indirectly. I will say that Graber is but a blasphemer and slanderer, and it is evident that his true intent is to subvert and to undermine, hurling accusations and being ignorant of the Truth!

One thing that I will comment upon concerning these nine paragraphs, from the fourth of page 6 through the third of page 7 of Graber's original document, is his very tenuous (a word from the Greek verb *τείνω*, “to stretch”) claim that the Romish catholic church was founded by Paul of Tarsus along with these named New Testament figures. This is a blatant lie! For all of the early Christians at Rome, from Paul and the British Christians of the family of Caradoc, and several of the first bishops of Rome and their followers with them, were persecuted and slain by the Romans, at the behest of the jews. There is absolutely no connection between the Romish church which began its development in Byzantium at the time of Constantine, and more notably the later emperor Justinian, and the True Christian assemblies at Rome in the first century, which were related to those of not only the Mediterranean regions, but of Ireland and Britain which are known as the Celtic Church. George Jowett, E. Raymond Capt, and Clifton Emahiser have gone to great lengths to demonstrate this. And who in Israel Identity is ignorant of this, but H. Graber? To pin the “pope” label onto Paul, Linus, Clement or Alexander is to join in league with the Romish catholics and their blasphemies, which Graber does here. The people who had ultimately made the Romish catholic church the fraud that it is are the same people who slew the early Christians (including Paul), who also crucified Yahshua, and slew the prophets: and I'm not accusing Romans, but jews! Read the martyrologies and early church fathers such as Tertullian!

Now it will be necessary to backtrack to where H. Graber had just misused a quote from Eusebius' *The History Of the Church*, translation by G. A. Williamson, published by Penguin Books © 1965, revisions 1989, pages 195-196, where he didn't properly identify his source. Clifton Emahiser had three sources for Eusebius' work and was fortunate to have had the edition from which H. Graber quoted from, which he so badly copied, making numerous errors, and which reads from Graber's *Kingdom Courier* thusly <Section S-2>:

" In their eagerness to find, not a way to reject depravity [sic the depravity] in [sic of] the Jewish scriptures, but a means to explain [sic of explaining] it away, they resorted to interpretations which cannot be reconciled or harmonized with scriptures, and which provides [sic provide] not so much a defence of the original authors, as a foolsome [sic fulsome, which means 'offensive'] advertisement for the interpreters [sic interpreters]. Inigmas [sic 'Enigmas'] is the pompous name they have given [sic they give] to the perfectly plain statements of Moses, glorifying [sic glorifying] them as oracles full of hidden mysteries, and bewitching the critical factor [sic faculty] by their extravagent [sic extravagant] nonsense." [My God! - Can't H. Graber read? C.A.E.]

In reply to section <S-2>: Here is either a purposely deceitful act on Graber's part, or one of the most idiotic instances in the history of scholarship. Graber has taken a paragraph from Eusebius, and has claimed that these are the very words of the church historian "speaking of Paul", when in fact Graber quotes a known liar whom most of the early church fathers condemned as such. Yes, the paragraph Graber cites is found in Eusebius, even though Graber could not cite it properly. It is apparent that Graber does not check out the context in which a passage is written, but chooses only a few short lines which he can force to fit his theory, no matter how nefarious the source might be. Yet checking the source itself, perhaps something Graber may have hoped that no one would do, we find the following:

- The words Graber quotes are not Eusebius', but a quote by Eusebius of an early anti-Christian writer and perverter of the truth named Porphyry.
- Porphyry was not even speaking of Paul, but of another early Christian writer named Origen, who lived from about 185-245 A.D.
- Eusebius considered Porphyry, who Graber is actually quoting, to be but a liar! Graber, the liar, relies upon liars, and lies about Eusebius too!

In order to demonstrate this fully, a larger portion of this same chapter of Eusebius, 6.19, from the same edition misused by Graber, that of G. A. Williamson at pages 195-196, but including the surrounding text (exposing Graber's misapplication of his source) is faithfully reproduced here. In this passage, Eusebius is discussing Origen (and indirectly Porphyry), **not Paul**:

" 19. Testimony to his [Origen's] success in these endeavours is paid by the Greek philosophers who flourished in his time, in whose writings I have found many references to him. Sometimes they dedicated their works to him, sometimes they submitted their own labours to him, as to a master, for criticism. Far more significant is the case of **Porphyry**, who in my own time settled in Sicily and in an attempt to traduce the Holy Scriptures published a long treatise attacking us, in which he refers to those who have interpreted them. He finds it quite impossible to bring any damaging accusation against our doctrines, so for lack of arguments he turns to abuse and traduces the interpreters. His special target is Origen, whom he claims to have known

as a young man and attempts to traduce, little knowing that he is actually commending him. **When he cannot help it, he tells the truth; when he thinks he will not be found out, he tells lies.** Sometimes he accuses him as a Christian, sometimes he enlarges on his addiction to philosophic studies. Listen to his actual words [Here is a correct reading of the passage H. Graber garbled]:

“‘ In their eagerness to find, not a way to reject the depravity of the Jewish [sic Israelite] Scriptures, but a means of explaining it away, they resorted to interpretations which cannot be reconciled or harmonized with those scriptures, and which provide not so much a defence of the original authors as a fulsome advertisement for the interpreters. ‘Enigmas’ is the pompous name they give to the perfectly plain statements of Moses, glorifying them as oracles full of hidden mysteries, and bewitching the critical faculty by their extravagant nonsense ... This absurd method must be attributed to a man whom I met while I was still quite young, who enjoyed a great reputation and thanks to the works he has left behind him, enjoys it still. **I refer to Origen**, whose fame among teachers of these theories is wide- spread’.” [emphasis mine, ellipsis in original]

Thus, it is quite evident from this **full disclosure** that Graber’s source implies quite the opposite that he would like his readers to believe. Not only that, but this reference which Graber cites in Eusebius has absolutely nothing to do with the apostle Paul! The bottom line is: Graber has taken the words of a known liar and presented them as being the truth, and out of context at that. Graber is either hopelessly ignorant, or an accomplished con-artist. Take your pick.

<Section T> H. Graber states: *“I believe that contrary to the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the apostle Paul teaches a doctrind [sic] of socialism and humanism, which establish the foundations for a ‘One World Government’. Paul himself tells us in Heb. 13:8, ‘Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and today, and forever.’ If Paul indeed believes this, how does he justify his divergent doctrine from the Gospel of Jesus Christ? Paul tells us in I Cor. 9:20-22, ‘And unto the Jew I become [sic became] as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, that I might gain them that are without law. To them that are without law, as without law, (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ,) that I might gain them that are without law. To the weak become I as weak, that I might gain the weak: I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some.’ This is an all inclusive position for any one to take. This includes compromise, this includes ignorant arrogance, for how can a mere man be ALL things to ALL men? And again Paul speaks of saving people: **ONLY JESUS CHRIST CAN AND DID DO THAT!**”*

In reply to section **<T>**: I have already addressed most of Graber’s statements in these final paragraphs (from the fourth on page 7 to the end of page 8 of his publication as originally formatted), so I am not going to repeat myself, yet there are a few things left to address.

In the closing lines of the fourth paragraph on page 7 of his original document, Graber criticizes Paul’s remarks at 1 Cor. 9:20-22 (where basically Paul is only explaining that he tries to speak to people on their own terms, not with the pretense of superiority and authority that the jew rabbis and their catholic followers do), and Graber accuses Paul of “ignorant arrogance” and states that “again Paul speaks of saving

people: ONLY JESUS CHRIST CAN AND DID DO THAT!" And here it can be demonstrated that Graber lies again! It is obvious to me that Graber, while claiming to glean his "spiritual sustenance from ... James" surely hasn't read James! Let us read James 5:19-20 from the A.V.: "Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and **one convert him, Let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins.**" (The emphasis is mine, of course). Who is a liar, but H. Graber? Why does he criticize Paul, and not James for making such a similar statement? While it is evident that Yahshua Christ, Yahweh Himself, is the author of our salvation, as Paul attests at 1 Thes. 5:9, 2 Tim. 2:10, Titus 2:11, and especially at Hebrews 2:10 and 5:9, it is also clear that "the workman is worthy of his meat" (Matt. 10:10), and that the children of Israel share in the fruits of their labors, which many parables illustrate (i.e. Matt. 20:1-16, 25:14-30). Graber, like the jews which Yahshua reproved time and again, claims to know the Scripture, but is consistently reproved by Scripture.

<Section U> H. Graber states: "*When we consider the books of the New Testament [sic], written by Luke and Paul, and recognizing that the book of Mark was also tampered with by an unknown scribe, then one comes to consider these works as a conspiracy to subvert Christianity. We know that in the last chapter of Mark, verses 9-20 were not in the original transcript of the apostle Mark, and when you consider these added verses, we see that they do not harmonize with the first eight verses, and are the first indication that Christianity was to be a universal religion, quote, 'and preach the gospel to every creature.' I believe that this was part of the betrayal, to justify Paul's claim that he was commissioned to go to the Gentiles. We know that Jesus Christ never commanded His Disciples to go to the Gentiles, or for that matter to every creature. He commanded to only go to the lost sheep of the house of Israel! And Jesus told His Disciples in Matt. 10:23, 'But when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another: for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come.'* From this we can conclude, that as of this moment, not ALL Israelites have yet received the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

"In conclusion, allow me to simply sum up the gist of this exposition, The Gospel of Jesus Christ versus The Doctrine of the Apostle Paul. I believe I have presented sufficient evidence, that there is a great discrepancy [sic] between the Doctrine of Jesus, and the doctrine of Paul."

In reply to section **<U>**: Mark cannot be blamed that the end of his gospel was lost, or maybe never even completed. And Mark certainly cannot be blamed that long after his death certain men (there are three spurious "endings" extant to Mark's gospel, not just one) attempted to pollute his gospel by supplying their own endings. Mark's gospel is sound and there is no valid reason to reject it once the spurious ending is removed. John's gospel was added to (for John 7:53 through 8:11 is surely a late interpolation) and so was one of his epistles (the end of 1 John 5:7 and the beginning of 5:8), and we certainly don't want to reject those for such reason! Now if Graber does not seem to reject Mark's gospel in this last paragraph of section **<U>**, he certainly did in the last paragraph on page 1, (or here at section **<C>**), even calling Mark a "professed apostle", as he also calls Luke and Paul, as if they were not worthy of the title. H. Graber is little but a lying duplicitous hypocrite!

Graber also insists here, and at the top of page 8 (the second paragraph [of his original document] there), that Paul brought the gospel to “gentiles.” An examination of Paul’s letters, of Luke’s gospel, and of the Acts clearly shows that Paul only brought the gospel to those nations (Gen. 17:6, 35:11) which were colonized by Israelites of the Old Kingdom, or founded by Israelites of the Assyrian deportations. This message is obfuscated in many places by all ‘mainstream’ translations, which is the reason for my own work in Paul in the first place. I will begin an article highlighting certain mistranslations and misconceptions in Luke and Acts sometime this winter. Luke 1:67-80 alone vindicates his gospel, for Luke knew perfectly well that the New Covenant applied only to the true Israelites. Note also Luke 1:54-55.

Language in Romans proves that Paul knew that the Romans were Israelites. Language in 1 Corinthians proves that Paul knew that the Dorian Greeks were Israelites. Language in Colossians proves likewise! History and archaeology support these claims fully. Galatians and Scythians and the Iberians of Spain are also Israelites, Paul knew it, and he went to them, just as he was supposed to! H. Graber is not only a liar, but a man of little understanding! Paul did not go to gentiles, but to Israel! It can even be demonstrated, or rather should be evident to one who studies, that at Acts 17 Paul even treats the Japhethite Athenians differently!

Graber continues:

“1. Jesus said, go not to the Gentiles, but rather go to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Paul proclaimed [sic] himself the apostle to the Gentiles, and compromised in the Jewish synagogues. [see Finck’s comments at [<U>](#) and [<H>](#)]

“2. Jesus said that He was the Messiah, and He and the Father are one. Paul claims messiahship for himself, and does not attribute this recognition to Jesus until [sic] after the resurrection. [see Finck’s comments at [<L>](#)]

“3. Jesus was reckoned by genealogy [sic], the same as all the seed of Adam, throughout the Old Testament [sic], many times. Paul negates the reckoning by genealogy [sic]. [See the comments at [<I>](#)]

“4. Jesus said, not one jot or tittle of the law would pass, even until [sic] heaven and earth shall pass. Paul negates the Commandments, Statutes, and Judgments of God, by the stroke of his pen, upon the cross. [See the comments at [<J>](#)]

“5. Jesus instructed His Disciples to preach the Gospel of the Kingdom. Paul teaches and preaches a gospel of salvation, an event that was finished on the cross for all true Israelites. Paul tells us many times that he is preaching his own gospel. [See the comments at [<V>](#), [<M>](#) & [<O>](#)]

“6. Jesus gave us many scriptures, admonishing us not to lie. Paul admits to lying [sic], if and when it serves his purpose. [See the comments at [<E>](#)]

“7. There is NO evidence given by the words of Jesus Christ, or His Disciples, concerning the miraculous conversion of Saul of Tarsus, and certainly there was ample opportunity to do so. [see Finck’s comments at [<P>](#)] Therefore, we have only the words of Paul himself, that have established him as ‘The Great Lion of God’. (Here we should be aware of the historic promotion by Jews, and Gentiles, that catapulted Paul into prominence [sic].)”

In reply to Graber at #5 [<V>](#): Here Graber accused Paul of not following the command of Yahshua to preach “the gospel of the Kingdom.” As I said at [<O>](#) of my reply, Paul’s letters are NOT his gospel, which is surely found in Luke. We don’t even

have all of Paul's letters (i.e. 1 Cor. 5:9), but probably only a small percentage of what he wrote. Nearly everyone I've ever read who criticizes Paul seems to neglect these facts.

Now at Acts 19:8, Luke says that Paul in Ephesus "... spake boldly for the space of three months, disputing and persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God." See Acts 20:25, 28:23 and 28:31. See then Romans 14:17, 1 Cor. 4:20, 6:9-10, 15:24, 50, Gal. 5:21, Eph. 5:5, Col. 1:13 and 4:11, 1 Thes. 2:12, 2 Thes. 1:5, 2 Tim. 4:1, 18, and Heb. 1:8 and 12:28! So who is a liar, but H. Graber?

Do we look forward to the establishment of Yahweh's law? So did Paul (Romans 3:31). Do we look forward to the destruction of Yahweh's enemies? So did Paul (Romans 16:20). Do we assert a knowledge of the identification of the "lost" sheep which Yahshua Christ established a New Covenant with? So did Paul (Romans 1:25, 1:31, 4:16-18, 1 Cor. 10:1-13, Eph. 1:4, Col. 1:20-21, etc.) Do we look forward to His return and the fulfillment of the establishment of His Kingdom? So did Paul (2 Tim. 4:1). Is this not the hope of Israel? Of course it is, which is also Paul's hope (Acts 28:20)! Notice that Paul said "Israel", not "Israel and the Gentiles" (to borrow a phrase from Clifton Emahiser). Don't blame Paul that some deceiver read "τὰ ἔθνη" 1550 years after Paul wrote, and translated "gentiles" rather than "nations"!

As for the law, all good Christians should seek to follow the laws of Yahweh! But remember that James' opinions of the law – which must have come from Yahweh Himself, and the prophets agree also – is fully cohesive with Paul's opinions. We being Israelites of the Faith are not going to be judged by the law. But our enemies the jews (and arabs) will be! Although the written law is good and is holy (Rom. 7:12) and we seek to establish it, desiring to be obedient (Rom. 3:31), do not "put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear" (Acts 15:10). Note Matt. 11:25-30. We are to separate ourselves from unrepentant lawbreakers (i.e. 1 Cor. 5:9-13, Rev. 22:15 et al.)

If I have not demonstrated that H. Graber is a liar and a fraud, manifold, then explain such to me. I will resign from writing anything of this sort again. If I have uttered a lie and attempt to deceive, explain it to me. I will resign from writing anything of this sort again. No liar should ever be allowed to be a teacher, and escape condemnation.

Either I am a liar, or H. Graber is a liar. There is nothing in between. He is a deceiver, or I am a deceiver. There is no compromise. There are many opinions in the world, but only one Truth. If I have built upon a foundation of sand, prove it before me, and I will resign from building. Yet if H. Graber is found to be a liar, I adjure the reader: Study again Luke's gospel, Acts, and Paul's letters, and in a new light make a new determination. I also adjure such a one: please share my reply to Graber with anyone also who may have read H. Graber's document from his misnamed *Kingdom Courier*, December, 1985, that they may have the opportunity to see his many lies. Even share it with Mr. Graber himself, if indeed he still lives, his document being just short of 20 years old.

With this I will close, only reiterating one thing: that those who criticize Paul of Tarsus and question the validity of his ministry seek only the ultimate division and destruction of Christianity itself. Do not be deceived by their devices!

Graber closes his *Kingdom Courier*, December, 1985 thusly: "*This subject deserves a volume of documentation, and I hope such research and writting [sic] shall*

be forthcoming. In light of what has been presented in this bulletin, it becomes an individual [sic] readers [sic] option to accept or reject the obvious disputatious evidence presented herein. You may elect to put your head in a pile of sand, and hope it will go away. Finally, we are all individually [sic], the captains of our own eternal destiny! [See the comments at [<A>](#)]

“For myself, I shall reject Mark 16:9-20, and ALL of the works of the professed apostles Luke and Paul! I shall glean my spiritual sustenance from Matthew, John, Peter, and James, the SURE Disciples of Jesus Christ, and this will remove for me, all the confusion and contradiction I encounter between the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and the doctrine of the professed apostle Paul!” [Again, see the comments at [<A>](#)]

This ends the critical response to the entity calling itself *Kingdom Courier*, and its Executive Director and Publisher Dr. H. Graber, 5393 Carleton Road, Mariposa, CA 95338. I last spoke to the original recipient of this letter concerning its contents in December 2003. At that time my friend only stated it was “good”, and that he would pass it on to one of the other anti-Paulist Israel Identity pastors in his congregation, who will also go unnamed here. Yet sadly, my friend continues in the camp of the anti-Paulists to this day. It is now July of 2005, and despite my pleas and my challenges, which are duplicated here, I have never been answered by my friend or by those whom he shared it with. Rather, my friend ceased sending me any more of the anti-Paul material which he or his congregation still produce and circulate! To me this is a sad situation, but a perfect example of a peoples’ willingness to believe a lie, rather than undertake the more difficult journey necessary in order to arrive at the truth. For my part, I shall not become exasperated, but rather hope to continue that I may more fully manifest the folly of all those who speak against Paul of Tarsus.

[H. Graber was a close follower of W. G. Finlay from South Africa, and on his audio tape #87, Finlay identified the source of his conviction. Finlay based his Paul-bashing tenets on a book *Popes From The Ghetto* by Dr. Joachim Prince, **president of the American Jewish Congress, and chairman of the Conference Of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations.**” Finlay also referred to Prince as “**The learned rabbi, who still serves in the Temple Beni-Abram of Newark in New Jersey.**” Finlay further stated:

“Dr. Prince, who in common with most theologians both Christian and Jewish, claims that Saul of Tarsus was the real founder of the Christian Church, and the true architect of Christian theology. He prefaces his work, which provides the documentary evidence, indicating that three popes during the Middle Ages were Jewish, was a very illuminating statement. He wrote, ‘Early Christianity, which should be called ‘Jesusdom’ for it is still intimately connected with Jesus of Nazareth, and not with the Church, or with a set of doctrines is a religion of the last days of mankind.’ Now, this statement, when placed side by side with what Dr. Prince had to say about Paul being the founder of the Christian Church ...” Questions: Were we not instructed by Christ Himself, “**beware of the leaven of the Pharisees**”, Matt. 16:6? Were we not told that those who did not believe Christ are Anti-Christ? And that there is no truth in them? And that they are of the synagogue of Satan? Thus, anti-Paulists are hypnotized by the “Jews.”
– *Clifton A. Emahiser*

PAUL WAS NOT A MISOGYNIST!

Many today accuse Paul of Tarsus of misogyny (hatred of women), and no doubt because of some of Paul's remarks concerning the place of women in Christian society. It does not surprise me that in today's liberal feminist society, where even ideas generally perceived as being moderate or centrist are actually skewed far to the left, that this is a prevailing view amongst the jew-controlled, jew-media dominated jew-led and fed masses of the populace. That feminism is a jewish cause and a primary jewish-led movement is easily demonstrated in the identities of its leaders, such as Emma Goldman, Betty Friedan, Gloria Steinem, Bella Abzug, et al., and also by their own testimony, which is published regularly by their media outlets. For instance in the *Wall Street Journal*, in an article entitled *How Do You Mark 350 Years in America?* by Naomi Schaefer Riley, which ran on p. W13 on Sept. 9, 2005, it is boasted that "... there is much to be gained from studying Jewish life in America after the mass migrations from Eastern Europe. Jews were among the most prominent voices pushing for liberalized immigration policies, a strong labor movement and rights for women ... Nor were Jewish efforts always on behalf of other Jews. The end of [an exhibit at the Center for Jewish History in New York] the exhibit explores Jewish participation in the civil-rights movement." Paul was certainly at odds with jewish thinking! What we see as a problem ("we" being aware Saxons), the jews see as an accomplishment, and take full credit for it!

The New Testament accounts show beyond doubt that Paul could not have been a misogynist, a hater of women, and here I shall endeavor to elucidate such in a simple manner; for it is plainly nothing which needs to be examined too deeply.

- In Acts 16, Paul along with Timothy, Silas, and surely Luke who wrote the account, are at Neapolis in Macedonia where they congregated by a river for prayer, and spoke at length to women there who did likewise. There a certain woman Lydia, and her household, were apparently the first Greeks of Europe to become Christians (lost Israelites returning to Yahweh, as Paul teaches in all his epistles). This woman later assisted Paul and his companions, after the brief imprisonment at Philippi (Acts 16:40).

- At Berea, as at many other places, Paul preached to "honorable women" as well as to men (Acts 17:12).

- Of the converts at Athens, a woman named Damaris merited particular mention (Acts 17:34).

- Paul met Aquila and Priscilla at Corinth, and every time the couple is mentioned it is obvious that the woman is respected by Paul every bit as much as her husband, and is even mentioned before him in most places where the two are mentioned (Acts 18:1, et al.).

- Paul entrusted a woman, Phoebe, to bear his epistle to Rome, and recommended her highly to the Christian assemblies there, also praising her for her assistance to him (Rom. 16:1-2).

- Of the people Paul specifically greeted in his epistle to the Romans, many were women, including Priscilla, Mary, Persis, Tryphaena, Tryphosa, the mother of Rufus (and Paul) and the sister of Nerea. Some of these were further lauded for their labor in the faith or for their having assisted Paul in some way.

- Other women mentioned are Chloe at 1 Cor. 1:11, and the text there infers that she is head of a household, and so probably a widow and a woman of means; Euodia and Syntyche at Ph'p. 4:2; Nympha at Col. 4:5 (although the A.V. and some early mss. have "Nymphas" as a man) and Apphia at Ph'm 2.

- Furthermore, in Paul's letters to Timothy, he spoke especially well of Lois and Eunice, Timothy's mother and grandmother, and must have known them personally (2 Tim. 1:5.) Paul also sent Timothy greetings from Priscilla, and from Claudia whom history shows is the wife of Rufus, and whom Paul is staying with at Rome when he wrote Timothy (2 Tim. 4:19, 21).

All of this shows that Paul certainly had all due respect for women in general, and had warm and Christian relationships with many of them.

The opinions which are formulated in and acted on by society today are not correct simply because a majority of people here are persuaded by them. Christianity is not a democratic institution, but rather a Theocratic one. A woman's place was to be subject to her husband, as with Paul (1 Cor. 11:3; Eph. 5:23; Col. 3:18), also with Peter (1 Pet. 3:1-5) and so with Yahweh (Gen. 3:16). A woman's place was to keep the household, as it was in Greek society (i.e. Euripides' *Alcestis* 304 ff., *Electra* 54 ff.) and so with Paul (Titus 2:5), and so in the Old Testament, i.e. Proverbs chapter 31. Those who doubt the validity of Paul's instruction here contend not with Paul, but with the entire Bible!

Paul instructs that a woman is never to have authority over a man (i.e. 1 Tim 2:12), and in the Old Testament at Isa. 3:12 we see that it was a reproach for women to rule over men in that time also. Whether it was the noble Deborah, or the wicked Athaliah, doesn't matter. Neither situation says much of the men of those times. Hillary Clinton, Margaret Thatcher, Janet Reno, Diane Feinstein, et al. are certainly a reproach to all Saxon men today, along with the millions of women who have forsaken childbearing and normal household life for love of lucre and status. Those who feel otherwise contend not against Paul, but against Yahweh! And Judi Nipps and Nellie Babbs are among their number.

Only men participated in the "democracy" of Athens. Women were excluded from politics, did not speak publicly, and as Euripides' character Aethra in his *Suppliant Women* says at lines 40-41 "It is proper for women, if they are wise, to do everything through their men." So Paul's admonition to women, not to speak in the assembly but to learn and inquire by their husbands (1 Cor. 14:34-35), was surely not a novel contrivance, but already a part of Hellenistic culture! In fact, Athenian life was stricter yet: For in Euripides' *Hecuba* at lines 974-75 the title character states that "custom ... ordains that women shall not look directly at men." The word translated "custom" in the Loeb Library edition of Euripides is νόμος, "law" everywhere in the New Testament. Paul's admonition against women "wandering from house to house ... idle ... tattlers ... busybodies, speaking things they ought not" was a normal concern long before Paul wrote such words, and in Euripides' *Andromache* lines 930-953, the poet through his character Hermione expressed very similar concerns.

I have cited Euripides here, having his writings at hand and having recently read them, yet may refer to a plethora of Greek writers, even those closer to Paul's own time, to show that Paul was not being novel to the Greeks concerning treatment of women. Strabo, speaking of the Cantabrians of Iberia and some of their customs, where

women have influence over their kinsmen, says: “The custom involves, in fact, a sort of woman-rule – but this is not at all a mark of civilisation” (Strabo 3.4.18, Loeb Library edition). Diodorus Siculus, speaking of the mythical Amazons, says “The men, however, like our married women, spent their days about the house, carrying out the orders which were given them by their wives; and they took no part in military campaigns or in office or in the exercise of free citizenship in the affairs of the community by virtue of which they might become presumptuous and rise up against the women”, and so of course in reality, in the Greek world women kept the home, having no voice in the community, nor role in government. The very role described in Proverbs 31!

As in the book of Numbers, so in Matthew (14:21, 15:38), women were not counted. It is not that women do not count, Yahweh forbid! Yet the woman’s role in a proper Christian society is clearly defined, and Paul explains that role properly. Pity those who doubt the truth of such matters. Nothing Paul says is contrary to Old Testament instruction or practice. Can the anti-Paulists make such a claim for themselves?

A RESPONSE TO CLAYTON DOUGLAS' ANTI-PAUL ARTICLES, PUBLISHED IN HIS FREE AMERICAN NEWSMAGAZINE

This past summer while Clifton was preparing the *Open Letter in Response to H. Graber* for publication in his *Watchman's Teaching Letters* (which has been reproduced above), one of his readers sent him a couple of articles found in *Free American Newsmagazine*, which much like the trash Graber had produced, were written to attack and discredit Paul of Tarsus. These articles were published in the December, 2003 and January, 2004 issues, and written by Clayton R. Douglas, the magazine's publisher. For the purpose of responding to them properly, the articles shall be fully and faithfully reproduced here. First, however, I shall respond to some of the statements made by Douglas in his December, 2003 "Publisher's Corner", in which he prepares his readers for his subsequent Paul-bashing articles, but which I shall not fully address.

Douglas lays the foundation for his statements by criticizing the jews as a race, where surely his intentions are good, yet I don't see much point in debating any of the jews themselves on the topic, which he describes doing. It may be less frustrating and more productive to simply beat one's head against the proverbial wall. Christ set a good example for us in this regard, for when the Edomite-jew Herod questioned Him at length concerning many things, "He answered him nothing" (Luke 23:9). Ditto before the Edomite high priests who questioned Him (Matt. 26:62-63, Mark 14:60-61). Why argue with the jews concerning good and evil? How could they, being evil, say anything good (Matt. 12:34)? Douglas goes on to refer to "*the fact that Judeo-Christianity is almost an oxymoron*", and he would have been correct if he had only omitted the "almost"! Ignatius, the Christian bishop who wrote circa 110 A.D. (according to Thayer) said in his Epistle to the Magnesians at 3:11 (as found in *The Lost Books of the Bible and the Forgotten Books of Eden*): "It is absurd to name Yahshua Christ, and to Judaize. For the Christian Religion did not embrace the Jewish, but the Jewish the Christian...". Surely Ignatius understood that the Old Testament religion of our (we Saxons and Kelts and related peoples) Hebrew fathers was nothing more or less than Christianity before Christ. Judaism is a corrupted version of the Old Testament laws of Moses, adopted by pretenders and charlatans claiming to be something they aren't, as Paul explains in Romans 9 and 2 Thes. 2, chapters poorly translated by blind, judaized exegetes.

From here Douglas goes on to attack the position assumed by many mainstream sects, that the "Bible" as we have it is infallible. Again, Douglas is pretty much on target, but as we will see later, some of his reasoning is wrong. First, basically there is nothing seriously wrong with many of the Greek manuscripts handed down to us through the ages. Copyists' errors have occurred in many places, yet the vast majority of them are minor and of little consequence. In other places in some manuscripts synonyms were substituted, often only to replace archaic words with more common ones, or because of preferred variations in regional dialect. Nearly all of these are of no consequence. In some manuscripts difficult or poorly understood sentences were altered, and sometimes this presents a problem, but nowhere are the major tenets of the true Christian faith seriously challenged when the oldest, most reliable manuscripts are followed. More dangerously, spurious additions were made in several places,

especially in Mark and John but many smaller ones in Luke, John's epistles, and elsewhere, many of which made it into the King James Version and persist in more modern versions. Yet because many old manuscripts do not have most of these additions, and more so because archaeologists have more recently discovered many ancient papyri dating from the second through the fifth centuries to which we can compare our copies of ancient manuscripts, the errors and additions made in the texts can be detected, for the most part, and can be corrected or removed. The most glaring, and the lengthiest, examples of such spurious additions to the New Testament texts are found at Mark 16:9-20 and John 7:53-8:11.

Yet for one who studies at length and in depth, it is fully evident that the consistency of the Word and the revelation of its prophecies are the best signs we have that – while not today found as perfect as in its original form – the books of the Bible (excluding Esther) surely were the inspired Word of Yahweh our God **when they were written**. Our biggest obstacle to understanding them is translation, and that **all** of the popular and published New Testament translations have been very poorly done, or at least contain a large quantity of serious errors, is highly demonstrable. And it is not only vague and subjective matters of exegesis (interpretation) that I would contend over, but also many issues of vocabulary and grammar, things which aren't so fuzzily subjective.

To his credit, Douglas states that *“While I believe that the Bible is a valuable, historically accurate document, as accurate as is possible for something done by the hand of man, it is not, for me, the end all and be all it is to mind-molded Christians.”* This, if by 'Bible' he intends the modern published editions, certainly is true. Yet the greater truths of the Christian faith surely can be revealed through a proper and thorough study of our ancient manuscripts together with history, prophecy, archaeology and language.

Yet Douglas fails where further on he states, *“There have been numerous translations, from Aramaic to Greek to Latin to Hebrew and finally to English and back again.”* *The Jews of today contend that Aramaic was the primary language of Judaea, and that the N.T. books – at least many of them – were somehow originally written in Aramaic.* Both of these contentions are false. While it is apparent that most, if not nearly all, of the Judaeans of the Roman period were bilingual, Greek was the primary language for many, if not for the majority. The inscriptions of the period demonstrate this fully, and even the coins of Herod bore only Greek inscriptions, and even synagogues bore Greek inscriptions where corresponding Aramaic or Hebrew ones are not found (See *Biblical Archaeology Review*, July-August 2003 pp. 25 and 36). The consistency of all early Greek mss., and the internal textual evidence show that they were all, even Matthew, John, and Paul's epistle to the Hebrews, originally written in Greek. The provenance of the earliest Aramaic (or “Syriac”) manuscripts known shows that they were translated from Greek into Aramaic, contrary to the claims of today's Jews. For brief discussions of this see the introduction to the *Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece*, 27th edition (hereinafter simply the NA27), on pages 65-68. Aside from all of this, most of the Old Testament quotes found in the four Gospels and in Paul were taken from the Greek Old Testament, the Septuagint (LXX), and not from any Hebrew or Aramaic version. Although **some** quotes do more closely resemble translations from those versions, these are but few. The bottom line is that the entire New Testament was

originally written in Greek, and our most ancient manuscripts and papyri, while not perfect, must be awfully close to the original accounts.

Then Douglas fails again where he says of the Bible “*It has been edited, with many books left out, those writings in Thomas and Enoch banned from the sight of the masses ...*” and goes on to criticize the King James Version. First, not all of the apocryphal or pseudepigraphal books (books which were for one reason or another omitted from the accepted canon at the Council of Nicaea in the 4th century) are worthy of equal credit. Each must be evaluated separately, and it certainly would be wise to do so before criticizing or promoting any of them! While the book commonly known as 1 Enoch contains text which is quoted at length by Jude, alluded to with certainty by Peter, and is quoted or alluded to often elsewhere in the New Testament (for which see the NA27 appendix *Loca Citata Vel Allegata*, pp. 804-805), it certainly seems that the lost Greek version (or perhaps a Hebrew version), of which some fragments still exist, should have been considered canonical. Yet I would not rely upon or promote with confidence the version from the Ethiopic which we have today, although versions of Enoch which may be more reliable were found among the Dead Sea Scrolls.

But the so-called “Gospel of Thomas”, along with certain other documents discovered at Nag Hammadi, is nothing but one of those forgeries perpetrated in order to corrupt Christianity by the Jewish sect of the Gnostics who were originally based at Alexandria. Failing miserably in the second and third centuries, the Gnostics have had much more success deceiving people today. And clowns such as the novelist Dan Brown have reaped millions by capitalizing on such deception, perpetuating ancient blasphemies.

Yet good or bad, none of these books were ever “*banned from the sight of the masses*”! Rather, as also happened to a good many valuable history books, once interest was lost in a book, for whatever reason, scribes simply stopped copying them. Because paper decays, books that fell out of popular favor (in other words, lost commercial viability) or which the organized church was not particularly interested in, simply and gradually vanished. While the King James Version originally contained 14 apocryphal books (not all of them deserving of merit) which were later removed and published only separately, the compilers of that version were certainly not responsible for errors made in the 4th century, at Nicaea, 1200 years beforehand.

Douglas also states: “*I, personally, have never felt the need or the desire to attend church. Something about the people there struck me as hypocritical and judgmental. Nor I am [sic] a dedicated Bible scholar. I believe that a true knowledge of God is available for EVERYONE, from within, not from tangled, mangled teachings of various sects.*”

Now first, for one who isn't a “*dedicated Bible scholar*”, and for one who obviously isn't a very good amateur historian, since he has events of the 4th century (decisions made at the Council of Nicaea) and the 17th century (publication of the King James Bible) confounded, Douglas surely goes out on a limb, because he is about to spend nearly 13 pages of his publication slamming Paul of Tarsus with all sorts of false accusations, amidst many other poorly conceived ideas and inaccurate statements. Now what sort of man would, as Douglas clearly does, announce an ignorance of something, and something so important as the Bible, and then spend so much time tearing apart large parts of it with such strong criticisms? If your thoughts contain

something like “Only an idiot!”, then they are much like my own. Of course there are many subjects and events which I would have to profess an ignorance of, or have only a surface knowledge concerning. I dare not write about any of them, and especially with scathing criticism of the parties involved.

Yet Douglas is guilty of a far greater error, for he criticizes the development of Christianity, and goes on to say that he believes “*EVERYONE*” (his own emphasis) has available to them a “*true knowledge of God*”. Is such a statement true? Certainly Not! And it shows that Douglas is no true Christian, whether or not he claims to be. A Catholic, a Baptist, a Methodist or a Hindu may make such a statement, but no true Christian can.

Why did Christ speak in parables? To exclude certain people from obtaining a “true knowledge of God”! It is also quite evident that:

There are people on this earth whom Christ does not know, regardless of whether or not those people claim to believe Him (i.e. Matt. 25:12, Luke 13:24-28).

He came only for the “lost sheep” (Ezekiel chapter 34, Jeremiah chapter 50) of the “house” (i.e., “family”, Amos 3:2) of Israel (i.e. Matt. 10:6; 15:24; Luke 1:33, 54-55, 68-80).

No man may know Yahweh, God the Father, unless the Son (Yahshua Christ) allows it (i.e. Matt. 11:27, Luke 10:22). Paul certainly knew this, for at Hebrews 1:6, speaking of Christ, he quoted the Septuagint version of Deut. 32:43 (which is supported over the Masoretic Text by the Dead Sea Scrolls), of which the Greek says “All the messengers of God must worship Him.” So much for the false messengers of Islam, Hinduism, Judaism, and all of the other pagan and godless cults!

The “sheep” are nations, as explained at Matt. 25:32 (where the word is ἔθνος, in plural “ethnicities”), a parable consistent with that found at Matt. 13:47-50, where the “good” kind of fish (“kind” meaning “race”, γένος) are saved, and all the “bad” kinds destroyed. As Abraham was promised, his descendants became many nations, yet are all the same race. As Christ professes, no one may know Yahweh our God except through Him, and He admits only the sheep! See John chapters 10, 5:17-47, and 6:31-58. Those “goats” and “wolves” have no hope to see Yahweh, and face only eternal destruction.

So how can Douglas claim that EVERYONE may know God? If Douglas claims to be a Christian, and as Paul instructs us a Christian is one who consents to “wholesome words: the words of our Lord Jesus Christ” (1 Tim. 6:3 paraphrased A.V.), he’d better stop and consider these things. With certainty both Christ, and Paul, taught that NOT everyone could be a Christian. Yet if Douglas would purport not to be a Christian, then he’s at fault to a greater degree, attacking something that he not only lacks expertise in, but denies having any part of!

It is universalistic thinking such as Douglas’ that has allowed our Saxon nations to be infiltrated by jews and overrun with heathen aliens in the first place. Douglas should consider this also, and perhaps spend more of his time studying something that Paul of Tarsus very well knew: that the identity of the “sheep” nations descended from Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, wrongly called “Gentiles” by all modern Judaized theologians and Bible translators, is certainly none but the true white Saxon, Keltic and related peoples of today!

This error alone, meaning Douglas' universalism, should be enough to demonstrate that Douglas is not qualified to say much of anything concerning either the ancient history of our "Caucasian" race, or of Christianity and the Bible. Yet I shall complete a full critique of Douglas' remarks concerning Paul of Tarsus, not merely because Douglas made them, but because like Graber, Douglas' remarks represent a great part of the trash "scholarship" and blatant misconception being used in an attempt to further soil Christianity today, and little of it is new, but has now been echoed by jews and Christ-haters for over 1900 years! And like Graber, it may also be evident that the primary sources for the trash Douglas spews here are indeed jewish. Anti-Paulism is a jewish conception. And if they succeed in getting Christians to disregard Paul, then Luke and Mark shall follow immediately, and then they'll set their sights on John! Certain jews have already begun campaigning against John. In the same manner, jewish Gnostics in the second century took Matthew's gospel and shredded it, called it the "gospel of the Hebrews", and disregarded the rest of what we call the New Testament. To that they began to add their forgeries and fairy tales, such as "Thomas" and "Mary Magdalene." Graber and Douglas follow in their footsteps!

Douglas' "Publisher's Corner" goes on to make many blanket criticisms of Paul, calling him "forerunner to the Zionists we deal with today", which is an absolute lie, and connecting him to the Catholic "church", another lie. These and other fallacies shall be addressed later on when Douglas' articles are addressed. But first, one last thing here I shall discuss. Douglas quotes a lengthy criticism of Friedrich Nietzsche concerning, and criticizing, Paul of Tarsus. Now it is likely that Nietzsche was a man of some intelligence, but he was also a critic of Christianity in general. He was also a critic of nationalism. I consider nationalism, true nationalism which is based upon ethnic (not geographic) identity, to be the political expression of one of those laws which Yahshua our God has written on our hearts: that we were to be a separate people, and not commit adultery. Yet his most famous and well-remembered quote is this bit of blasphemy: "God is dead." No wonder the anti-Paulist jews love him. Jews too, are enemies of Christ, of Yahweh, of Paul, and of Nationalism! No wonder too, that Nietzsche ended up in an insane asylum in 1889, at the age of 45. I would not consider such a man to be a valid authority on Christianity at all. Where he claims that Paul was "the first Christian", he denies not only Christ, but all of the prophets! These are the sorts of men whom the anti-Paulists always seem to follow. And how many they manage to deceive! What follows shall be a reproduction and criticism of Douglas' articles written against Paul of Tarsus. To avoid confusion, all of Douglas' original text shall appear in italics and all of the responses in normal type.

<Section #1> Clay Douglas states: "***The Seduction: Judeo-Christianity OR Pauline Christianity? Saul of Tarsus: Paul. A different view. A magical effect is like a seduction. Both are built through careful details planted in the mind of the subject.***"
Sol Stein

"You will know them by their fruits. Grapes are not gathered from thorn bushes, nor figs from thistles, are they? Even so, every good tree bears good fruit; but the bad tree bears bad fruit. A good tree cannot produce bad fruit, nor can a bad tree produce good fruit, Every tree that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire. So then, you will know them by their fruits." (Esu Immanuel)"

In reply to section <#1>: It is fitting that Douglas opens this diatribe against Paul with a quote about deception from one who should know: a Jew! Paul himself warned us against the Jew deceivers (i.e. Acts 13:10; 20:29 et al.), yet the Anti-Paulists embrace the Jews and their writings! This has already been demonstrated in these pages concerning H. Graber, and shall also be concerning Clay Douglas. Douglas quotes Matt. 7:16-20 here, and the name he attributes the statement to, "Esu Immanuel", shall be treated shortly.

<Section #2> Clay Douglas cites Paul: "*Let every person render obedience to the governing authorities; for there is no authority except from God, and those in authority are divinely constituted...*" (Paul) (Romans 13, 1)."

In reply to section <#2>: Any serious student of Daniel and the Revelation should realize that Paul is entirely correct in his statements at Romans chapter 13. This too will be discussed shortly, for first Douglas' comments on the topic shall be presented.

<Section #3> Clay Douglas states: "*Jesus Christ (real name: Immanuel or Esu; it was Saul who changed Immanuel's name) did not found Christianity. Paul did.*"

In reply to section <#3>: Anyone who has read my pamphlet *Yahshua to Jesus: Evolution of a Name* has seen all of the linguistic evidence presented showing the various forms of Christ's given name, Yahshua (Yashu, Ἰησοῦς, Iesus, Yesu), in the Hebrew, Greek, Latin and English languages. Yet I can't imagine from which of the pits of hell Douglas retrieved the corruption "Esu", and so can't even comment on it since I've never seen it in any manuscript, lexicon or ancient document. Someone, probably some Jew, must have tricked Douglas into using it, because it surely is a farce!

The title "Immanuel" however, has somewhat more credibility. Matthew 1:23, quoting from Isaiah 7:14, states: "Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Immanuel, which being interpreted is, God is with us." But at Matt. 1:21 the messenger had commanded to Joseph: "thou shalt call His name Yahshua (Ἰησοῦς)." At Luke 1:31 we see that His mother, Mary, received the same instruction, where she was told that she "shalt call His name Yahshua (Ἰησοῦς)." Now a discerning mind may see one difference here immediately. For the messenger told His parents: "You shall call His name Yahshua", and so Yahshua was His given name. Then the messenger said "They shall call his name Immanuel", stating a prophecy, that the people at some later point would call him such. Immanuel is Hebrew (Strong's #6005) for "with us is God", which is exactly what the people did later say of Him, Paul included! But that doesn't mean that His name was not Yahshua! Simon was called Peter by Christ, and so later he was either Simon, Peter, Kephas (the Hebrew equivalent of Peter), or Simon Peter, and by his own pen! Being called Peter doesn't mean that he somehow lost the name Simon. The same for "Joses, who by the apostles was surnamed Barnabas" (Acts 4:36), or James and John, whom Christ "surnamed them Boanerges" (Mark 3:17), and there are yet other examples of this, but already it should be explained sufficiently.

Yet Douglas insists: "it was Saul who changed Immanuel's name"! Did Paul of Tarsus write Matthew 1:21? Mark 1:1 states: "The beginning of the gospel of Yahshua Christ ...", did Paul write that? Did Paul write Luke 1:31? Okay, Douglas may retort that Luke was Paul's cohort, but what about John? What does John's gospel call Him? This

is a ridiculous exercise, but necessary! The name Ἰησοῦς appears in John's gospel alone, referring to Christ, over 240 times. The Revelation, written over 30 years after Paul of Tarsus was killed, written by John, opens: "The Revelation of Yahshua (Ἰησοῦς) Christ ..."! What does all this add up to? One thing: Clay Douglas is an idiot! For Douglas errantly states, as it shall be quoted below: "Paul ... wrote almost two-thirds of the New Testament." Tell me Mr. Douglas, which one-third do you believe Paul did not write, and I'll wager that we find the name "Ἰησοῦς Χριστός", Yahshua Christ, mentioned quite often there also as He is the central figure. And since we have discovered through archaeology several papyri containing portions of both Matthew and John which are with certainty dated to the second century A.D. (see the Introduction to the NA27, page 58 comparing the dates from the appendix at pp. 684-688 for the papyri cited), it could not be that some later "church" could have changed all these names in our New Testament books! The name Yahshua Christ appears at James 1:1, 1 Peter 1:1, 2 Peter 1:1, 1 John 1:3, 2 John 3 and Jude 1. Was this Paul's doing also, Mr. Douglas? Only one people have endeavored to destroy the name of Yahshua Christ from the beginning, Mr. Douglas: the Canaanite-Edomite jews. And you are their proselyte!

Douglas states that Paul, not Yahshua Christ, founded Christianity. The historian Josephus, writing not long after 70 A.D. at *Antiquities* 18:3:3, tells us that "... Jesus (Ἰησοῦς, Yahshua), a wise man ... was [the] Christ ... and the tribe of Christians, so named from him, are not extinct at this day." Josephus never mentioned Paul, and was a follower of those who persecuted Paul (those of Acts chapters 21-26). Did Paul write this also, Mr. Douglas?

In order for the Old Testament prophecies concerning the repentance of (genetic) Israel (who are not the jews) to be fulfilled, and the return of (genetic) Israel (not the jews) to Yahweh, which the Book of Hosea and most of Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel are all about, the gospel of Yahshua Christ had to succeed in Europe. Peter went to Babylon (1 Peter 5:13, it is only a conjecture that he meant "Rome" metaphorically), and his first epistle was addressed only to those Israelites of Anatolia (Asia Minor). James remained in Jerusalem, and John made it to Ephesus (and was exiled at Patmos for a time, an island off the coast of Anatolia), a Greek city of Anatolia, only late in his life. Surely there were Israelites of many tribes: Greeks, Kelts, Romans, Parthians and others, in these areas. Yet the bulk of "lost" Israel was in Europe, or soon to be there (i.e. during the mass migrations of the 4th and 5th centuries).

While we have stories of apostles in Ireland and Spain at an early time, we have no substantial and contemporary (i.e. 1st or 2nd century) writings from the Irish or the Spanish to prove so. But with surety we know that Paul brought the gospel to Europe, initiating the fulfillment of the prophecies. And the Irish Celtic Church, which developed independently of the Romish Church and was never under Rome's authority until the English sold it out to Rome in the 12th century, "cherished a deep love of the Bible, and from the Epistles of St. Paul developed their theology." (*The Celtic Church In Britain*, Leslie Hardinge). That Douglas does not understand these things is not Paul's fault. Perhaps it shall soon be evident that there is much more which Douglas does not understand!

<Section #4> Clay Douglas states: *“Paul crafted Christianity as we know it today. In reality, we learn little about Immanuel’s actual life on earth, his experiences and his teachings from the Scriptures. Astonishingly, Jesus did not really create the basis for Christianity. As a matter of fact, Immanuel/Jesus warned his followers NOT to organize a formal church network from His teachings; but - rather - encouraged them to pray in small informal groups. Most of the New Testament doesn’t even concern the historical Jesus, while the main influence AND focus is the Apostle Paul. It was Paul of Tarsus who renamed Immanuel ‘Jesus Christ’ (although Immanuel had consistently cautioned all of His followers not to be fooled by those who would falsify His name and call Him ‘Jesus the MESSIAH’ - that He was not the ‘Messiah’ come to save anyone!”*

In reply to section **<#4>**: So few words, yet so many lies! I’m beginning to wonder whether someone swapped Clay Douglas’ Bible with a copy of the Talmud, and he hasn’t yet noticed it! Where else could Douglas get these statements from, and why doesn’t he make citations? Likely because he **CAN’T** make citations, and is inventing his own philosophy! And under the slightest scrutiny it shall disintegrate, just like fragile Clay (pun intended). Where did Christ “warn his followers NOT to organize a formal church network”? Not that I’m advocating one, but I only want to know where the warning is, along with His encouragement only “to pray in small informal groups.” The schematic for Christian community proposed by Paul is nothing like what the catholic “church” became. Paul proposed no formal mega-church with popes, bishops, nuns, and the like. This was the work of later oppressors. The catholic “church” as we know it didn’t begin to take shape until the 6th century A.D., and can’t be blamed on Paul! Paul only proposed that each individual community govern itself, with the elders appointing an overseer (supervisor or “bishop”) who would answer to them and manage the day to day affairs of widows, ministers (be they teachers or doing other services) and the like. Evidently Douglas hasn’t read Paul very closely, as these things are evident throughout his epistles. Neither does Douglas know history! For even Eusebius in his church history complained of how certain 4th century bishops of Rome were attempting to usurp authority over the other bishops, of churches Paul helped found, and they resisted any such thing! Only an ignoramus would blame Paul for the overbearing church organizations of the later centuries.

Douglas complains that from the scripture “we learn little about Immanuel’s actual life on earth.” Was this Paul’s fault? What does Douglas want? “Jesus: the miniserics”? “Jesus goes to high school”? “The Jesus diet”? That’s in Leviticus 11 and Deuteronomy 14! Matthew, Mark, Luke and John wrote exactly what they thought necessary for us to have. Certain first and second century jews had a complaint similar to Douglas’, and began to manufacture fairy tales to substitute for what they thought was lacking! Some of these are found in *The Lost Books of the Bible and the Forgotten Books of Eden*. Should Paul answer to Douglas for not founding a first century version of *People Magazine*? More is known about the life of Christ than about most men of the first century, yet I believe that whatever Douglas had, he would not be satisfied with – for he hasn’t even read what he does have! This is readily evident!

Douglas also complained that “we learn little about ... his teachings from the Scriptures” and then goes on to say that Christ did not accept that He was “Jesus the Messiah”, and that “He was not the ‘Messiah’ come to save anyone!” Incredible! Here

it is, and it can't be any plainer. **Clayton Douglas is no better than a Jew by his own admission: for he denies not only Paul but the entire New Testament, and has adopted fully the position of the Jews!!!**

First there is Daniel 9 and the vision of the 70 weeks. If we understand the chronology of Ezra and Nehemiah, 483 years may be counted from the rebuilding of Jerusalem, and we would arrive at 28 A.D., the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar and the beginning of Christ's ministry: the coming of "Messiah the Prince" of Daniel 9:25, who was Yahshua Christ, who was "cut off" 3 ½ years later at Passover, in the middle of the 70th week (483=69x7, a day being a year in prophecy). So Douglas denies Daniel.

Then there is John. At John 1:41 the apostle puts these words down, as having come from the mouth of Andrew: "We have found the Messiah", and says: "which is, being interpreted, the Christ." At John 4:25-26 the apostle records the following exchange between a woman of Samaria and Yahshua Christ: "The woman saith unto him, I know that Messiah cometh, which is called Christ: when he is come, he will tell us all things. Yahshua saith unto her, I that speak unto thee am he." And so, Douglas denies John!

Then there is Matthew 1:21: "And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Yahshua (which means 'Yahweh, Savior'): for he shall save his people from their sins." While Douglas professes Matt. 1:23 out of one side of his mouth, he denies Matthew 1:21 out of the other side of his mouth! Now either Douglas is a purposeful deceiver, or a blithering idiot: take your pick! Unless, of course, you would choose to believe that Paul wrote Daniel, John and Matthew too.

While we shall continue to address Clayton R. Douglas' article "The Seduction: Judeo-Christian OR Pauline Christianity?" from the December 2003 issue of his *Free American Newsmagazine*. I hope to have already pointed out that, while rejecting Paul, in reality Douglas has also rejected much of the rest of the Bible, although he pretends to acknowledge those parts of it which evidently suit his own distorted views. While pretending to be a Christian, most of Douglas' claims concerning the Bible may get a warm reception from readers of *The Trumpet* or *The Jerusalem Post*. Yet because much of Douglas' audience is Christian, and many of them Israel Identity, his oblique misinterpretations must be addressed.

<Section #5> Clay Douglas states: "*Did you know that Paul/Saul of Tarsus wrote almost two-thirds of the New Testament? I'll bet you didn't.*"

In reply to section **<#5>**: Well, Clayton, you are right, I didn't know that! Having read the Bible for so many years, I never even imagined it! So we'd better see just how accurate this statement is. The NA27 contains only Greek text, and the Greek footnotes which display textual variations among mss., without wasting any space explaining anything. Its methods are well defined and the scholar's task is to use them properly, so its text is pretty much evenly distributed across 680 pages. Of the 680 pages of Greek text, 87 of them are the gospel of Matthew, or 12.79%. 62 are Mark's, or 9.11%. Works attributed to John, his gospel, epistles, and the Revelation, consume 136 pages, or 20%. Already that adds up to 41.90%, so already Douglas' statement is in error. No wonder I didn't know that! The epistles of James, Peter and Jude together occupy 30 pages, or 4.41%. The parts written by Luke, both his gospel and Acts, occupy 186

pages, or 27.35%. Paul's epistles, and there is no doubt in my mind that Hebrews was written by Paul, occupy 179 pages, or 26.32% of the NA27 version of the New Testament. A far cry from "two-thirds"! Even lumping Paul and Luke together, as H. Graber would, we aren't anywhere near "two-thirds"! How many other times would Douglas state a blatant lie, and looking at you in the eye say "Did you know that ...? I'll bet you didn't!"

<Section #6> Clay Douglas states: *"Paul/Saul never met Jesus in the flesh; he only claimed some strange vision and proceeded to then pagenize [sic] the teachings of Jesus, until he created Pauline Christianity. Because there are no known writings from Jesus, the actual Apostles, or anyone that actually knew Him in the flesh (other than [sic] perhaps James), most of what He taught is lost forever. Why? More on this topic later."*

In reply to section **<#6>**: While it is no new revelation that "Paul ... never met Jesus in the flesh", Paul certainly did not "*pagenize [sic] the teachings of*" Yahshua Christ! A detailed examination of Paul's writing would reveal that none of it would be found contrary to either the Old Testament or the recorded words of Yahshua Christ. Yet since Douglas makes only blanket allegations, and offers no specific examples with which to support his blasphemy, I can only respond with general statements. Why doesn't Douglas offer specifics? Probably because he hasn't researched anything for himself, but like the hare-brained remark that "Paul ... wrote almost two-thirds of the New Testament", he is only parroting some dissembler, or more likely, some jew.

Of course, we do not have any writing from Yahshua. Even in the Old Testament, Moses wrote the laws, and prophets wrote down the designs of our Father and Creator. So also in the New Testament era did He select men to record what He wanted us to know. Yet that "there are no known writings from ... the actual Apostles" is another odd statement from someone who would claim to be a Christian! What of not only James, but of Simon Peter? What of Jude, "the servant of Yahshua Christ, and brother of James"? What of Matthew, and especially John? Which, Mr. Clayton R. Douglas, of these ten gospels and epistles were NOT written by the original Apostles? Douglas condemns not only Paul, but the entire New Testament, just like the pagans and the jews! The mark of a prophet, or anyone who claims to be writing in the name of Yahweh (and so Yahshua Christ), is spelled out in Isaiah chapter 41, vv. 21-29. All of the New Testament writers have in some way met this criteria: and especially Paul, yet no jew could possibly understand that! If the prophecy stands the test of time and is revealed (i.e. Romans 16:20, or Luke 21:20-24), then its writer is true, and if the writer is true, woe to the man who would not heed that writer! Remember what happened to those in the days of Hezekiah, who respected not the words of Jeremiah. Now it can be demonstrated that a great deal of the Revelation of Yahshua Christ, which John recorded, has already happened: 2000 years of history written in advance. If Douglas had studied the writings of John in unison with history, he may have arrived at a similar conclusion. Rather, Douglas studies the writings of jews, magicians and charlatans, and so is only able to make idiotic hare-brained remarks! Will all of the scoffers of today go unpunished?

<Section #7> Clay Douglas states: *“Of personal knowledge of Jesus, Paul had none! The philosophies and theologies that he created were of his own conception, and those colored by his education as a Pharisee in a Hellenistic world, and the pagan religions which surrounded him. His own writings evidence these influences.”*

In reply to section **<#7>**: Here again Douglas spews truths mixed with half-truths and makes blanket allegations while offering no specific instances of error or wrongdoing. Paul, educated in both Judaism (which he later realized was but a corrupted form of the Hebrew religion of his fathers) and in Classical Greek learning, was in a unique position to fulfill the task which Yahweh required: to bring the gospel to the “lost” Israelites of Europe. Only a man who could speak both to Judaeans from a Judaeans perspective, and to Greeks from a Greek perspective, had the capability to perform such a task!

Paul was the first teacher of what we today call Israel Identity. I must profess that unless one studies the classics, one is not properly qualified to teach Israel Identity today! This I realized seven years ago, and today I am quite happy that I did, and thankful to Yahweh for it! Without a knowledge of the Greek and Roman myths, one cannot convince either Greeks or Romans that they are “lost” Israelites, among those nations descended from Abraham (Genesis 15:5-6; 17:4-6; 35:10-11), as Paul certainly did! Paul must have told the Romans that they were part of “lost” Israel, evidence of which is at Rom. 1:23, 24, 25, 26, 31, 32; 9:25-33; 11:13-33; and 16:20, though it is not always easily seen in the blind, judaized, modern translations. Paul explains to the Dorian Greek Corinthians that they descended from the Israelites, i.e. 1 Corinthians chapter 10, and references this often with Old Testament quotes such as that at 2 Cor. 6:16-17. Who was Jeremiah talking about at 31:31-33, or Isaiah at 52:11, but Israel? No one but Israel! And Paul certainly knew it! Likewise Paul tells the Ephesians, descendants of the Israelites, that they “... had at that time been apart from Christ, having been alienated from the civic life of Israel ...” (Eph. 2:12), and the Colossians, also descendants of the Israelites, that “... you at one time being alienated and odious in thought by wicked deeds, yet now He has reconciled ...” (Col. 1:21-22). These translations are my own because the judaized published translations distort Paul’s words terribly, not having any such understanding as Paul did! Therefore, all those taking part in discrediting Paul are doing Yahweh and His Kingdom a very horrible disservice. How could one be alienated from something, unless he had a part in it in the first place? How could one be reconciled to something he knew not beforetime? Both the Colossians and the Ephesians were Israelites, and Paul knew it, and both the Old Testament and the Greek classics reveal it to be so. No classical education? No means by which to prove Israel’s migrations! And Paul certainly would not have pursued non-Israelites, except with one exception which he explains: his visit to the Japhethite Ionians of Athens. It should be becoming clear that it would have been quite difficult for the other eleven apostles to fill Paul’s shoes.

How could Paul tell the Galatians, who were Hellenized Kelts with Greeks and Romans among them, that while the covenants of Yahweh could not be amended, they were included in it because they, not the Edomite-Jews or the Ishmaelite-Arabs, were offspring of Abraham and Jacob (Gal. 3:15-18)? That they were children of Isaac (Gal. 4:28) and of the promise! Only because Paul learned from the classical historians such as Herodotus, Strabo and Diodorus Siculus that the Kelts were indeed the Israelites of

the Assyrian deportations, as were the Scythians which Paul mentioned! No classical education? No connection of history to Biblical prophecy, and so none of the revelations of Israel Identity, the very "mystery" which Paul mentions at Ephesians 3:1-9, which I have translated:

"¹ For this cause I, Paul, captive of Christ Yahshua on behalf of you of the Nations, ² if indeed you have heard of the management of the family of the favor of Yahweh which has been given to me in regard to you, ³ seeing that by a revelation the mystery was made known to me (just as I had briefly written before, ⁴ besides which reading you are able to perceive my understanding in the mystery of the Anointed,) ⁵ which in other generations had not been made known to the sons of men, as it is now revealed in His holy ambassadors and prophets by the Spirit, ⁶ those Nations which are joint heirs and a joint body and partners of the promise in Christ Yahshua, through the good message ⁷ of which I have become a servant in accordance with the gift of the favor of Yahweh which has been given to me, in accordance with the operation of His power. ⁸ To me, the least of all saints, has been given this favor, to announce the good message to the Nations - the unsearchable riches of the Anointed, ⁹ and to enlighten all concerning the management of the household of the mystery which was concealed from the ages by Yahweh, by whom all things are being established."

The Prophecy? That Israelites were to become many nations. The mystery? Where they were! To them, and to them only, did Paul deliver the gospel! Without a classical education, Paul never could have accomplished such a task. No wonder that today the Jews and their proselytes despise classical education, and have succeeded in removing it from our educational system. Even most Humanities departments in today's universities are but a parody of those of ages past. Friedrich Nietzsche, much to his discredit, was a professor of the classics at Basel, Switzerland, yet realizing none of this he chose instead to despise Paul and belittle Christianity! Clayton Douglas is his disciple.

<Section #8> Clay Douglas states: *"Paul's writings clearly contradict Jesus' teachings. Over and over again. The above reference (I) is just one of numerous examples. Jesus was an often-violent reactionary revolutionary. Jesus/Immanuel NEVER TAUGHT SUBMISSION TO ANYONE EXCEPT TO God. So, why is Paul teaching Christians that governmental authority is 'divinely constituted?'*

"Again, Jesus could be quite angry and violent when 'fighting the good fight'. Let us remember his anger when he chased the merchants from the temple, or when he openly condemned the religious leaders of the time, the Pharisees and the scribes. Here's the advice He gave before being arrested; '...and he who has no sword, sell your coat and buy one ... they said; Lord, look, here are two swords. He said to them: it is enough.' (Luke 22, 36 to 38).

"Jesus was - therefore - not against changes, but he had chosen to bring these in as non-violent a way as possible, through the persuasion of individuals and action of the masses. But, Jesus did not rule against violence either. When he removed the moneychangers from the religious place, it was with extreme violence. So, why did Paul advocate unquestioning obedience to authority, submission and non-violence? Paul cunningly taught early Christians to 'wait for the new Messiah' rather than to fight back against governmental authority even though that same authority sought to enslave

them. Paul's very same message of docility in the face of grave danger cripples Christians today."

In reply to section <#8>: Paul's writings do not contradict the teachings of Yahshua Christ at all! They may contradict Clayton Douglas' perception of Yahshua's teaching, and at times the poor translations found in all published editions of the Bible make it seem as though there are contradictions, as this happens even in the gospels, such as at Luke 16:9, an often mistranslated, poorly understood verse. But Paul certainly does not contradict Yahshua, or the Old Testament, once the Greek is studied by someone who has a thorough knowledge of the Old Testament prophecy, of ancient history, and so of Israel Identity, which these other things lead to as Truth. Now Douglas cites Romans 13:1 as an example of Paul's contradiction. Is Paul truly contradicting Yahshua here? This we shall see!

Romans 13:1-8, as I have translated it, reads: "¹ Every soul must be subject to more powerful authorities. Since there is no authority except from Yahweh, then those who are, by Yahweh are they appointed. ² Consequently, one opposing the authority has opposed the ordinance of Yahweh, and they who are in opposition will themselves receive judgment. ³ For rulers are not a terror to good work, but to evil. Now do you desire to not be fearful of the authority? Practice good, and you will have approval from it; ⁴ A servant of Yahweh is to you for good. But if you practice evil, be fearful; for not without purpose will he bear the sword, indeed a servant of Yahweh is an avenger with wrath to he who has practiced evil. ⁵ On which account to be subordinate is a necessity, not only because of indignation, but also because of conscience. ⁶ For this reason also you pay tribute; they are ministers of Yahweh, obstinately persisting in this same thing. ⁷ Therefore render to all debts: to whom tribute, tribute; to whom taxes, taxes; to whom reverence, reverence; to whom dignity, dignity. ⁸ You owe to no one anything, except to love one another: for he who loves another has fulfilled the law."

Not only Douglas, but many other well-intended people claiming to be Christians – yet not knowing scripture – despise these words of Paul's. Here we shall see that they are just! First, no one denies that Yahshua Christ said "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill" (Matt. 5:17). He also said, speaking of temporal government: "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto Yahweh the things that are Yahweh's" (Matt. 22:21). Therefore, since it is Christ's clearly stated intention that the prophets, as well as the law, should be fulfilled, it certainly would be appropriate here to examine just what the prophets say concerning temporal governments.

In Leviticus chapter 26 the children of Israel were told what to expect if they were obedient to Yahweh and His covenants, and what to expect if they were disobedient, which we know that they were. One of the consequences of disobedience was "seven times" of punishment. A prophetic "time", as can be demonstrated and as we have often done elsewhere, is 360 years. Seven times is therefore 2520 years. By most of the better students of Biblical prophecy, it has been stated that this 2520 years of punishment began as the Israelites, along with most of Judah too, were taken into captivity by the Assyrians. Adam Rutherford, Wesley Swift, Bertrand Comparet, Clifton Emahiser and surely many others have all elucidated as much.

In 1 Samuel chapter 8, it is recorded that the children of Israel rejected Yahweh as their King, and demanded a temporal king, which Yahweh thus permitted. Now if

Clayton Douglas is upset with temporal governments, here it should be obvious: he has none but his own grandfathers to blame for the situation! And so this is the predicament we are all in.

Some time after the children of Israel were taken away by the Assyrians, Daniel the prophet was given to recording several visions for us. One tells us, as we have interpreted it, that the Babylonian system will be with us for seven times, or 2520 years, from the time of Nebuchadnezzar. This is found in Daniel chapter 4 and was discussed at length by Clifton Emahiser in his *Watchman's Teaching Letter #61* and elsewhere. It is beyond the scope of my purpose here to explain all of the details at length, which surely would take some time. In Daniel chapter 2 the prophet is given a vision of four great empires which would succeed one another, and then a fifth which would break in pieces all of the first four, and itself would last forever.

Daniel chapter 7 is a vision much like that in Daniel chapter 2, although it goes further forward in time. A study of Daniel 7, along with Revelation chapter 13, reveals when compared to history that men would be subject to two different periods of subjection, each lasting 3½ times, or 1260 years, for a total of 2520 years. It is evident that the first period was the same as that covered by Daniel's four empires, and the second was the temporal power of the papacy. This is discussed at length in Bertrand L. Comparet's *14 Lessons On The Book of Revelation* which Clifton Emahiser publishes, and in my own notes there, things which are simply too involved to reproduce here but which have also been elucidated to some degree by many other Israel Identity writers, such as Howard Rand and Wesley Swift.

It may be evident that the original seven times of punishment began several centuries earlier than the seven times of the Babylonian order, the "mystery Babylon" of Revelation, forewarned in Daniel 4. And so for several centuries in this modern age the children of Israel have been allowed to experiment in this liberal age of "self-government", the so-called "Western Democracies", yet in truth mystery Babylon and the "princes of this world" are still actually in control. I, a simple and humble man, not wanting to sound like so many fools have, dare venture to say that the fall of mystery Babylon and the culmination of this age must be awfully close.

So it is evident from the prophets: temporal governments were indeed decreed by Yahweh, the children of Israel brought such upon themselves, and Paul of Tarsus certainly knew it, and so expressed as much in Romans chapter 13! To Clayton Douglas I can only offer the advice of the wise – but often maligned, and for no good reason – Gamaliel, who said: "But if it be of Yahweh, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against Yahweh." (Acts 5:39). Not even the Edomite jews present disputed such advice (Acts 5:40)! Not at the immediate time anyway.

Yahshua Christ did not resist Roman authority, as Douglas so foolishly claims here. If Yahshua had, He surely would have been found resisting His Own plan as outlined in the ancient prophets, and which we are reassured of in His Revelation as given to John. And so Paul's advice to Christians in Romans 13 is certainly sound, and Douglas should heed it. Also, the Caesars of Rome were of the Julian family and descended from Judah-Zerah through royal princes, therefore they held the sceptre of Judah themselves, which Yahweh decreed, a story too long to include here, and again from the classics.

It is not docility that has hurt Christians. For Christians have fought against and defeated the “armies of aliens” (Heb. 11:34) at the prescribed times again and again. It is not the act of “rendering to Caesar the things which are Caesar’s” that hurts Christians, though our fathers were warned by Samuel of how much a temporal king would take from us. What hurts Christians today most is that they take the things that belong to Yahweh, and instead of rendering them to Yahweh they render them to Babylon! All those who spend their money on organized sports, which makes “heroes” out of all sorts of beasts and which makes them millionaires to boot, renders to Babylon the things which are Yahweh’s. All those who spend their money on the jew-produced propaganda which streams forth from Hollywood, New York and yes, Nashville too, renders to Babylon the things which are Yahweh’s. All those who claim to love their brother, but purchase goods manufactured by aliens in foreign lands truly hate their brother! All those who would hire an alien, or who would shop at a store owned or operated by aliens hate their brother! All of these things and more hurt Christians. Paul told Christians to “Love without acting; abhorring wickedness, cleaving to goodness: brotherly love affectioned towards one another; in honor preferring one another with diligence, not hesitating” (Rom. 12:10-11). How could Christians claim to love one another, yet spend all their money on cheap made-in-China products at Wal-Mart? How does that brother whom you claim to love feed his family, because you “saved” a dollar? All of these things and more hurt Christians.

Douglas scoffs at Paul because “Paul cunningly taught early Christians to ‘wait for the new Messiah’.” But was Paul alone teaching thusly? What of Matthew 24:36-44, where Christ is said to be discussing His return, the “coming of the Son of man”, at some unrevealed future date? This same discourse is related by Mark (13:32-37) and by Luke (21:25-28). What of John 21:23 and Christ’s promise to return there? What of Revelation 22, verses 6 to 20, written over 30 years after Paul was killed and 60 years after the crucifixion, which foretell the return of Christ? Why doesn’t Douglas scoff at Matthew, Mark, Luke and John? They taught the same things which Paul did! Yet Douglas quotes Matthew and Luke in his article as authorities! Here we have the same situation which Yahshua Christ encountered among the Pharisees, who claiming to know the scriptures were time and again reproved by scripture! Clayton Douglas: follower of jews and Pharisees! Clayton Douglas: Hypocrite big time!

<Section #9> Clay Douglas states: “*Bishop John S. Spong (Episcopal Bishop of Newark): ‘Paul’s words are not the Words of God. They are the words of Paul - a vast difference!’ Thomas Jefferson: ‘Paul was the first corrupter of the doctrines of Jesus.’ Thomas Hardy: ‘The new testament was less a Christiad than a Pauliad’.*”

In reply to section **<#9>**: Douglas goes on to cite three apparent critics of Paul. John S. Spong, Episcopal Bishop of Newark, is of the same city from whence the jew rabbi Joachim Prince hails. You will remember Prince from the foregoing address of H. Graber’s article, above in section **<R>** on pp. 21-22 and in the closing remarks on pp. 29-30, for Graber cited Prince often. No doubt both Spong and Prince attended the same ecumenical councils, sleeping together metaphorically if not otherwise! Spong’s words lead me to wonder just which part of Paul’s writings Spong disagrees with. The Episcopal church has recently garnered much media attention when one of its dioceses elevated an openly homosexual minister to the position of bishop. But that isn’t so great

of a sin compared to this: that the organization had a homosexual minister, which it must have long known about since he was “openly” homosexual, in the first place! And for Spong to be a bishop in an organization that admits homosexuals as ministers makes him a willing accomplice and an approver of such behavior!

Now Paul wrote of homosexuality that “they practicing such things are worthy of death, not only they who cause them, but also they approving of those committing them” (Rom. 1:32). Paul also wrote: “Do not be led astray: neither fornicators (race mixers) ... nor adulterers ... nor homosexuals ... shall inherit the Kingdom of Yahweh” (1 Cor. 6:9-11), where the Greek word is ἀρσενικοίτης (733) and means nothing but “homosexual” in all secular Greek writing! Paul used the word again at 1 Tim. 1:9-10: “Knowing this, that the law is not laid down for righteous, but for lawless ... fornicating, homosexual ... men.” Surely in the case of homosexuals Paul had Leviticus 20:13 in mind, which states: “If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination: they shall surely be put to death; their blood shall be upon them.” Yet Spong must approve of such behavior if only by simply maintaining his position rather than separating his flock from such sinners!

And about Spong’s flock! Newark N.J. is about three miles from where I grew up in Jersey City. The two are separated by a few miles of highway and a bridge over Newark Bay. This entire region is densely populated, being in the shadow of New York City, and is the epitome of ethnic diversity in the entire country. But Newark itself is not very ethnically diverse, because except for the Ironbound section of the city, which in the 1970’s was becoming more and more Portuguese and less and less white and Italian, Newark and its western suburbs of Hillside, Irvington and East Orange are virtually all black! Newark, site of large and violent black riots in 1968, where the National Guard was called in to restore order, was in the 1970s and 1980s well over 60% black, maybe 70%, and nearly all of the non-blacks were Catholic Italians and Portuguese! I can honestly state that in the 1980s one may have had a very difficult time finding a real white family in Newark. Spong’s flock may have consisted of many goats and wolves, but I can’t imagine where he’d find any sheep with which to fill his pews! With all of this I can only wonder: what sort of man could Spong be?

Now Thomas Jefferson is a man to be admired for many things, and especially for his opposition to the central bank crowd. Yet I do not admire his Bible scholarship. While a pious man, Jefferson saw no use in most of the Bible, and so attempted to create his own version. Doing so he discarded the books of Moses, the books of the prophets and the historical books. In fact, he also discarded much of the gospel accounts and other New Testament scriptures, not only Paul.

With the Jefferson Bible, we would have no law, no Leviticus 20:13 by which to know the truth concerning homosexuals, no Daniel 2 or 7 and no 1 Samuel 8 by which to learn about the reason why we have temporal government, no Messianic prophecies, no Isaiah or Jeremiah, no history, no way to discover the truths of our own Identity or the rest of the Adamic race, no background by which to understand the life of Christ, no context! Because the Jefferson Bible contains little but words of Christ separated from the gospels, and the Psalms, we wouldn’t know much from it at all! While of course the words of Christ are important, their context both historical and immediate is just as important! Neither would we be able to understand Christ’s references to “the law and the prophets”, because we wouldn’t have them. We surely would be lost then! Since

Jefferson had no use for the law and the prophets, surely not understanding much of them, it does not surprise me that he disregarded or criticized Paul, for surely he also misunderstood Paul. Yet it is obvious that he is no authority on the subject, and neither is Clayton Douglas!

Thomas Hardy was a novelist, and probably not a very good mathematician. As Douglas attempted to credit Paul with “almost two-thirds of the New Testament”, Hardy attempts likewise. As I said, Thomas Hardy was a novelist. That should be sufficient a reply.

It is no great thing, that in today’s “information age” where we have managed to preserve the writings or opinions of thousands and thousands of intellectuals and pseudo-intellectuals, one is able to find a few who are critical of someone such as Paul of Tarsus. One may find many more recognizable names who would criticize Thomas Jefferson! Yet that alone wouldn’t give them credibility in any given topic, because their names are recognizable and because they were opinionated. Paul himself told us to “prove all things.” Using scripture as our ruler, concerning Romans 13 Paul of Tarsus is shown to be true, whereas Clayton Douglas has failed. Would Douglas admit his error?

Now we shall proceed with Clayton Douglas’ article, *“The Seduction: Judeo-Christianity OR Pauline Christianity? Saul of Tarsus: Paul. A different view.”*, and all of his ignorant, ill-begotten and unwarranted criticisms of the apostle Paul. While Douglas offered a quote from the novelist, Thomas Hardy, as we continue through Douglas’ article, it may become evident that Douglas has taken to writing fictions of his own, where he makes all sorts of false assertions, and he offers no citations whatsoever with which to support his phony ‘history’.

<Section #10> Clay Douglas states: *“Who Is Saul of Tarsus? That is Paul’s original name. Shortly after Saul claimed he had his vision of Jesus, he changed his name to ‘Paul.’ Why? Did Paul seek to re-create himself for benevolent purposes? Or, was Paul deceiving everyone and his namechange was simply one of many indicators in support of this? You decide.”*

In reply to section **<#10>**: Contrary to the opinions of those critics who often jump to such false conclusions, the truth is that Paul of Tarsus never changed his name at any time during the period of his life covered by Luke’s account in Acts or by his own epistles. Luke wrote the Acts account, not Paul. Luke calls him “Saul” 15 times in Acts chapters 7 through 13, and in Acts 13 Luke begins to refer to him as Paul, and so throughout the rest of Acts. Luke tells us: “... Saulos, who also is Paulos ...”, which only indicates that Paul already had two names. Yet, for some reason Luke does not explain, Luke called him “Saul” until he related the account of their engagement with another man of the same name: Sergius Paulus, a Roman proconsul. Paul in Greek is everywhere Παῦλος (Strong’s #3972), the same as “Paulus” the proconsul.

It is notable that Paul and Barnabas had ready access to a man of such rank as a Roman proconsul, which is nearly the equivalent of being governor of a state, but not elected. Rather, proconsuls were appointed by the Roman Senate for a term of two years. So it may be that Luke simply took this occasion to use the name “Paul” in order to show us that Paul indeed had some prior acquaintance with the man. It was not uncommon in Rome for a man to adopt the name of a benefactor. The historian

Josephus took the surname Flavius in honor of the Roman general who became emperor and was his benefactor: Titus Flavius Sabinus Vespasianus, popularly known only as Vespasian. It was normal for Romans to have three or four names, but to use only one commonly. One of a Roman's names would be that of his *gens*, or family, which in the case of the Roman emperors Vespasian, Titus and Domitian was Flavia. "Flavius" is literally "of Flavia" in Latin, and so Josephus adopted the name "Josephus of Flavia", or Flavius Josephus.

As discussed earlier in this response, several New Testament figures had multiple names, and now it should be also evident that it was normal for Roman men to have more than one name. To criticize Paul for something Luke wrote is ridiculous, yet upon examination it is also plain that there is nothing wrong with Luke's writing! It may even be that Luke was unaware of Saul's full name until their encounter with Sergius Paulus, and from that time Luke, who was the one doing the writing, chose to call him by Paul rather than Saul. While this may all be pushed aside as conjecture, it surely is more plausible than the absolutely false conjecture that Paul changed his name!

<Section #11> Clay Douglas states: "*Paul publicly claimed to be a 'Pharisee of the Pharisees.' He also claimed to be the son of a Pharisee. Additionally, Paul said that he was 'of the Tribe of Benjamin.' Whichever account you believe to be true does not make a difference. In either case, he is a liar. If Paul was a Pharisee, he would have been of authentic Edomite/Canannite [sic] stock. ... The family bloodline of Benjamin was Shemite (non-Jewish). It was a (Saxon) Israelite Tribe from the family bloodline of Issac [sic] through the paternal line of Israel. You can be one but not the other. Pharisees, or the ruling Jewish (Edomite) religious and governmental entity at that time in history, did not 'recruit' from Israelite tribes. It was a 'supremacist' clan, i.e. 'Edomite tribe only.' If Paul was truly a Benjamite (Southern Tribes, Isaac/Israel), then he was lying when he claimed to be a (former) Pharisee.*"

In reply to section <#11>: Oh the lies which Douglas spouts here, and the audacity he has to call Paul a liar at the same time! Yet he offers not one ancient citation or an iota of historic evidence with which to support his claims! Not one! Such is the method of a novelist, and not of a historian. The slightest examination proves to a rational mind that Clayton Douglas is a liar, and not Paul. The historian Flavius Josephus discusses the three sects among the Judaeans "at this time" in the days of the high priest Jonathan, the same man found at 1 Maccabees 12:1 ff., which were the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes, at *Antiquities* 13:5:9 (13:171-173). This is some years before the recorded conquest of the Edomites by the Judaeans, recorded at *Antiquities* 13:9:1 (13:254-258), which was done by the later high priest Hyrcanus. In *Antiquities* 13:10 (13:270 ff.) Josephus mentions the Pharisees and their general opposition to Hyrcanus at length. So it is apparent that the sect of the Pharisees was prominent in Judaea long before any Edomites had the chance to gain political influence there, a situation which did not fully develop until after 80 B.C.!

In Josephus' description of these three sects in *Wars* 2:8:2 (2:119-121) only the Essenes are described as **racial** separatists, being a "Judaeans by birth" a requirement for membership, and not the Pharisees or Sadducees. In his autobiographical *Life* at 1:1 (1-6), Josephus records his own genealogy and shows that he was a Levite. Josephus then tells us that he was an Essene for a time (*Life* 2, 10-12), but settled upon following

the Pharisees. There were other “good” Pharisees mentioned in the New Testament, such as Gamaliel and Nicodemus. Nicodemus was certainly no Edomite! See the accounts concerning him at John 3:1 ff.; 7:50 (where he is recorded as defending Christ before the high priests who wanted to kill Him); and at 19:39, where John tells us that he assisted Joseph of Arimathea (who was on the council, the “sanhedrin”, and who was likely also a Pharisee) with the body of Yahshua after the crucifixion. Here it should be absolutely apparent that Clayton Douglas, flippantly spouting accusations and offering no proof to back them up, is a liar!

While the word “Pharisee” surely does come from a Hebrew word which means “to separate”, the word was used only in the sense of religious, and not racial, separatism. Strong defines “Pharisee” in his Greek dictionary “a *separatist*, i.e. exclusively *religious*” (see #5330). This surely is obvious since the sect existed before the Edomites were absorbed into Judaea and Judaism! Christ condemned the Pharisees for traveling “sea and land to make one proselyte”, hardly necessary to find a willing Edomite! The Talmud attests that the Pharisees were converting people of all races into Judaism at the earliest times, for which see John Lightfoot’s *A Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica*, volume 2, pp. 55-63. Clayton Douglas? He is a liar! There is no doubt, from the historical record, that one may have been both a Pharisee and of the tribe of Benjamin. The Pharisees were only one of several religious sects, and it was quite normal for an ambitious young man who wanted to have a voice in the governance of his nation to join one of those sects. While today we live in a so-called “secular” society, the sects in Judaea were not much different functionally than the political parties of today.

<Section #12> Clay Douglas states: “... *Paul/Saul was a Roman citizen who was born around the turn of the century 2000 years ago in Tarsus, Cilicia. The country of Cilicia was located at the northeastern corner of the Mediterranean Sea. Cilicia and the adjoining nations of Syria and Phoenicia on the eastern end of the Mediterranean Sea were all under the rule of the Roman Empire. The remaining country which bordered the ‘Sea’ on the east was Palestine, which joined Phoenicia on the south. Palestine was also under the rule of Rome. Rome, very nicely, controlled all of her acquired territory by using native puppet kings who were subservient to Rome. Saul was well educated and highly trained as a Roman citizen, though he was an Turco-Armenian by birth. He and his family were well known Pharisees of Tarsus. He spoke several languages as well as Latin, the language of the ‘empire.’ Early in his life he became a Roman soldier, and because of his nationality, he was placed in Jerusalem as a key person to both understand and help control the native Palestinians.*”

In reply to section **<#12>**: While Douglas has some of his geography right, Syria and Phoenicia were never properly “nations”, but only geographical entities demarcated for the purpose of governmental administration, separated by the natural boundary of the Lebanon Mountains. A nation is properly composed of a single people of a common race, history, government and language and is not but a mere geographical or geopolitical unit. A government ruling diverse peoples is an empire, and this is true even when the peoples governed are of the same general race, as with the German Reichs, or empires. “Palestine” was a loose geographic term and never used to designate any particular province.

Tarsus, in Cilicia, according to Strabo in his *Geography* was originally built by the Assyrians, and he cites an inscription “in Assyrian letters” which stated as much (14.5.9). Strabo explains that the city which occupied the site in Greco-Roman times was founded by Argives (14.5.12), and while this is shrouded in myth, there is no doubt from Strabo’s account that Tarsus is a Greek city. The Geographer states at 14.5.13: “The people at Tarsus have devoted themselves so eagerly, not only to philosophy, but also to the whole round of education in general, that they have surpassed Athens, Alexandria, or any other place that can be named where there have been schools and lectures of philosophers. But it is so different from other cities that there the men who are fond of learning are all natives, and foreigners are not inclined to sojourn there; neither do these natives stay there, but they complete their education abroad, and when they have completed it they are pleased to live abroad, and but a few go back home ... Further, the city of Tarsus has all kinds of schools of rhetoric; and in general it not only has a flourishing population but also is most powerful, thus keeping up the reputation of the mother-city [Tarsus]”. Is it no wonder that Paul had such an excellent classical education, and called himself “a citizen of no mean city” (Acts 21:39)?

Now Cilicia itself was originally colonized by the Phoenicians, and those of Cilicia originally called themselves Hypachaeans, according to Herodotus (7.91). Now it should be no surprise that these people should take well to Greek culture and learning, since in Homer’s time Greece itself was said to be colonized largely by Phoenicians, along with the Danaans (tribe of Dan) said to come from Egypt, and Homer called those people Achaeans. As George Rawlinson notes in his edition of Herodotus, “The Cilicians were undoubtedly a kindred race to the Phoenicians”, meaning the ancient Phoenicians, which, as can certainly be established, were indeed the northern tribes of Israel.

Strabo wrote before 25 A.D., the year in which he is believed to have died, and only a few years before Paul. To call Paul of Tarsus a “*Turco-Armenian by birth*” is utterly ridiculous, since the Turks, an eastern Asiatic tribe of obscure origins, did not appear in or west of Mesopotamia for another thousand or so years! The Turks, invading from further Asia, conquered Baghdad in 1055 A.D., and invaded Asia Minor in 1071 A.D. This major gaffe alone exposes Douglas’ absolute ignorance of history, which he is by no means qualified to write about.

Armenia too, until the invasions of Arabs, Turks and Mongols, was a land inhabited by the white races. Where Herodotus tells us that the Scythians conquered all of Asia (1.104), Strabo identifies them geographically with “Greater Armenia”, (11.13.5). A large part of Armenia was called Sacasene, named for the Sacae who dwelt there (11.8.4). Herodotus affirms that the Sacae were indeed the Scythians (7.64), as does Strabo (7.3.9), who goes on to describe Iberia, the country north of Armenia, and says that the Iberians are “both neighbors and kinsmen” of the Scythians (11.3.3). Surely the Israelites who were deported by the Assyrians had called one of their first lands “Iberia”, just as the Israelite Phoenicians who settled old Spain had first called that land “Iberia”, because “Iberi” is “Hebrews” in Hebrew, whom they all were! So again, Douglas’ ignorance is wholly manifest. How many other false impressions and historical untruths does he spout forth daily?

Douglas states that early in Paul’s life “*he became a Roman soldier, and because of his nationality, he was placed in Jerusalem*”, and here he becomes a novelist, for not one iota of historical evidence is cited to support such a claim! And in

fact, Douglas only knows that Paul's "family were well known Pharisees of Tarsus" by guessing the "well known" part, and by Paul's own statements in Acts 23:6. Why does Douglas choose to believe only some of Paul's statements, and of those only the ones he can use against him! Just like a government prosecutor, Clayton Douglas is a liar and a hypocrite! Surely Paul was a Pharisee, and the son of a Pharisee (Acts 23:6), and an Israelite of the tribe of Benjamin (Ph'p. 3:5) just as Josephus was a Pharisee, and an Israelite of the tribe of Levi.

<Section #13> Clay Douglas states: "... Saul and his Roman troops closely followed the developments of the '(new Christian) cult' led by Esu (Jesus) Immanuel in Palestine. Esu Immanuel had several close disciples who assisted in his work. One, 'Judas Ischarioth had become disloyal to the teaching of Immanuel and he followed only his desires. He secretly gathered up among the listeners of Immanuel gold, silver and copper in his moneybag, so that he could idly indulge in his life style.' Juda Iharioth, whose father was Simeon Iharioth the Pharisee, observed what Judas was doing and informed Esu Immanuel of this, hoping to be paid well for this information. Immanuel thanked him but did not pay him.' Being a man of greed for gold, silver and other possessions, Juda Iharioth became very angry and sought revenge. Saul of Tarsus was a friend of Simeon Iharioth, and when Saul learned of this incident between Simeon's son, Juda and Esu Immanuel, he reportedly arranged for the theft of the scrolls of the teachings of Esu, which had been written and kept by Judas Iscarioth (have you ever wondered why there is such little real information in the New Testament about the life and the teachings of Jesus Christ?). Judas Iharioth was paid 70 pieces of silver to steal the writings and another 30 pieces of silver to identify Esu Immanuel at night at his capture with a kiss – a sign of mockery to his enemy. Saul was – reportedly - personally responsible for the plan and gave assistance in the capture, arrest, trial and crucifixion of Esu Immanuel. Saul truly believed that the 'christian cult' leader, Esu Immanuel, had been destroyed forever. As Esu Immanuel Sananda had said Saul of Tarsus was his greatest enemy during his life in Palestine (and even through all of history down to this present day.) Let me explain how this came to be. Saul made it his business to know about any cult or new teaching or idea that might challenge the rule of Rome over the Palestinians. To do this, Paul/Saul worked closely with the religious leaders of the day, the Jewish Pharisees. (Many scholars have challenged Judas' alleged role in the capture of Esu; claiming that Judas was used as Saul and Simon's 'Lee Harvey Oswald' in the murder conspiracy plot.)"

In reply to section **<#13>**: Here we have a fantastic story which is a novel – a fictional prose narrative – and nothing more! None of the claims made here can be substantiated in the New Testament, or in Josephus or any other history, and so unless Douglas can tell us – and show us – where he got this story from, then he must have made it all up! Douglas whines that "there is ... little real information in the New Testament about the life and teachings of Jesus Christ", which by itself is a mischaracterization, and so he goes on to invent his own story!

Saul had Roman troops under his command, which is a lie. While it is certainly evident that Paul had some office or capacity in the service of Judaea, the province was in some degree autonomous when it came to the handling of internal affairs, and the

affairs of the Judaeen people. There is no indication at all that Paul was acting as a Roman, and if he were he would have been found in violation of Roman law.

Douglas takes the name of one single man, Judas Iscariot, in the N.T. Greek everywhere Ἰουδᾶς and either Ἰσκαριώθ or Ἰσκαριώτης (Iskarioth or Iskariotes), two different forms of the same word due to the use of two different grammatical conventions employed in transliteration from Hebrew to Greek, for the word is from the Hebrew terms for Ish (man) and Kerioth (i.e. Jer. 48:24, 41), and he splits him into two different names and people! Douglas takes one man, Judas Iscariot, and produces two men: Judas Ischarioth and Juda Iharioth. Just like the recent announcements by the cult which calls itself the Raelians which turned out to be a fraud, likewise Douglas' attempt to clone the traitor Judas finagles a fraud.

Earlier (see the section [#6](#)) Douglas claimed that “*Paul/Saul never met Jesus in the flesh*”, that none of the New Testament writers “*actually knew Him [Christ] in the flesh*” and says (section [#7](#)) “*Of personal knowledge of Jesus, Paul had none!*” But here Douglas states that “*Saul was – reportedly – personally responsible for the plan and gave assistance in the capture, arrest, trial and crucifixion of Esu Immanuel ... As Esu Immanuel Sananda had said of Saul of Tarsus was his greatest enemy during his life in Palestine ...*” and also that “*Saul made it his business to know about any cult or new teaching that might challenge the rule of Rome ... To do this, Paul/Saul worked closely with the religious leaders of the day ...*”. So which is it, Mr. Douglas? Did Paul know Christ or not? And from whence is this name “Sananda”, and the statements which you have attributed to Christ here? From where did any of this information come? I must conjecture, that there are only two possible sources for any of this information, which I could possibly imagine. The first would be the Talmud. No wonder Douglas doesn't reveal his sources! The second would be Douglas' own twisted mind, and so he has written a novel, but can't so much as keep his plot straight! Paul knew Christ “in the flesh”, or he did not know Him! Both conditions can't be true, except of course, in the contorted fantasizing of Clayton Douglas!

Here Douglas claims that there existed “scrolls of the teachings of” Christ, which I shall also address below. However, earlier Douglas stated “there are no known writings from Jesus, the actual Apostles, or anyone that actually knew Him ...” for which see section [#6](#) on page 41. Is it not absolutely obvious that Douglas' writing is full of double-speak and conflicts? Is Douglas not aware of this? Or is he just a blatant liar? If Douglas knows that “*scrolls of the teachings of*” Christ existed, how could there be “*no known writings from*” Christ?

When one uses terms which aren't generally known, or which can't be found in a dictionary or lexicon, such as “*Esu*” or “*Sananda*”, one should define the terms and also identify their sources. To do so is scholarly. One not doing so may be perceived as creating fictions! Clayton Douglas has created fictions here. When one relates historical events, to cite sources which attest to those events is scholarly, and is necessary when the events aren't generally known. Clayton Douglas claims to be a revealer of truths here, to an audience which he anticipates would not previously have heard such claims, and cites not one of his sources! Clayton Douglas has only spouted lies here. He is a novelist, one who writes fictional narratives: either he reveals the witnesses who attest to the events which he describes, or he made it up all by himself! Note that Douglas' account is peppered with phrases such as “some scholars think” and “many scholars

have challenged”, as if that alone made his statements authoritative. Who are “some scholars”, and why do they think as Douglas purports?

There are other obviously false statements of Douglas’ here, yet it would be fruitless to debate any of their merits. Without any substantiation for his fantastic claims, Douglas is a novelist. Who can debate history with someone such as Douglas, who invents his own version at leisure? How can one debate a fiction?

<Section #14> Clay Douglas states: “... *The Edomite (Jewish) Pharisees were the dominant force controlling the economy and religious thought of the area. To identify with these leaders and to gather the information he needed, he joined their ranks. As a Roman citizen and soldier he held international power over people, and as a Pharisee, he held local power over the Palestinians. With this blending of authority the Pharisees used Saul to their advantage. Saul was encouraged to move swiftly against Esu Immanuel and his followers, who taught Truth to the people. He traveled to various cities to hunt them down and to arrest or to kill them. Paul/Saul tortured and murdered thousands of innocents, many of them mere children.*”

In reply to section **<#14>**: Now there is no doubt that the Pharisees had a great deal of influence, even dominating the religious and political spheres in Judaea, but they did not have total control of it. And certainly the Pharisees did not control the economy, for the Romans did that! We see throughout the New Testament how the Pharisees despised the “publicans”, who were Roman-appointed tax collectors. We also see that the Sadducees held doctrines which differed greatly from the Pharisees, and also had a strong political voice (Acts 4:1 ff., 23:6-8). At least two Sadducees even became high priests. One is recorded at Acts 5:17, which was not long after the crucifixion. The other Josephus tells us about, saying of one Ananus the younger, “he was also of the sect of the Sadducees”, at *Antiq.* 20:9:1 (20:199). This was during the procuratorship of Albinus about 63 A.D., shortly after Paul was sent in bonds to Rome, and right around the time that James was murdered. The family of Herod being Edomites (as Josephus’ histories attests in several places), substantiates why the Edomites of the Pharisees were favored and appointed to high office, and at Christ’s time on earth, Edomites had control of the priest- hood. Yet it has already been demonstrated here (section **<#11>**) that not all of the Pharisees were Edomites! Our current political situation parallels that of first century Judaea to an astonishing degree. While not all Republicans are jews, the jews surely are over-represented at the top of the political hierarchy, and especially in this current administration, where most of the so-called “neo-cons” (former socialists who suddenly became “conservative”, a huge deception and a lie) are also jews. And while not all Democrats are jews, the jews are surely over-represented at the top of the political hierarchy there too! While jews claim to be only 3% of the population (though I suspect their actual number to be at least twice that) they make up at least 20% of the Supreme Court, and I count at least 16 U.S. Senators of jewish descent. Douglas’ misconstrued version of history would prevent one from noticing these parallels, these repetitious patterns. The Edomite jews took over Roman Judaea the same discreet way they did 19th century England and 20th century America.

If Paul of Tarsus were a Roman soldier he would have been attached to a Roman legion and he would have taken his orders from a Roman tribune or a Roman centurion. He certainly would not have needed or sought orders from the high priest at

Jerusalem (i.e. Acts 9:2) to do anything which a Roman soldier may have lawfully done! It would even have been considered treasonous for a Roman soldier to take such orders from a foreign (non-Roman) authority. Rome was a strictly disciplined society, with strict laws governing the behavior of citizens and soldiers alike. By no means could a Roman soldier take upon himself to persecute the people of a Roman province. The authority had to come from elsewhere.

Often appearing in the New Testament is the phrase “the captain of the temple” (Acts 4:1; 5:24) or also “the captain with the officers” (John 18:12, Acts 5:26). This word “captain” is the Greek word for “general”, στρατηγός (4755), and of the temple in Jerusalem Liddell & Scott say of the word in their Greek-English Lexicon: “4. *An officer who had the custody of the Temple at Jerusalem.*” That the high priests used this “captain” and his temple-guards, “officers” in the N.T., as their own private army is evident in the New Testament at Luke 22:52, John 18:12, and Acts 5:24-26, where it is seen that they had their own prison. From here alone did Paul acquire the authority which he needed to persecute the Judaeans Christians, for the Romans afforded their provinces a great degree of autonomy in the governance of their own people. Roman soldiers had no such authority, unless it came from the Roman government, which Douglas has not one bit of evidence, again, with which to support his claims.

Neither does Douglas have any evidence to support his claim that Paul persecuted “thousands” of people, for the New Testament accounts give no specific number, unless he read such a number in the Talmud. Douglas, writing a novel, needn’t cite any sources for his statements! Neither does Douglas document his claim that “many of them” were “mere children”, which the New Testament account contradicts. Like a government prosecutor and a satanic Jewish false accuser, Douglas just piles up the charges against Paul, offering no documentation, no proof, no witnesses, and many contradictions! The government awes juries with stature and authority. Who shall Clayton Douglas likewise deceive?

<Section #15> Clay Douglas states: “*Paul/Saul claimed that he had a vision in which the crucified Jesus came to him (along with 500 other witnesses). As a result of this strange experience, Saul convinced others that he was now a ‘disciple’ of the Master Teacher, Esu ...*”

In reply to section **<#15>**: Now I am absolutely convinced of one thing: Clayton Douglas is ignorant of many things, and probably because he simply can’t read! When this paper was first published, in *Watchman’s Teaching Letter #92*, Clifton Emahiser inserted a remark on page 1, where H. Graber badly misquoted Eusebius, concerning Graber’s reading skills, saying “My God! - Can’t H. Graber read?” It is evident to me that all Paul-bashers are blind as bats! Here Douglas says that Paul claimed 500 witnesses had seen Paul’s vision on the road to Damascus. Did Paul claim that 500 witnesses had seen his vision? The only place in all of Paul’s writing which mentions “five hundred” is at 1 Corinthians 15:6. Just look under “five” in Strong’s *Concordance* to find out as much. Now let us read 1 Cor. 15:3-6 from the A.V. to see what Paul meant:

“³ For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; ⁴ And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures: ⁵ And that he was seen of Cephas, then

of the twelve: ⁶ After that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep.”

Nothing about Damascus, nothing about Paul’s vision. He only relates here to the Corinthians what he himself had been told, “**that which I also received**”, about the events surrounding Christ’s resurrection and appearance to the disciples, for which see Matt. 28:9-20; Luke 24:13-53 and John 20:11-21:35 for partial accounts. If Clayton Douglas **can** read, then he’s a mere liar, take your pick!

Here we shall continue to address Clayton Douglas’ article *The Seduction: Judeo-Christianity Or Pauline Christianity? Saul of Tarsus: Paul. A different view*. Hopefully I have already long established that Douglas’ “different view” of Paul has been seen through some awfully distorted lenses. Yet Douglas’ distortions must be addressed because his article, like H. Graber’s, is very well representative of the trash being circulated by Paul-bashers everywhere. It was obvious that much of H. Graber’s material was drawn from jewish sources, and as I have shown (see section [#7](#)) that Paul of Tarsus taught what we today call “Israel Identity”, and he also exposed the “jews” as Edomites (Romans 9), why wouldn’t they (the jews) want to hate him? Why wouldn’t they want to trick us into disregarding him? It is also obvious that much of Clayton Douglas’ thinking also follows jewish lines. Douglas, following the jews, believes that the gospels were originally written in Aramaic, which is a downright lie: they were originally written in Greek. Douglas uses judaized appellations for Christ, such as “Esu” and “Sananda.” And although I didn’t address it specifically, Douglas even defends the one apostle who was a jew, whom Christ Himself identified as a devil and a traitor, as if he may have been but some innocent pawn (see section [#13](#))! Douglas, like the jews, denies that Yahshua Christ was the Messiah (section [#4](#))! Douglas’ penchant for jewish thought shall be further evident as we proceed, but here I would like to put all Paul-bashers everywhere on notice: reexamine your thinking, because you are all mere puppets and proselytes of and for the jews, therefore aiding and abetting them in their satanic agenda!

<Section #16> Clay Douglas states: “*Paul’s own words bring us a sense of his strange experience. First, Paul/Saul said there were people with him who heard the voice and saw the bright light.*

“*Now as he journeyed he approached Damascus, and suddenly a light from heaven flashed about him. And he fell to the ground and heard a voice saying to him, ‘Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me?’ And he said, ‘Who are you, Lord?’ And he said, ‘I am Jesus, whom you are persecuting; but rise and enter the city, and you will be told what you are to do. The men who were traveling with him stood speechless, hearing the voice but seeing no one’ (Acts 9:3-19; [sic 3-7] RSV)*

“*But, then, later Paul’s experience changes – according to his own words:*

“*Now those who were with me saw the light but did not hear the voice of the one who was speaking to me.’ (Acts 22:9-13; RSV)*

“*This time the witnesses hear no voice, but they do see the light. But – hold on – Paul’s experience changes yet again.*

“*When Paul addresses King Agrippa, the witnesses hear nothing, they see nothing, and the vision becomes Paul’s alone.*

“At midday, O King, I saw on the way a light from heaven, brighter than the sun, shining round me and those who journeyed with me. And when we had all fallen to the ground, I heard a voice saying to me in the Hebrew language...” (Acts 26:13-14; RSV)

“... Paul’s vision continues to mutate subtly. By the end of the metamorphosis, Paul has become Al Pacino – the megastar in his newly developing screenplay.

“... By the time of Galatians, Paul’s authority has grown beyond measure. He is now an ‘apostle’, and he proclaims his standing as, Nazarite, one chosen before his birth as a Prophet of God. No one may challenge his position, no one may challenge his authority, Paul has taken it beyond the realm of man into an arena which no one dare question.”

In reply to section <#16>: A critic may read two different versions of the “Sermon on the Mount”, given at Matt. chapters 5-7 and Luke chapter 6, and claim fraud because the records aren’t identical. Yet rather we have two different note-takers, each recording individually the parts which impressed him most, and so we have two different accounts of the same sermon. Not having the technology that we have today, even in manual writing, such was a tedious process to the ancients, and so unlike today, precise accounts of speeches unwritten beforehand are very rare. There is historical evidence that various forms of shorthand were used in the Roman Senate about this time, yet we can hardly expect that of the pastoral folk of Galilee.

Paul gives three accounts of the “Road to Damascus” event, the last given many years after the first. Can we expect them to be the same, word for word? Of course not! Over the years, different aspects of an event are more lasting in the memory, while other details fade into oblivion. And each time Paul relates the event, it is someone else (here either Luke or someone Luke obtained the record from) who is recording it! Is the recorder really reporting everything which Paul said on each of the three occasions? Or is it more likely that, as was customary at the time, only a synopsis was given in each of the three records? Of course each record is only a synopsis, and we should not force a higher standard upon Paul than we would upon any other ancient writer, and the same goes for Luke. Luke, the typically exacting historian (see Luke 3:1), certainly saw no conflict in the three accounts, and may well have rectified one if he did, having every opportunity to do so since he wrote them!

Yet comparing the A.V. or the R.S.V. translations of Acts 9:7 and 22:9, I can see where there would be a cause for concern regarding the validity of the account, for there does seem to be an irreconcilable discrepancy there: **in English**. It is commonly professed by most people in various factions of what we term “Israel Identity”, that there are many errant translations found in the A.V. and other versions of the Bible. While Douglas cites the R.S.V. here, referring to Acts 9:7 and 22:9, that version does virtually no better than the A.V. in many respects, for Acts 22:9 is poorly translated in both. I have checked other versions of Acts 22:9, such as the *New Living Translation*, and they are worse still! It can be demonstrated time and again that theologians have written what they think the Greek says, and just as often what they think that the Greek **should** say, and claim to be offering fair translations! Because all of our Bible versions are so polluted, to one extent or another, one shouldn’t dare to judge any Bible passage critically unless one can, as Paul attests, “prove all things”, making trial of them for one’s self!

The first half of Acts 22:9, which I have translated “And they who were with me surely beheld the light”, is not an issue here. The second half, which I have translated “but for the voice they did not understand that being spoken to me”, is in the NA27 Greek: τὴν δὲ φωνὴν οὐκ ἤκουσαν τοῦ λαλοῦντός μοι, and is consistent among all ancient mss.

- δὲ, “but”, marks the beginning of a new clause here, being a conjunctive Particle with adversative force. It is always placed as the second word in the clause, and so follows the Article τὴν here.

- τὴν φωνὴν, “the voice”, in the Accusative Case which marks it as the direct object of the verb here. I have supplied “for”, just as with the Genitive Case “of” or “from” often must be supplied, or “to” or “with” with the Dative Case. φωνή (phonê, 5456) may have been written “sound” here, and such is evident since it was translated as such in the A.V. at Matt. 24:31; John 3:8; 1 Cor. 14:7, 8; Rev. 1:15; 9:9 (twice) and 18:22.

- οὐκ is the negative Particle, “not” here. It precedes that which it negates.

- ἤκουσαν is a 3rd person plural form of ἀκούω, “to hear ... to hearken ... to listen to, give ear to ... to obey ... to hear and understand” (Liddell & Scott), and this last sense is used often in the N.T. For instance, where Christ is attributed as saying at Matt. 13:9 “Who hath ears to hear, let him hear”, the verb is ἀκούω both times it says “hear.” Yet it is clear from the context that everyone present heard His words physically, and certainly they all had physical ears, yet there were probably many present who did not understand what He said. The same verb is repeated twice again in Matt. 13:13, accompanied with another word which does literally mean “understand”, and so the physical acts of hearing, and hearing with understanding, may be both represented by the same word, lest how could one “hearing ... hear not”?

Now if Luke wanted to write, or if Paul wanted to say, that the men present with him physically “heard not the voice”, he may well have stopped right here, for he has said enough! By continuing, Paul explicitly reveals his intended meaning.

- τοῦ λαλοῦντός is a Participle form, Imperfect tense, of the verb αλέω, “to speak” or “to talk.” With the Article it is a Substantive, a group of words used as a noun. The form of both the Participle and the Article here is either Masculine or Neuter, yet there is no personal pronoun present, i.e. “him” in the A.V. or “the one who” in the R.S.V., and the writer or speaker may easily have included one if he wanted to explicitly state as much. Rather, the phrase may just as properly, and perhaps more so for want of the personal pronoun, be written “that being spoken.”

- μοι, the last word is “to me.”

And so the way in which I have rendered this verse is quite proper, and there is **no conflict** with Paul’s earlier statement at Acts 9:7. Indeed the men with him heard the voice, or the sound (φωνή), but did not hear with understanding what the sound had said!

Yet Douglas creates conflict even when none can be detected! For he says: “When Paul addresses king [sic] Agrippa, the witnesses hear nothing, they see nothing, and the vision becomes Paul’s alone”, yet no such thing is found at Acts 26! The simple truth is that Paul did not relate, or maybe he did but Luke did not record, what those with him saw or heard, because to repeat it here was not important! So again, like

a government prosecutor, Douglas manufactures charges hoping to further impress or awe the jury into favoring his indictment.

Douglas also states that Paul “*proclaims his standing as, Nazirite [sic], one chosen before his birth as a Prophet of God*”. First, **did** Paul do such a thing? The words Nazarite or Nazarene appear nowhere in the A.V. in Paul’s letters, or in the Acts, except at Acts 24:5, and this is the same word that pertaining to Christ also appears at Acts 2:22; 3:6; 4:10; 6:14; 22:8 and 26:9 and is translated “of Nazareth” at those places in the A.V. The Strong’s number for the word is 3480, but under “Nazareth” Strong misidentified many of the entries there with #3478, and the sources I am using here instead are the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 27th edition, and the Moulton-Geden *Concordance To The Greek Testament*. Except for Acts 24:5, the word appears in Acts only in reference to Christ (in the A.V. “of Nazareth”), and nowhere do these words appear in any of Paul’s epistles, not even Galatians, which Douglas clearly suggests. Why is Douglas lying?

Because “the sect of the Nazarenes” is mentioned at Acts 24:5, let us examine that verse, from the A.V.: “For we have found this man a pestilent *fellow*, and a mover of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world, and a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes.” So we find that in the one place that the word is used of Paul, it is used by the jews accusing him before the procurator Felix. Now Douglas joins the jews and accuses Paul again!

Yet it can be further determined that there was indeed a sect by this name, and that they were persecuted by the jews. For writing about Herod Agrippa I (who ruled Judaea under the Romans until he died in 44 A.D.) in the days of Claudius Caesar (emperor, 41-54 A.D.), and so some time before Paul was brought to Felix (procurator in Judaea from 52 to 56 A.D.), Josephus states at *Antiquities* 19.6.1 (19:292-294): “He also came to Jerusalem and offered all the sacrifices that belonged to him, and omitted nothing which the law required; on which account he ordained that many of the Nazirites [sic] should have their heads shorn.” A footnote in my copy of “The King James Study Bible”, Thomas Nelson Inc., at Acts 24:5 correctly states that “The **Jews** would not call the believers Christians, the people of the Christ (Messiah). They used other terms like **the sect of the Nazarenes**. This nickname was derived from [that of] Jesus’ hometown of Nazareth” [emphasis in original, brackets mine].

The Nazarites or Nazarenes of New Testament times were followers of Christ, as identified by the non-believing jews of Judaea. While prophetically Christ’s being raised in Nazareth, that He may be called a Nazarite, has a symbolic connection to the Nazarites of the Old Testament (see Matt. 2:23), in reality being a follower of Christ, a “Nazarite” in New Testament times, is not the same as being an Old Testament Nazarite (see Num. 6:1-21), as Douglas infers above. So again, where Douglas condemns Paul, an investigation of his accusations clears Paul’s good name fully, and it is Douglas who is condemned instead!

<Section #17> Clay Douglas states: “... Saul promptly changed his name to Paul to disguise himself as a deserter from the Roman army, and to fool other disciples of Esu, who had been his enemies. Though he had access to Esu’s original scrolls stolen from Judas Iscarioth, ... Paul twisted purposefully twisted [sic] these teachings of Truth ... Paul began traveling from place to place, proclaiming the teachings of Esu. Even Esu’s closest followers were fooled into believing what the ‘new missionary’ taught. Through financial assistance of his Pharisee friends in Jerusalem, Paul set out on his first ‘missionary’ journey, teaching his twisted version of Esu’s new teachings of ‘truth.’ During his life he made three major missionary journeys through the countries bordering the east and north shores of the Mediterranean Sea, even as far east [sic west] as Italy. Everywhere he traveled, Paul established groups of believers he called churches. Those more commonly known churches were Jerusalem, Ephesus, Antioch, Corinth, Colassae [sic], Thessalonica, Philippi, Laodicea, Galatia, Athens, and Rome.”

In reply to section **<#17>**: It is evident that Paul did not change his name, as explained in section **<#10>** of this response. It is also a certainty that Paul was never in the Roman army, for which see sections **<#12>** and **<#13>** of this response. Now furthermore I must ask, what sort of man would desert an army after committing a series of infamous deeds, change his name to hide his desertion, as Douglas so forthrightly alleges, yet go around admitting that he was the perpetrator of the very deeds he is hiding from? Oh, Paul’s admissions are recorded at Acts 22:4-5, 26:11, and he admits it in his own hand at Gal. 1:13 and 23 and at 1 Tim. 1:12-13. His actions were admitted indirectly at Acts 9, described at Acts 8, and it is explained that the Christians knew who he was and of his conversion in Acts 9. Those same Christians treated him respectfully at Acts 15! And they surely knew who he was, lest Douglas expects us to think of them as idiots, as he obviously thinks his own readers are. How can a man be fleeing from what he is at the same time admitting? And while he spoke many languages and had the capacity to travel, he stayed in Judaea! Why wouldn’t those who disputed with him at Antioch not simply turn him in to the Roman authorities if he were a deserter, rather than send him to let him plead his case to the Christian elders at Jerusalem? And when he prevailed he returned to Antioch, and was accepted! (Acts 15). The plot to Douglas’ novel makes no sense at all, and it’s Douglas’ story which contains all sorts of conflicts and discrepancies, not Paul’s! If Douglas believes that anyone who has actually studied the Bible and history could accept any of his garbage, he must be an idiot!

Yet Douglas’ script becomes even more fantastic. While I ignored some of his sub-plots when responding at section **<#13>**, I won’t ignore them here: “*he [Paul] had access to Esu’s original scrolls stolen from Judas Iscarioth.*” Now if Yahshua Christ, “Esu” as Douglas calls Him, had “*original scrolls*”, how does Douglas have this information? Where is their existence recorded? Why didn’t Matthew mention them? or James, or Mark, or Peter? Why didn’t John, who lived at least 30 years after Paul was killed, tell us about them? Why didn’t Jude tell us about them? Because they never existed! If Douglas could tell us something material concerning any such writings, he would have already, but he can’t, so he didn’t! Either he is inventing such scrolls to suit his own purpose, or he repeats someone else’s lies because it suits his purpose! Clayton Douglas, I challenge you: offer substantial evidence from antiquity concerning the existence of these scrolls! Or, you are a liar! Or is your source perhaps some unprovable passage found in the Talmud or Gnostic ‘gospels’? And no wonder you

haven't already revealed it! Yet if you choose to withhold it, you are a liar: an inventor of tales!

Nearly every one of my claims concerning ancient history are accompanied by a reference to some ancient writer (i.e. Strabo) and a number referring to book, chapter and paragraph (i.e. 11.3.3 for the relationship of the Iberians to the Scythians). Now with some writers I don't name a work, because only one work from each has survived, i.e. Herodotus' *Histories* or Strabo's *Geography*. Where I cite a writer who has more than one book surviving, I name it, i.e. Josephus' *Antiquities* or *Wars*. All of this should be self-evident, being normal scholarly practice, and often my writing cites articles in archaeology magazines or more recent books as sources for my contentions. I would stake my reputation upon one thing, that if you would go to a decent library you would find some translation of Strabo, Josephus, Herodotus, Euripides, or whoever (and they are all currently published by Harvard University Press and others), and find the section which I cite, and that I have quoted or paraphrased it accurately. Clayton Douglas makes many, many statements which would be new to many readers, and he cites no one at all. If he isn't getting his unique account of history from somewhere, he can only be inventing it!

Furthermore, notice above, that Douglas does acknowledge the generally recognized fact that it was Paul of Tarsus who traveled throughout the Roman world establishing Christian assemblies, where Douglas states: "*Paul established groups of believers he called churches. Those more commonly known churches were Jerusalem, Ephesus, Antioch, Corinth, Colassae [sic], Thessalonica, Philippi, Laodicea, Galatia, Athens, and Rome*". This admission will be referred to in Paul's defense later in this exposition.

<Section #18> Clay Douglas states: "*... Paul avoided many of the Laws of God. Indeed, most of the time, Paul made God's Laws 'of no effect.' In other words, he simply neutralized them. For example, Paul taught the escaping of personal responsibility by believing in salvation from one's sins through 'God's Son' dying as a ransom for one's sins. The idea of a 'rapture' probably began with Paul, the waiting for 'Jesus Christ' to return in the clouds and the snatching up of his faithful believers and taking them to 'heaven' to live happily ever after. Paul's writings of lies were so widely accepted that by 323 AD at the Council of Nicea the Pharisees placed many of them into the 'Cannonized [sic] Bible' of the day. Some of these writings today are known as Romans, I and II Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and I and II Thessalonians. These writings were letters of instructions to the 'churches' which Paul had established at various locations during his missionary travels.*"

In reply to section **<#18>**: It is so easy to be shown a passage or two, take them out of context, and use them to write a blanket condemnation of any writer, not only Paul, which is precisely what Douglas has done here. It is clear to me that either Douglas can't read (and that has already been established here, in section **<#15>** explicitly), or at least Douglas hasn't read Paul completely. On page 13 above, in my response to the Paul-bashing H. Graber at section **<J>**, I have covered similar accusations against Paul concerning the law at length. It is clear that Paul said that we do **not** make void the law through faith, but rather as Christians we seek to establish the law. We do not seek to establish the legalism of the Pharisees, which Christ condemned

and which has encompassed us again today in all of the modern governmental regulations (i.e. IRS, OSHA, EPA, DOE, ATF, etc. ad nauseum), nor do we seek to reestablish the Levitical ordinances of purification ritual and sacrifices, which as a matter of prophecy were done away with, the “works of the law” nailed to the cross. Rather we seek to establish the law which, as prophesied, Yahweh has inscribed on the hearts of the children of Israel, encompassed in the ten commandments and the warnings against fornication (race-mixing), and the admonition to be a separate people: all things which the jews have campaigned against unceasingly since we allowed them to dwell among us! Illustrating these things above in section [<J>](#), I cited Romans 3:31; Deut. 30:6; Isa 51:7; Jer. 4:4; 31:31- 33; 32:39-40; and Ezek. 11:19-20. Then further on in that section, continuing the same response, it is shown that Paul’s position on the law does not conflict in any way with the positions of James or Peter in their epistles. Doing this I compared Romans 2:13-15, 25; 14:10; Gal. 2:4; 5:1-3, 13-14; James 1:22-25; 2:10, 12; 4:11-12; 1 Pet. 2:15-16 and 2 Pet 2:1, 19. Anyone who condemns Paul’s position on the law does so in ignorance, not knowing what is written in the law itself, or in the prophets.

Christ intends to fulfill both the law and the prophets, as the Paul-bashers love to point out (Matt. 5:17), and these writings of the prophets which tell us that under the New Covenant the children of Israel would follow the law of Yahweh “having been inscribed not with ink but with the Spirit of the living Yahweh; not on tablets of stone, but on fleshly tablets of heart” (2 Cor. 3:3) are certainly a part of what Christ came to fulfill, and so we find that the actions of Paul are one with the intentions of Christ! Douglas chides Paul for being a Pharisee, yet Douglas follows the Pharisees! For the Pharisees being legalists, couldn’t bear to part with the traditions of the elders, which Christ condemned (Matt. 15, Mark 7), and their presumed expertise in all the matters of Mosaic Law, and so the Pharisees condemned Paul for wanting to do away with those things (i.e. Acts 18:12-15; 21:20-26; 21:28 et al.), just as the Paul-bashers do today. Here it is proven! The Paul-bashers, accusing Paul of evil for being a Pharisee, themselves are followers of the Pharisees! And that Paul was following the true way of Christ is evident, for we see that the same charges which the jews had leveled against Paul they had also leveled against the martyr Stephen! (Acts 6:13). So the Paul-bashers are followers of the jews, and Paul was a follower of Christ, “believing all things which are written in the law and the prophets” (Acts 24:14). Why don’t the Paul-bashers believe everything written in the prophets? Because they follow the jews, who claimed to know the scripture, yet time and again they were reprovved by scripture! (Matt. 21:42; 22:49).

Clayton Douglas has, and properly, credited Paul of Tarsus with the founding of the “churches” (properly “assemblies”) of several places throughout the Greco-Roman world, which he lists at section [<#17>](#) though I didn’t fully address the issue there. Here, Clayton Douglas properly credits Paul with having written letters to several of those assemblies, letters still with us today. Among the assemblies which Paul is credited as having founded are those at Ephesus and Laodicea. While there is no surviving epistle of Paul to the Laodiceans, they are given mention at Colossians 2:1 and 4:13-16. Can we tell, from the Bible, that the assemblies at Ephesus and Laodicea were valid Christian assemblies? No one else is recorded in any place as having founded Christian assemblies in these cities! It is to be noticed that Peter wrote to the

assemblies of Asia, and all these places, Ephesus, Laodicea and Colossae, were in the Roman province of Anatolia called Asia. Yet there is more than this.

In the Revelation of Yahshua Christ as recorded by John, there is a message to the assembly at Ephesus, which Paul founded. They were admonished for having left their “first love”, which must have been the form of Christianity which Paul brought to them, since Paul founded the assembly! So Yahshua Christ Himself testifies of the good work of Paul by His very message to this assembly. Now while the Ephesians were also praised for having rejected false apostles, this can’t mean Paul, because Paul was the first founder of the assembly, and Paul warned the Ephesians of this same thing prior to his arrest in Jerusalem (Acts 20:17-38). This message to the assembly at Ephesus is at Revelation 2:1-7. There is also a message for the assembly at Laodicea at Revelation 3:14-22. Since only Paul founded these assemblies, as Douglas admits, then the very fact alone that Yahshua Christ considers these assemblies recognizes the validity of their founding and existence as a part of His purpose! And so Paul’s work was good, and Christian! Clayton Douglas and the rest of the Paul-bashers are blind for not seeing these things, their eyes beset with the thorns of the Canaanites (Num 33:55; Josh. 23:13; Jdgs. 3:2), the jews of today.

Were there “Pharisees” at the Council of Nicaea? Christians were persecuted throughout Roman history, from the days of Claudius and Nero right up to the days of Diocletian, who persecuted Christians heavily, and who was emperor until 305 A.D. The danger of persecution did not end until the rule of Constantine was fully secured in 324 A.D., and this is apparent even though his edict of Milan in 313 A.D. made Christianity lawful. Pagans hostile to Christianity succeeded to the throne even after Constantine, though it was not again persecuted. While it cannot be proven one way or another that Nicaea was void of men of Canaanite stock, nor can it be disproven, it is very unlikely that any learned jew (i.e., a Pharisee) would have infiltrated Christianity and risked his life for it. The men who attended Nicaea were Christian bishops recently come out from the underground from across the empire! That “judaizers”, legalists who like the Pharisees would bind men to the Mosaic law and rituals, were despised is apparent in the writings of early Christians such as Eusebius. It is not likely that any of the men at Nicaea were jews, or Pharisees.

While the men at Nicaea were not perfect, we certainly cannot blame Paul, who died over 260 years prior, for any of their mistakes! And we certainly can’t blame Paul for the Romish catholic church, or even the men at Nicaea, since that beast didn’t begin to take its shape until the time of Justinian in 528 A.D. Yet that the letters of Paul were universally accepted by the men at Nicaea, who had endured so many persecutions in the face of the jews and the Pagans, and that Paul was also accepted by the Celtic Church, which had existed long before Nicaea and was a totally separate entity from the assemblies of the Mediterranean regions, is absolutely indisputable evidence that Paul’s mission and epistles and teachings were valid and ordained by Yahweh.

<Section #19> Clay Douglas states: “... *Paul tells much about his persecutions and trials during these missionary years. He claimed he was beaten, arrested, and placed in prison many times. Finally, in Rome, Paul was arrested and put into prison. He died in Rome nearly blind and while under house arrest. While reading these tales of Paul’s travels the reader is enticed to feel sorry for Paul and angry at his persecutors. This is all part of the Lie.*”

In reply to section **<#19>**: Paul and Barnabas were persecuted by jews at Pisidian Antioch in Anatolia (Acts 13:50), at Iconium (Acts 14:2), and at Lystra (Acts 14:19). Paul was likewise pursued in Thessalonica (Acts 17:4-9) and at Berea (17:13-14). Paul was also persecuted by jews in Corinth (Acts 18:17) and by silversmiths at Ephesus who appear to be pagan Greeks, but not necessarily (Acts 18:24-41). Throughout these accounts the jews always enlisted the common people to their cause by some device, just as Douglas does in his article! The jews (Judaean in Jerusalem who rejected Christ, which all Edomites did though many of these may yet have been blind Israelites) seized Paul in Jerusalem and beat him, and plotted and attempted to kill him (Acts 21-23), and jews testified against him before the Roman authorities (Acts 24-25). We have an unbroken tradition, from Acts 6 down through all the early church writers such as Tertullian (*Apology* 21.18, 21.25), that the jews were behind the persecutions of all Christians, and of course that of Christ Himself! When Clayton Douglas talks about Paul’s persecutions, and scoffs at them saying “*this is all part of the Lie*”, who is Clayton Douglas defending? The jews! Clayton Douglas, follower of the jews, defender of the jews, champion of the jews! No wonder he attempts to let Judas the traitor off as some poor unsuspecting patsy (see his comments at section **<#13>**)! I’m beginning to wonder whether there’s a yarmulke under his motorcycle helmet! (Douglas dons such a helmet in a photo of himself on page 5 of his December, 2003 *Free American Newsmagazine*).

As we continue to address Clayton Douglas’ article *The Seduction: Judeo-Christianity Or Pauline Christianity? Saul of Tarsus: Paul. A different view*, I do hope that up to this point where Douglas’ article has been addressed, his deceit has already been exposed, and his lies and his fraud are fully exhibited. Yet all of Douglas’ articles about Paul must be addressed, as all of H. Graber’s article was addressed, for an exhibition to Paul-bashers everywhere, that their assertions are vain, and based upon nothing but lies and misunderstandings, and that Paul of Tarsus was a true and noble man, an Israelite fulfilling the tasks which were given him to do. While I have not mentioned it until now, the irony of Douglas’ title to his first Paul-bashing article, published in the December 2003 issue of his *Free American Newsmagazine*, has certainly not escaped me. Douglas would on one hand criticize the jews, and on the other use jewish sources to bash Paul. Then Douglas would offer “Judeo-Christianity” as an alternative in place of Paul, as if somehow judaism and Christianity could ever be compatible with one another in the first place! And he does this even though he himself admitted “*the fact that Judeo-Christianity is almost an oxymoron*”, which I’ve already discussed here on p. 33, in the introduction to these Douglas articles. This is only further confirmation that Clayton Douglas is not a clear thinker, since his statements are full of conflicting thoughts, and his ideas consistently clash with one another. For my part, I will esteem the teachings of Paul, and reject not only “Judeo-Christianity”, but all the attacks by the jews against Truth.

<Section #20> Clay Douglas states: ***“THE LIES.*** *In Paul’s letters (and teachings), he passionately reminds people over and over again that he is NOT a liar and that he does not lie. The God and Father of the Lord Jesus, he who is blessed forever, knows that I do not lie. (II Corinthians. 11:31-33). In what I am writing to you, before God, I do not lie! (Galatians 1:15-20) For this I was appointed, a preacher and apostle (I am telling the truth, I am not lying), a teacher of the gentiles in faith and truth (1 Timothy 2:7). I am speaking the truth in Christ, I am not lying; my conscience bears witness in the Holy Spirit that I have great sorrow and unceasing anguish in my heart. For I could wish that I myself were accursed and cut off from Christ for the sake of my brethren, my kinsmen by race (Romans 9:1-3).”*

“So, is Paul lying...or not? *If it is a lie, and you accuse me of lying, I will be forced to respond with a denial because a lie cannot and will not speak for itself. The things that motivated me to lie will motivate me to deny my lie. Then, feeling the weakness of my position, I look for something more! What more can I do? I must call forth a witness, so that you have not only my testimony, but also that of another. The scripture plainly states that everything is established at the mouth of two or three witnesses. You may have me pegged for a liar, but perhaps you will believe someone else. But on whom can I call on such short notice? To be effective, I must have a witness now! Not only so, but my witness must be a person of undisputed veracity, for it will not do to call on a reputed liar. Whose testimony would you accept immediately without question? Who? Who? Who? Ah! There is only one person right for my task ... God in heaven!*

“So, who is Paul’s witness? *(It is) understand that Paul’s denials do not constitute proof that he was lying. Many have denied in an ‘off the cuff’ manner when accused of lying, even though they were truthful. Children react this way when they accuse one another, and they frequently call on some higher authority to witness for them: ‘If you don’t believe me, ask my dad.’ They, being children, don’t think of the implications of denial, although they would understand them if they paused to reflect before responding. They may even establish a habit of denial that persists into adulthood and there continue to deny through force of habit. Perhaps we have all done it. But we are not dealing here with children or with flippant responses in face-to-face encounters. Paul was writing letters under circumstances that should have provided opportunity for reflection. I visualize him in the home of some disciple, or in prison late at night after all others have retired, sitting before the dim light of a flickering oil lamp and carefully measuring his words.”*

In reply to section **<#20>**: Here Douglas addresses first century literature, which Paul’s letters are, and criticizes it through the distorted lens of twentieth century psychobabble. Because Paul emphatically states that he is telling the truth, or that he is not lying, then Douglas would have one believe that he must be lying. Douglas’ statements here are a classic example of Jewish “double think”, and as we shall see a little later on in Douglas’ article, of what he has the audacity here to accuse Paul, he practices himself!

Yahweh Himself is recorded as saying through the psalmist “Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me” (Psa. 89:35-36). So according to Douglas’ twisted logic, Yahweh Himself, by denying that He lied, should be considered a liar! Nay, for Paul

proclaims to us, “let Yahweh be true, but every man a liar”! If Clayton Douglas’ assertions are not jewish psychobabble, then he is a mere hypocrite, for holding Paul to a higher standard than Yahweh. Here it is clear that Douglas’ judgment is far from being just.

Douglas also makes much of Paul’s own appeals to Yahweh, accusing Paul of childish tactics, where he attributes to Paul the attitude: “*If you don’t believe me, ask my dad.*” Unlike the scoffer Douglas, there was a time when men took such public appeals to Yahweh seriously, and there are many men who still do. At one time men understood that blasphemy and impiety, along with other sins, were followed by judgment. The English word *crisis* is nothing more than a transliteration of the Greek word κρίσις (2920), which means *judgment*. There are still some men around who understand this.

We should examine the words of Paul at Galatians 1:15-20 in light of the statements of Yahshua Christ at John 5:19-38, where Yahshua asserts that He is True, and that it is Yahweh the Father who bears witness of Him. Yahshua Christ also uttered assertions that He was telling the truth in His statements, as recorded at Luke 4:25; 9:27; 12:44; 21:3; John 8:31-32, 40, 45-47; 14:6 and 18:37. Was Yahshua Christ lying? Certainly not! And neither was Paul, whom we should measure with the same standard. But since Clayton Douglas does not measure Paul with the same standard, then if he isn’t employing jewish psychobabble, he’s merely a hypocrite! My assertion would be that both elements are true.

Furthermore, Douglas admitted that Paul was “*in Rome nearly blind ... while under house arrest*” (see section [#19](#) on p. 64), yet here envisions Paul alone, writing by candlelight late at night. Yet how could this be? It is true that Paul was nearly blind, which shall soon be discussed here at length. And so Paul never wrote alone, for someone else always did the actual writing for him. Sufficient evidence of this is found at Romans 16:22; 1 Cor. 16:21; Gal. 6:11; Col. 4:18 and 2 Thess. 3:17. Can Clay Douglas get **any** of his story straight?

<Section #21> Clay Douglas states: “*The Truth of the matter is that Paul/Saul was a Pharisee, known today as a Khazarian Zionist. From the beginning of time their philosophy and life-style has never changed. They use anyone and everyone for their purposes as set forth in the Protocols of Zion. Paul was no exception. Paul WAS persecuted, but - reportedly - not for the reasons you think. Many sources claim that Paul/Saul was a latent homosexual.*”

In reply to section **<#21>**: With this short paragraph, Douglas once again openly displays his shameful lack of knowledge both of Scripture and of history. This last irrational diatribe to come from the pen of Douglas demonstrates he has not the ability to comprehend what he reads, and the reader should thus take caution when reading anything of Douglas’.

Was Paul a Khazar? The Khazars were at one time an Adamic people, who dwelt north and east of the Caspian Sea (modern Kazakhstan), far removed from Paul’s world both in time and place. The later Khazar monuments show an admixture with the Hittite, for which see Clifton Emahiser’s *Watchman Teaching Letter #56*, p. 3, col. A., par. 4. They were converted to Judaism beginning in the seventh century A.D., centuries after Paul’s death. By no means may Paul be associated with these people. Was Paul a Zionist? *The American Heritage College Dictionary* defines zionism: “A

Jewish movement that arose in the late 19th century in response to growing Anti-Semitism [sic] and sought to reestablish a Jewish homeland in Palestine and that now concerns itself with the survival and development of the state of Israel [sic].” Can Paul be blamed for these policies? Certainly not! Rather, he taught that the Edomite-jews in Judaea were the enemy, and that they were destined to be destroyed (Rom. 9:1-13, 21-23), that the enemy had taken over the temple (2 Thess. 2), and that the Romans were to participate in their destruction (Rom. 16:20), **hardly a Zionist position!** The statements in the New Testament records concerning Paul of Tarsus are consistently opposed to Clayton Douglas’ claims concerning him. One can only wonder whether Douglas ever actually sat and read the book.

Yet most vile are Douglas’ claims concerning Paul’s sexuality: *“Many sources claim that Paul/Saul was a latent homosexual.”* Note his use of the term “many sources”, as if that alone made his statement authoritative. Note also the use of the term “latent”, of which the basic definition, again from *The American Heritage College Dictionary*, is: “1. Present or potential but not evident or active.” I must say, all men have such potential! And so in reality the term is meaningless. Yet the dictionary continues: “2. *Pathology* In a dormant or hidden stage ... 4. *Psychology* Present in the unconscious mind but not consciously expressed.” In truth “latent homosexual” is a term invented by those same purveyors of psychobabble, who seek to have such behavior to be considered “normal”, and who slander all men with that and other artificial terms such as “homophobic” if one dares to speak out against such deviancy. Was Paul a “latent”, or any other type, of homosexual? Certainly not! Yet this, along with Douglas’ source for such a slanderous remark, will be discussed further below, after we finish hearing from Douglas on the issue. First, Douglas intermixes several other topics with this vile claim, and they also must be addressed.

<Section #22> Clay Douglas states: *“Nothing good dwells in me, that is, in my flesh. I can will what is right, but I cannot do it.” - Romans 7:18 (Paul of Tarsus). While Paul’s impact on the world is clear, the issue of his sexuality is not. He was responsible for two of the three New Testament texts specifically interpreted in the modern period as condemnation of homosexuality, and for the only reference in the Bible taken to refer explicitly to lesbianism. He was an intense, passionate man filled with tremendous self-loathing. Read some of his words: ‘I pummel my body and subdue it lest after preaching to others. [sic] I myself should be disqualified.’ - I Corinthians 9:27.”*

In reply to section **<#22>**: It is clear from the record: Paul taught that self-control over one’s lusts and emotions was a necessity (i.e. Acts 24:25, where ἐγκράτεια, 1466, which means “self-control”, was translated “temperance” in the A.V. The word also appears at Gal. 5:23, and twice at 2 Pet. 1:6). Anyone who’s ever read Deuteronomy should know that such self-control was necessary to practice in Old Testament times also! And not only sexual self-control, but also self-control over other facets of general behavior, such as alcohol consumption and public conversation. Yet aside from the lures of drugs or alcohol, which most if not all of us have experienced to one extent or another during our lives, there is the lure of covetousness, or lust, not only for money or property but also for the opposite sex, which we are tempted with daily. The desire for security in our finances leads us to excess, reflected by the stock market bubbles of the 1920’s and 1990’s, manifestations of the evils of lust and greed. Our egos cause us to

furnish our lives with all sorts of toys and unnecessary items, and the gross consumerism of western society today leads to our downfall (cf. Ezek. 27, Rev. 18). Yet worse than these things is sexual lust, and sexual lust of any sort! We are bombarded with sexual images daily and from many directions. The same hormones which drive us to marry and have children are triggered by our minds when we succumb to these images, and can cause us to lust. Any man who denies such must be a eunuch! All of these invitations to sin which are available today were also available in the first century, although they weren't as technologically advanced, and these Paul warned about consistently. Where Paul uses himself as an example, at Romans 7:13-25 or at 1 Corinthians 9:19-27, both of which Douglas quotes from here, he is only explaining just how difficult it is even for him to control all of these lusts. We have all, without exception, experienced these lusts! How many of us have gone to the lengths which Paul did, to maintain self-control and suppress them? The issue of Paul's sexuality should not even be called into question here, and it is slanderous to do so. Paul's statements here address things which we have all experienced, once we read them in context, and have nothing at all to do with sexual deviancy, "homosexuality", as the blasphemous Douglas is suggesting, and in the next section of his article continues to suggest, enlisting the help of his icon Bishop Spong!

<Section #23> Clay Douglas states: *"Bishop John Spong had closely analyzed Paul's life and writings. Spong believes Paul's fiery manner of writing was his method of dealing with his own homosexuality. There is much, as Anglican Bishop of Newark John Spong has pointed out, which leads one to suspect Paul might have been 'queer' in some way. The fact he was never married, unusual for a Jew of his time, his companionship with a series of younger men, especially St. Timothy, his mention of an unnamed 'thorn in the flesh', and, possibly, his disdain for some types of exploitative homosexual relationship in his period, all raise questions which cannot be answered it must be admitted, about his sexuality."*

In reply to section <#23>: It is apparent that Douglas has developed many of his ideas about Paul and Christianity from Bishop John Spong. Shortly we shall examine what sort of man this John Spong is, since it is evident that Clayton Douglas is more than a casual reader of Spong's many uncouth works. I must say now, once the truly pious men amongst the Paul-bashers read what we have to present about Spong, surely they'll want to reevaluate **many** of their positions! But first the immediate issues raised here by Douglas must be dealt with.

The liberal (note Isa. 32:5) bloc in this and other western nations, which is actually a motley coalition of deviants, various minority groups, and ignorant do-goody Whites, all led by the communist jews, have long been attacking not only Christianity but all of the pillars and icons of Western civilization. One of their common tactics is to portray a corrupt and decadent portrait of one of our heroes, usually with little or no solid evidence, slandering that hero as some sort of deviant or hypocrite. In that manner, once the masses are convinced by the media, their own decadent behavior is eventually accepted and absorbed into the public perception of "normal". While this is only one method of their attacks on us, it is effective. It is more than a coincidence that the word "devil" in the N.T. in Greek is often διάβολος (1228), which means in truth "false accuser". They did this recently with Thomas Jefferson by claiming that he fathered a

child by a negress. In truth, they knew that the DNA evidence pointed to only one of several dozen possible male Jeffersons of the era as the culprit, but that didn't stop them because they *wanted* it to be Thomas. In reality, the historical evidence points instead to his carousing brother Randolph Jefferson, but the media blitz is long over, the icon is soiled, and the masses will never hear the evidence. Thomas wasn't perfect, but he was no miscegenist. The desired result is only that once enough great White men can be shown to have been miscegenists, why should it remain taboo for the rest of us? Ditto for homosexuality and other deviant practices. This is just one tactic of the communists' culture war against our race, brought to us by deviants and jews, the so-called "intelligentsia".

These vile 'liberals' have a problem with Paul, because Paul made it absolutely, unequivocally clear that sexual deviancy and Christianity have nothing in common, thus being impossible to accept together. And if the deviants cannot be Christians, how can they then corrupt Christianity? Although they've tried for centuries, never could they destroy it from without! So in this modern age they've put forth polluted translations of Scripture, perverting and corrupting the text more and more with each new edition, in order to blur the lines of righteousness and the vision of the readers, circumventing the Truth. Then they destroy the reputation of the writers so that once the truth does come out, it isn't received with credibility in the minds of the masses! Paul, foremost defender of the gospel of Christ, is in this day the foremost target of the jews and the deviants, and all Paul-bashers are their accomplices, **wittingly** or **unwittingly!**

Here are Paul's remarks from his epistles in reference to deviant sexual behavior, which I shall take from my own translation of Paul because I believe that I have rendered the Greek as clearly as possible, which is especially important in these instances:

Romans 1:26-32: ²⁶ Therefore Yahweh handed them over to a state of disgrace, for both their females exchanged their natural intimacy for that contrary to nature, ²⁷ and likewise the males have given up the natural intimacy of the female, inflamed in their desires for one another, males with males perpetrating shamefulness, and their wandering necessitates the reward they are receiving among themselves. ²⁸ And just as they do not think it fit to have Yahweh in their knowledge, Yahweh handed them over to a reprobate mind, to do things not fitting; ²⁹ being filled with all injustice, fornication, greediness, wickedness; full of envy, murder, strife, treachery, malignity, slanderers, ³⁰ loud talkers, haters of Yahweh, insolent, arrogant, pretentious, contrivers of evil, disobedient to parents, ³¹ void of understanding, covenant breakers, heartless, merciless; ³² such as these who knowing the judgments of Yahweh, that they practicing such things are worthy of death, not only they who cause them, but also they approving of those committing them." (The parallels with the apostasy and deviancy of this present time are not coincidental.)

1 Cor. 6:9-10: ⁹ Or do you not know that the unjust will not inherit the kingdom of Yahweh? Do not be led astray: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor homosexuals, ¹⁰ nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor railers, nor rapacious shall inherit the kingdom of Yahweh."

1 Tim. 1:9-11: ⁹ Knowing this, that law is not laid down for righteous, but for lawless and unruly, impious and wrongful, unholy and profane, patricidal and matricidal, murderous, ¹⁰ fornicating, homosexual, kidnapping, lying, falsely swearing men, along

with anything else which is contrary to sound instruction ¹¹ according to the good message of the honor of the Blessed Yahweh, which I have been entrusted with.”

In both cases in which it appears, the word “homosexual” is from the Greek ἁρσενοκοίτης (733), used in this same manner throughout Classical writings. The 9th edition of the Liddell & Scott *Greek English Lexicon* succinctly defines the word “sodomite”. It should also be evident, that the law which Paul referred to at 1 Tim. 1:9 is certainly the Old Testament law, whereby he clearly demonstrated an obeisance to its principles.

While it shall soon be demonstrated that John Spong certainly is a member of the jewish-liberal bloc seeking to corrupt forever our race and civilization, first his remarks above concerning Paul must be addressed. Douglas states that “*Spong believes Paul’s fiery manner of writing was his method of dealing with his own homosexuality*”. This is clearly unprovable, undocumentable psychobabble contrived to be false support for further untrue accusations. It is typical jew calumny. As for Paul’s not marrying, he explains the reasons for such himself at 1 Cor. 9:1-23, not wanting to have any hindrance in the task to which he was assigned: the spreading of the gospel of Christ. How many men have sacrificed carnal desires, wife and family, for God and country and other noble pursuits? Were they all homosexuals? Certainly not! And neither was Paul! Yet I shall resort to another comparison with Yahshua Christ, for neither did He marry! Not accusing Christ, which would certainly be blasphemous, Douglas and Spong are mere hypocrites instead. “Marriage is valuable in every way” wrote Paul (Heb. 13:4), and advised Timothy that bishops and ministers must be married, and have faithful children, since if they couldn’t govern their own families well then they certainly weren’t qualified to govern the household of Yahweh (1 Tim. 3:1-13).

Again, Douglas and Spong accuse Paul of having “*companionship with a series of younger men*”, thereby throwing a blanket accusation of homosexuality over all of the associates of Paul! Calumny indeed! In the laws of Yahweh, which Paul certainly invoked, as quoted above, “If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman ... they shall surely be put to death” (Lev. 20:13, cf. Lev. 18:22; Deut. 23:17), and it is also written that “... if the witness be a false witness, and hath testified falsely against his brother; Then ye shall do unto him, as he had thought to have done unto his brother...”, or in other words, if one makes a false accusation for which the penalty is death, the accuser suffers the penalty instead! I pray that Yahweh grants Douglas and Spong the rewards of their labors, and quickly! Let all the followers of Douglas and Spong consider this, and beware! And again I must say that Yahshua Christ Himself chose out many young men to be His apostles. Douglas and Spong wouldn’t dare accuse Him! So instead, they are again revealed to be hypocrites!

As for Douglas and Spong’s contention concerning Paul’s “unnamed” thorn in the flesh, first we must ask, was it truly unnamed? Surely the jews and liberals would like us to think it was unnamed, so that they can use it as another false support for their attacks on Christianity. Paul mentions his “thorn in the flesh” at 2 Cor. 12:7. This again is from my own translation:

⁷ And in order that I would not be exalted in the excellence of the revelations, a thorn in the flesh has been given to me, an adverse messenger, that it would strike me in order that I would not be exalted. ⁸ Three times I have exhorted the Prince concerning

this, that it may depart from me,⁹ and He told me, ‘My favor is enough for you; since the power is perfected in weakness’” (2 Cor. 12:7-9).

In weakness, not in sodomy! Paul didn’t necessarily have to tell the Corinthians what his “thorn in the flesh was”, for they probably already knew. Paul had spent some time in Corinth (Acts 18) and had written them not only once before (1 Cor.), but at least twice (see 1 Cor. 5:9, 2 Cor. 7:8), and at least one of his letters to them is lost. Yet we must examine something Paul wrote to the Galatians after he had visited them:

“¹³ Now you know that in sickness of the flesh I had announced the good message to you earlier,¹⁴ and of my **trial in my flesh** you did not despise or loathe, but as a messenger of Yahweh you accepted me, like Yahshua Christ.¹⁵ Then what is your blessing? I testify to you that, if possible, your eyes being extracted you would have given them to me.” (Gal. 4:13-15).

Now any honest man, or even a child, can see that Paul’s “thorn in the flesh” was nothing more than his failed eyesight! To make anything more of it is not only dishonest, but purposely slanderous! Spong and his disciple, Clayton Douglas, are both guilty of such deceit!

Writing above, on pages 47-48 in Section 9, while addressing Douglas’ first quote in his article from Bishop Spong, I wondered: “what sort of man could Spong be?” That was back on October 23rd of last year (2005 – this section was first written in February, 2006). Shortly thereafter I was able to obtain some information concerning Spong, and Clifton Emahiser has collected more since then. How little I suspected, that Spong is a much more vile man than I could have imagined back in October! Here it is fitting to divert from our response to Clayton Douglas’ articles to discuss Bishop Spong himself, whom Douglas must have read in depth, and of whom Douglas is a disciple. Once we see – from his own mouth – that John Spong is a lover of negroes and homosexuals – that he is no true Christian but rather a full-blown member of the jewish-led liberal – Communist – deviant – minority bloc who are hell-bent upon destroying our White race and civilization, then the motives of Spong, and perhaps Douglas also, shall become fully manifest. I strongly urge all Paul-bashers everywhere to fully contemplate this review of the life and works of John Spong, which we will begin with some comments and biographical information compiled by Clifton:

In an effort to find all the origins of the phenomenon known today as “Anti-Paulism”, it has led in many unusual directions. We first observed that Paul-bashing was nothing new, for there were many Anti-Paulists during Paul’s own time. The one common characteristic surrounding the attempted refuting of Paul’s writings in all periods of time since Paul is that it appears to have its origin from the bad-fig Judaeans of Rev. 2:9 & 3:9 whom we term as “Jews” today. In pursuit of the “Jewish” connection to this Paul-bashing, which is gaining epidemic proportions, we find that W. G. Finlay from South Africa, a ravenous Paul-basher, based his flawed assumptions on a book *Popes From The Ghetto* by Dr. Joachim Prince, **president of the American Jewish Congress, and chairman of the Conference Of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations**. Finlay also referred to Prince as “**The learned rabbi, who still serves in the Temple Beni-Abram of Newark in New Jersey.**”

As we shall see, this is not the only connection associated with Paul-bashing and Newark, New Jersey. Not that that should be a bad reflection in any way upon any of the good citizens of Adamic-culture from that state. Clayton Douglas’ Paul-bashing

articles in the December 2003 and January 2004 issues of his *Free American News-magazine* state: “*Bishop John S. Spong (Episcopal Bishop of Newark): ‘Paul’s words are not the Words of God. They are the words of Paul - a vast difference!’*” Thus, we have one Paul-basher in the person of Clayton Douglas quoting another Paul-basher in the person of “Bishop John S. Spong”. It is paramount, therefore, to investigate the tenets of this “Bishop John S. Spong” from Newark, New Jersey, which we will now examine. To fully investigate this “Bishop” Spong will be no short task. Anyone who would like to verify what is about to be revealed here can go to the web site:

www.dioceseofnewark.org/jsspong/jssbiog.html

At this web site one will find a biography of John Shelby Spong, and from that biography one can decide if it is advisable and proper to be associated with such an evil person. One will find at this web site that John Shelby Spong is a member of the “House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church in the United States.” No insignificant position, and a vast realm of influence!

Spong was born 1931 at Charlotte, NC; where he also attended public school; graduated from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1952, and received his Master of Divinity from the Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary in Virginia in 1955, which later conferred on him, along with St. Paul’s College, “honorary Doctor of Divinity” degrees. He then served as rector of St. Joseph’s Church in Durham, NC, 1955-1957; rector of Calvary Parish, Tarboro, NC, 1957-1965; rector of St. John’s Church at Lynchburg, VA, 1965-1969; rector of St. Paul’s Church, Richmond, VA, 1969-1976; consecrated bishop June 12, 1976. Spong’s influence has touched a wide variety of official authority serving on committees and commissions. He was editor of *The North Carolina Churchman*; president of the Standing Committee; three times deputy to the General Convention; he has been president of the New Jersey Council of Churches; consultant, Episcopal Radio & Television Foundation; consultant, Standing Liturgical Commission; member, Overseas Review Committee of the national church; elected 1973 to six-year term Executive Council, next highest governing body under the General Convention; appointed by Presiding Bishop Edmond Browning to serve on the Standing Commission on Human Affairs and Health; serves on the House of Bishop’s Theology Committee; elected Quatercentenary Scholar, Emmanuel College, Cambridge University, 1991; guest lecturer, Oxford University, United Kingdom, 1993. Also, Spong takes an active interest in sports, including play-by-play radio announcer for stations in Tarboro, NC and Lynchburg, VA for the three major sports; also serving as sports editor for the *Daily Southerner* at Tarboro.

In addition to the above web site, one might also check the web sites:

www.dioceseofnewark.org/jsspong/reform.html

www.dioceseofnewark.org/antiracistmothers.html

newark.rutgers.edu/~lcrew/spong_cv.html

www.dioceseofnewark.org/jsspong/profile.html

[End of Clifton’s compilation of Spong’s biographical information.]

Here we have interrupted our address of Clayton Douglas' article *The Seduction: Judeo-Christianity OR Pauline Christianity? Saul of Tarsus: Paul. A different view* in order to investigate the life and works of the so-called "Bishop", John S. Spong. Since Douglas quotes Spong repeatedly in his criticism of Paul. Douglas must have read Spong's extensive works with a more than casual interest in the "Bishop's" opinions, because he speaks of Spong with great respect in his article and repeats Spong's conclusions with avid conviction.

In sections <A> through <V> above, on pages 1 through 26, while discussing the anti-Paulism of H. Graber it was seen that Graber's primary sources for his opinions were the Socialist George Bernard Shaw and the Jew Joachim Prince. Here it may well be made evident that John S. Spong is much more dangerous than these, for Spong is an embracer of negroes and homosexuals, a lover of the anti-christ Jews, and a hater of nationalism and patriotism, all while claiming to be a Christian, and a bishop! But we shall let Spong testify to the truth of these things by himself. We are often told that one shouldn't judge a book by its cover, yet just as often one can find all that's needed to know simply by reading its title!

At the end of section <#23> above, we gave a summary of Spong's academic credentials and vocational positions, condensed from the website:

www.dioceseofnewark.org/jsspong/jssbiog.html

At another website, newark.rutgers.edu/~lcrew/spong_cv.html, one can find a summary of Spong's credentials plus a list of books and articles which Spong has authored, and this partial list of their titles should tell us much about his work: *Dialogue: In Search of Jewish-Christian Understanding* (Co-authored with Rabbi Jack D. Spiro); *Beyond Moralism: A Contemporary View of the Ten Commandments* co-authored with Denise G. Haines, Archdeacon; *Living in Sin? A Bishop Rethinks Human Sexuality*; *Rescuing the Bible from Fundamentalism: A Bishop Rethinks the Meaning of Scripture*; *Born of a Woman: A Bishop Rethinks the Birth of Jesus*; *Resurrection: Myth or Reality?* *A Bishop's Search of the Origins of Christianity*; *Liberating the Gospels: Reading the Bible with Jewish Eyes*; *Why Christianity Must Change Or Die: A Bishop Speaks To Believers In Exile*.

Some of the individual articles written by Spong include: "The Christian Need for Judaism" *The Christian Century*; "Breaking Definitions" *The Integrater [sic]*; "Sexual Stereotypes in the Life of the Church" *Ecumenical Trends*; "Understanding the Gay Reality" *The Christian Century*; "Sexual Ethics: No Longer a Matter of Black and White" *The Episcopalian*; "Changing Patterns of Sexuality" *The Living Church*; "The Bible and Sexual Ethics" *The Living Church*; "America's Survival Depends on Patriotism's Death" *American Values*; "Bishop, Please Tell My Congregation I Was Gay" *The Church Times*, London; "No Outcasts" *Update*, Presbyterians for Lesbian/Gay Concerns, New Brunswick, NJ; "A Dialog on Christian Sexual Ethics" with John R. W. Stott, *Crux*; "Christian Symbols and Jewish Midrash" *The Human Quest*; "Most Biblical Interpretation Illogical" *The Human Quest*; "Judas Iscariot - A Creation of Prejudice?" *The Human Quest*; "A Call for a New Reformation" *The Fourth R*; "The Powerless Christ" *The Witness*.

By the titles of Spong's books and articles alone, it should be unequivocally clear that the statements I have made about him are true. 'Bishop' Spong is surely a member of the jewish-liberal bloc seeking to destroy our nation from within, and Clayton Douglas is his disciple! Paul-bashers everywhere beware: you have all been following the pied piper of deceit big time!

Some of Spong's national television appearances include: Good Morning America, ABC; The Today Show, ABC; This Morning, CBS; Firing Line with Wm Buckley - 3 times; The Phil Donahue Show; Politically Incorrect with Bill Maher - 4 times; Firing Line, Debate with Pat Buchanan; Religion Today with Bob Abernathy; McNeil/Lehrer News Hour - 2 times; Larry King Live - 3 times; The O'Reilly Factor with Bill O'Reilly - 2 times; The Tom Snyder Show - 2 times; The John Ankerberg Show; The Oprah Winfrey Show; Nightline, ABC - 2 times; Town Hall, CNN.

Clayton Douglas reveres Bishop Spong, but seemingly the jewish-controlled media establishment loves him even more, and it is no surprise to me considering his views. We also find from this website that Spong lectured at Harvard University in 2000, and was "Humanist of the Year, 1999", although we are not told which organization bestowed that honor (or rather, *placed that curse*) upon him. Clearly Spong is **no Christian** by any stretch of the imagination.

Spong wrote "The Christian Need for Judaism", yet the early Christian bishop Ignatius knew better, for he wrote that "It is absurd to name Yahshua Christ, and to Judaize. For the Christian Religion did not embrace the Jewish, but the Jewish the Christian" (see page 33, at the beginning of this response to Douglas' article). Hebrewism was nothing more than Christianity before Christ. Christianity is Hebrewism after its fulfilled promise of Christ's coming. Judaism is only an offshoot, a corruption, of Hebrewism! The Apostle John refers to the jews as nothing but antichrists: 1 John 2:18, 22; 4:3; 2 John 7. The **last** thing Christianity needs is Judaism! Except that Adam himself chose to know good **and evil**.

Spong wrote that "... Christianity Must Change Or Die ...", and "No Outcasts" which was for a homosexual publication. In contrast, Paul wrote "Yahshua Christ: the same yesterday, and today, and for the ages" (Heb. 13:8). Compare Psalms 111:7-9; 119:89; Isa. 40:8; 55:10-11; Mal.3:6; Matt. 24:35; Mark 13:31 and 1 Pet. 1:25. Paul also wrote of a sexual deviant, quoting and/or alluding to Deut. 13:5; 17:7, 12; 19:19; 21:21; 22:21, 24 and 24:7: "**And you are inflated, and rather you have not mourned, in order that he who did this deed would be taken from your midst ... But presently I have written to you not to associate with any brother if he is being designated a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or abusive, or drunken, or rapacious; not even to eat with such a wretch. What is it to me to judge those outside? Not at all should you judge those within you. But those outside Yahweh judges; 'you will expel the wicked from amongst yourselves'.**" (1 Cor. 5:2, 11-13). Surely Paul teaches that there shall be outcasts, as we have seen from Rom. 1:26-32; 1 Cor. 6:9-10 and 1 Tim. 1:9-11, all discussed here on pp. 69-70 in section [<23>](#), and that homosexuals shall be among those outcasts (cf. Rev. 22:15). Who is in compliance with the laws of Yahweh, Spong or Paul? Who is in compliance with the will of Yahshua Christ, Spong or Paul?

The liberals and the jews with their followers wrongly accuse Paul of somehow doing away with all of the laws of Yahweh (as if a mere man could possibly do such a

thing), which they themselves refuse to heed, and certainly do not understand. The Old Testament lays before the children of Israel – and no one else – certain blessings if they are obedient to Yahweh (Lev. 26:3-13; Deut. 7:12-26; 28:1-14), and certain consequences if they are disobedient to Yahweh (Lev. 26:14-46; Deut. 6:10-25; 28:16-58). Paul certainly did not lay this aside (i.e. Rom 3:31; 1 Cor. 10:1-11; Gal. 6:7). Spong embraces homosexuals and aliens, things we were taught to keep ourselves clean from (Jer. 31:31-33; Isa. 52:11; 2 Cor. 6:14-18), and when life doesn't go as **he** thinks it should, he writes articles such as "The Powerless Christ". Blasphemy indeed! Liberals and Humanists seek to conform "God" to their image. True Israelite-Christians know that our Adamic race was created in the image of Yahweh our God (Gen. 1:26-28; 5:3; 9:6; Rom. 8:28-39; Col. 3:1-10 et al.), and we are obliged to act accordingly! Liberals and Humanists refuse to admit that there may be a penalty for their abhorrent, deviant behavior, and John Spong goes to great lengths to convince all men of that same denial. Clayton Douglas is his disciple!

Spong, who couldn't possibly get around Paul's clear condemnations of sexual deviancy, employs Freudian psychobabble and uses Paul's statements out of context in a vain slanderous attempt to discredit Paul, attempting thereby to nullify those condemnations! The treacherous plot should be clear to anyone with a modicum of spiritual discernment. Yet Clayton Douglas fell for it wholeheartedly. Clayton Douglas, publisher of *Free American Newsmagazine* makes himself a disciple of John Spong, lover of homosexuals and aliens, author of "America's Survival Depends on Patriotism's Death". Oh, the irony is nearly too great to bear! Is Clayton Douglas deceived, a deceiver, or just stupid?

A summary of Spong's career and personal life can be found in the article "Profile of a Bishop: John Shelby Spong" by Ellen Barrett, found at:

www.dioceseofnewark.org/jsspong/profile.html

The following paragraphs are based upon information found in the article:

Apparently Spong was not a homosexual, **at least openly**. He married university classmate Joan Ketner, who was trained as a zoologist and worked for the C. I. A., acting as the breadwinner while Spong attended the seminary. Joan stopped working just before the birth of their first child, the first of three daughters, but "rebelled against the claustrophobic nature of her expected role ... not content as a housewife and mother." Joan developed an unspecified mental illness some time around 1973, and from around 1983 "she had all but cut herself off from outside contact", and refused treatment for a cancer she developed. "During these years Spong grew ever closer to his teenagers, becoming a mother as well as a father to them ... He also turned more and more to study and writing as a solace and a way to put order into the chaos of his domestic life."

Yet evidently "study and writing" weren't the only things which Spong turned to while his wife, who died in 1988, was ill. For "In that loneliness was also born the beginning of his conviction that God was right, 'It is not good for a human being to be alone.' Evidently, about the time of Joan's death, this would lead him to affirm the

relationships of homosexuals as well as those of heterosexual people living in non-traditional arrangements.”

So there it is evident, that during his wife’s illness and the resulting loneliness which he is apparently weakened by, John Spong has some sort of Homosexual Epiphany so profound that he begins a campaign to normalize such deviant behavior and force it onto his church. Sure, in our Bibles the saying is attributed to Yahweh that “it is not good that the man should be alone” (Gen. 2:18), yet Yahweh’s response to the situation was to create a woman! We are advised by Christ: “He which made *them* at the beginning made them male and female.” Who is Spong to insist that Christianity be corrupted in order to satisfy some perverted, deviant lust? How is Spong so egotistically arrogant to even think that Christianity could somehow be changed? Placing a honey label on a jar of dung doesn’t do anything to change the dung! Remember Paul’s words at Hebrews 13:8!

Returning to the aforementioned article, Spong’s involvement in the policies of his church toward homosexuals began in 1982, when his wife had already been sick for about 9 years, and the “General Convention resolved that the church should begin serious study of ‘changing patterns of family life’.” Spong must have seen this as a green light for his own base ambitions, since “Three or four years later, the Bishop [Spong] commissioned a diocesan task force to study what he considered to be three key points: The overwhelming increase in young people living together outside of marriage; unmarried older people living together for various economic reasons; and whether people living in homosexual relationships could be called into the church’s desire to consecrate human partnership.”

There we have it: John Spong was a trailblazer in the gay marriage movement, 20 years before the recent attempts by deviants to have their iniquity blessed by the State! “A nationwide storm broke in 1987 when the press reported the committee’s findings as endorsing gay marriage”, after which Spong wrote two of his books in defense of the idea. After the death of his wife, Spong got even bolder: “Acting on his growing conviction that gay people should be fully included in the life of the church, Spong ordained Robert Williams in 1989. The wave of hostility Williams’ ordination generated even intruded upon the funeral service for Spong’s wife, Joan. She was buried from their old parish church in Richmond, and as the Bishop and his daughters sat beside the coffin a woman approached him, struck him across the shoulders with her cane, called him a ‘son of a bitch’, and strode out triumphantly through the pallbearers. But not all reaction was negative.... The Bishop who had once dismissed a gay vicar was well on the way to becoming a hero of the gay community as well as a target of conservative wrath.” Yet that “conservative wrath” didn’t last very long. While initially the Diocese of Newark was dissociated from the rest of the Episcopalian church, political pressure put half of the church’s House of Bishops on Spong’s side within a year, and “inspired two married bishops to ‘come out of the closet’ to” Spong during this period of controversy. While at first I criticized Spong for even participating in a church which had homosexual ministers, little did I know that he was the one who made such shamefulness possible for the Episcopalian church in the first place!

This is the type of man whom Clayton Douglas has chosen to follow, and all Paul-bashers everywhere are in league with! The motives for Spong to pervert Paul’s

teachings and to portray the apostle in such a slanderous manner should be perfectly evident. Clifton's reaction to Spong's deeds is, in part:

"Thank Yahweh for the woman who struck Spong across his shoulders and called him a "SON-OF-A-BITCH." She undoubtedly knew something about the secret sex life of Spong! She deserved to be given the Congressional Medal of Honor for courage beyond the call of duty! She demonstrated to all the observers there that day that she was a Christian in every respect! May her reward for that act be greater than she can receive at the White Throne Judgement!"

I find it very difficult to conceive how Clayton Douglas could have read Spong's work, found Spong's blasphemous remarks concerning Paul of Tarsus, yet not see that Spong was such an advocate for having homosexuals and their deviant relationships fully recognized, and even consecrated, in open society! I must assert that Douglas had to be aware of all of this, and by making a conscious decision to use Spong's material as he did, showing reverence for Spong himself, the only logical conclusion is that Clayton Douglas approves of John Spong and his actions. May all Paul-bashers be put on notice: for you are all treading very dangerously by following such misguided men.

I find it just as difficult to conceive how Clayton Douglas read Spong's work yet managed to avoid or ignore, or even overlook, Spong's position on racial issues, which is just as vile and even more dangerous than his position on homosexuality. For while homosexuality retards the maintenance and growth of the race, miscegenation destroys it down the line forever. Many branches of White Adam have already, in the past, committed racial suicide, and we see it happening again today on a massive scale!

From the same article by Ellen Barrett, quoted from above, we find that Spong was an integrationist long before he became a champion of sexual deviancy. From 1957-1965 Spong was Rector of Calvary Church, in Tarboro N.C. Barrett tells us: "These were the years of controversy over school desegregation in the South, and Spong was in the forefront of the battle. The local sheriff was a member of his congregation, and Spong announced that he expected black school children to be protected, and that he was going to be there with them as they entered the previously all-white school. The sheriff was stuck; to protect his rector he had to protect the children. Supporting integration in North Carolina in 1959 was not a way to popularity. But the struggle was exhilarating, and Spong found others to fight alongside him for the equality of black people as children of God. It was his first serious foray into the arena of social controversy." You may thank John Spong for our now ruined educational system!

Aside from the obvious deficiencies in Spong's scholarship (for only White people are descendants of Adam and are children of Yahweh), Newark N.J. was a good place for Spong to end up. Aside from the Ironbound section (or "Down Neck", as the locals call it) the city is almost exclusively black, and so there are few integration problems there. My own memories of the city are mostly of its decaying, boarded-up, run-down former areas of commerce, and its sprawling slums. Lately, I understand, the city is undergoing a sort of renaissance, having attracted the interest of yuppies and immigrants because of its proximity to New York and much lower taxes.

But Spong's crimes as an integrationist continue, so Clifton Emahiser has compiled and comments upon this information from yet another website connected to him:

At the web site www.dioceseofnewark.org/antiracistmothers.html, one will find Spong's position concerning race. It is nearly identical to Jewish-Communism and Catholicism, along with most Protestant churches.

“Mission to Dismantle Racism *Anti-Racism Dialogs* Facilitators provide guidance for the Anti-Racism Dialogues ‘Seeing the Face of God in Each Other: A Positive Vision of the Unity that can be achieved through Christ.’ They will guide groups through an interactive process to increase participants’ awareness and understanding of diversity, prejudice, social power, privilege and institutional and systemic racism. The ideal goal of the dialogues is the transformation of individuals, congregations and the Church, from a habit of exclusiveness to a value of full participation, the elimination of social oppression and shared decision-making and power.

“Anti-racism Training As it is so very important for participants of anti-racism training to experience the process within the context of community, the Anti-racism Dialogues will be congregationally or organizationally based. In other words, for the foreseeable future, ‘Seeing the Face of God in Each Other’ will [sic, be] sponsored by a congregation or congregations or by a commission, committee, agency, district or board.

“The dates will be published in the *Voice* and posted online each month with the name of the contact person (and phone number) at the congregation or committee, so that others who so desire may join the groups based on the convenience of the location or the schedule. Call the office of the Justice Missioner for more information - 973.430.9909 or lheadleydeavours@dioceseofnewark.org.”

From the context of this brazen “Anti-racism Dialog” of Bishop John Shelby Spong, it would appear that the enemy of true Israel is by far working much more forcefully to accomplish their agenda of destroying the White Israel race than those in Israel Identity are in defense of true Israel! When are we ever going to wake up! [End of Clifton’s compilation from the “antiracistmothers” website.]

Scripture makes it clear, and Yahshua Christ fully expresses in His own parables, that He is indeed a racist (i.e. Matt. 13:36-43, 47-50; 15:21-28; 25:31 ff.). Paul certainly followed in Yahshua’s footsteps on this issue as on all others (i.e. Rom. 9:1-13, 21-23; 1 Cor. 10), yet the issue of race was not at the forefront of Paul’s letters because in the Europe of Paul’s time race was simply not an issue: Europe was very nearly 100% Adamic - White! Yet Paul told the Philippians (from my own well-annotated translation of Paul’s epistles):

“¹⁴ Do all things apart from murmuring and disputing, ¹⁵ that you would be perfect and with unmixed blood, blameless children of Yahweh in the midst of a race crooked and perverted - among whom you appear as luminaries in the cosmos, ¹⁶ upholding the Word of Life for a boast with me in the day of Christ, that not in vain have I run nor in vain have I labored” (Phil. 2:14-16).

Aside from Spong’s lifetime of evil works on behalf of sexual deviants and negroes, he also demonstrates a consistent rebellion against the admonitions of Yahshua Christ (John 8:44), Paul (2 Corinthians 6:11-18) and the apostle John (1 John 2:18-23; 4:1-6; 2 John 7-11) by his work with the jewish rabbis. One of Spong’s first books was entitled *This Hebrew Lord*. Evidently Spong, unlike Paul (Rom. 9, Acts 13:6-11) and Yahshua Christ (Rev. 2:9; 3:9; John 8:33-47), has the jews confused with true

Hebrews. Again from Ellen Barrett's article: "A local rabbi was so impressed with *This Hebrew Lord*, despite his disagreement with the premise, that the two of them debated the book three Friday nights at the synagogue and three Sunday mornings at St. Paul's to record-breaking crowds. Local radio picked up the debates, and the pair were offered a twenty-week cable TV contract to continue."

Spong co-authored a book with another Jewish rabbi, and has written articles for Jewish publications such as *Menorah*. While I have not seen evidence of a relationship mentioned on any Spong-related website, I would find it odd if Spong did not have at least an acquaintance with that other prominent Paul-basher from Newark, N.J., the Jewish rabbi and contemporary of Spong's, Joachim Prince. It would be hard to believe that Joachim Prince, being president of the American Jewish Congress, and chairman of the Conference Of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations, wouldn't be aware of Jewish collaboration with people such as Spong within his own city.

One of Spong's articles is "A Call for a New Reformation", originally published in 1998. This article is available at the website:

www.dioceseofnewark.org/jsspong/reform.html

and a review of it fully reveals that, while Spong is an Episcopal bishop, his true religions are Darwinism and secular Humanism. It should be no wonder that Spong has so little use for Paul of Tarsus, that he would stoop to slandering a noble man in order to promote his own immoral, homosexual agenda!

Spong's article begins by misrepresenting the Protestant Reformation. He belittles the issues which led hundreds of thousands of faithful Christians to sacrifice their lives by calling them "quite trivial in retrospect", and leaves unmentioned the oppression of the Romish church, ignoring all of the slaughter and sins perpetrated by that evil institution. Spong surely has no sense of history, and is absolutely ignorant of Biblical prophecy.

He goes on to state that "The need for a new theological reformation began when Copernicus and Galileo removed this planet from its previous [sic, -ly] supposed location at the center of the universe", which is also a mischaracterization. Modern astronomical discoveries surely upset the Romish church's model of creation, but that was actually founded upon the errant beliefs of Aristotle, and not Biblical Christianity. Copernicus and Galileo did nothing to harm true Biblical Christianity because nothing in the Bible – not even the Genesis creation account when viewed from a proper perspective – insists upon a geocentric model of the universe.

Spong then states that "After [Sir Isaac] Newton the church found itself in a world in which the concept of magic, miracle, and divine intervention as explanations of anything, could no longer be offered with intellectual integrity". Yet Newton didn't anticipate the discovery of the atom and the subsequent finding that all matter is truly nothing but energy. Paul knew this, and in Hebrews he states "By faith we perceive the ages to be furnished by the word of Yahweh, **in which that which is seen has not come into being from things visible**" (Heb. 11:3). Today in particle physics it is discovered that sub-atomic particles do not act in a manner which any previously known laws of physics could have possibly predicted, and that some particles apparently even disappear, or can occupy two different places at the same time. The more we learn, the less we know, and Newton's laws – while once seeming to – certainly do not completely define the behavior of matter in the universe. Spong is arrogant to insinuate that we

know too much to believe in the God of the Bible, and by doing so he only betrays his own ignorance!

Spong continues by embracing Darwinism: "... Charles Darwin ... related human life to the world of biology more significantly than anyone had heretofore imagined ... The Bible began with the assumption that God had created a finished and perfect world ... Darwin postulated instead an unfinished and thus imperfect creation out of which human life was still evolving." And while it can be shown that Spong mischaracterizes even the fundamentals of Darwinism, Darwinism in itself is nothing but another religion. The foundation of Darwinism, that higher life forms somehow evolved from lower ones, is impossible, has never been observed, shall never be observed, and is slowly being discredited; slowly only because of the resistance by atheists. Darwin gave the godless a religion they can accept: Evolution! Darwinism is **not** science!

Finally, Spong embraces Freud, "who analyzed the symbols of Christianity and found them manifestations of a deep-seated infantile neurosis." I wouldn't waste time here in vain debate with Freud's perverted opinions. The man was a jew and a cocaine addict and just another instrument of the jewish-liberal attack on our civilization. When are we ever going to "beware of the leaven of the Pharisees"?

Here are the final theses to Spong's proposed "Reformation", which he boasts "are far smaller in number than were those of Martin Luther, but they are far more threatening theologically". Read very carefully the anti-christ positions of Spong, and ponder his blasphemous planks paralleling those of Marxism in many ways:

"1. Theism, as a way of defining God, is dead. So most theological God-talk is today meaningless. A new way to speak of God must be found.

"2. Since God can no longer be conceived in theistic terms, it becomes nonsensical to seek to understand Jesus as the incarnation of the theistic deity. So the Christology of the ages is bankrupt.

"3. The biblical story of the perfect and finished creation from which human beings fell into sin is pre-Darwinian mythology and post-Darwinian nonsense.

"4. The virgin birth, understood as literal biology, makes Christ's divinity, as traditionally understood, impossible.

"5. The miracle stories of the New Testament can no longer be interpreted in a post Newtonian world as supernatural events performed by an incarnate deity.

"6. The view of the cross as the sacrifice for the sins of the world is a barbarian idea based on primitive concepts of God and must be dismissed.

"7. Resurrection is an action of God. Jesus was raised into the meaning of God. It therefore cannot be a physical resuscitation occurring inside human history.

"8. The story of the Ascension assumed a three-tiered universe and is therefore not capable of being translated into the concepts of a post-Copernican space-age.

"9. There is no external, objective, revealed standard writ in scripture or on tablets of stone that will govern our ethical behavior for all time.

"10. Prayer cannot be a request made to a theistic deity to act in human history in a particular way.

"11. The hope for life after death must be separated forever from the behavior control mentality of reward and punishment. The Church must abandon, therefore, its reliance on guilt as a motivator of behavior.

“12. All human beings bear God’s image and must be respected for what each person is. Therefore, no external description of one’s being, whether based on race, ethnicity, gender or sexual orientation, can properly be used as the basis for either rejection or discrimination.”

Here ‘Bishop’ John Shelby Spong should be fully exposed as a godless, sexually deviant, perverted, hypocritical Humanist, and certainly no Christian! Clayton Douglas is his disciple! All Paul-bashers everywhere should investigate and consider this evidence and the consequences which are inevitable if they continue in following the likes of Clayton Douglas, John Spong, H. Graber, Joachim Prince, and all the rest of this cast of perverts, jews and deceivers. Once we veer from the straight path just a little, we are far more likely to end up in a ditch! Yet there is more of Clayton Douglas’ Paul-bashing articles left to address, and we shall continue to do so however long it takes.

[One of the erroneous charges made against Paul is that he did not follow Christ, but started his own religion. Anyone who makes such a charge is highly in error, and has not studied in depth the Scripture. At no time did Paul countermand the teachings of Yahshua Christ, for we read at 1 Corinthians 11:1: “**Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ.**” Paul, in effect was saying: “If I follow not Yahshua Christ in any way shape or manner, then do not follow me, but follow me only to the extent in which I myself follow Christ.” Without Paul’s ministry, we lost Israelites today would still be **groping** in the **dark! Yes, it’s that serious!** – Clifton A. Emahiser]

Having taken the opportunity to exhibit the policies and motives of the so-called “Bishop” John S. Spong, we shall now continue to address the Paul-bashing articles of Clayton Douglas. Here we will commence from where we left off in Douglas’ article *The Seduction: Judeo-Christianity OR Pauline Christianity? Saul of Tarsus: Paul. A different view*, which Douglas wrote and published in the December 2003 issue of his *Free American Newsmagazine*.

<Section #24> Clay Douglas states: “*It should also be added that despite Paul’s modern reputation for placing women lower than men, he also penned revolutionary words about the absolute equality of all believers in Christ, a complete destruction of prevailing social codes.*”

In reply to section **<#24>**: Douglas’ ignorance of history and the contradictions of his own remarks should be readily evident here. First he grouses that Paul placed “*women lower than men*”, which is not true at all because both the Hebrew and Greek societies had placed women in a position subservient to men long before Paul came along. Then he complains that Paul advocated “*a complete destruction of prevailing social codes*”, and neither is that true because Douglas is taking Paul’s remarks out of context. Yet surely he is accusing Paul at least in part because Paul said, as he quotes further on and as we shall address shortly: “there is neither male nor female ...”

As we have already discussed in the short article “Paul Was Not a Misogynist!” on pages 30 to 32 above, Paul did not despise women, nor did he consign to them any role which was not already their expected role in Greek society. The role which many women have anointed themselves with in our society today is rebellion against not man, but Yahweh, as can be fully demonstrated in the Old Testament, the “law and the prophets” which Christ came to fulfill. However in the ancient world there were certainly

far worse alternatives: “women enjoyed greater personal and property rights in Roman societies than among the Germans, who regarded them as legally subject to their menfolk from birth to the grave” (*The Oxford History of Medieval Europe*, p. 47).

<Section #25> Clay Douglas states: “*For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.*” (Paul of Tarsus)

“*The above Scriptural quotation is probably the most repeated on earth; particularly, when one dares to speak of the Jewish Problem. It is a classic example of ‘double think’. And, it is classically ‘Pauline’ in both its orientation as well as its hidden agenda.*”

In reply to section <#25>: There is no “double think” here, as shall be demonstrated. And it amazes me that the “*Jewish Problem*” concerns Douglas, who as we have seen is a disciple of John Spong, who, in turn, is an embracer of jews and homosexuals. What a hypocrite Clayton Douglas is! The quote here, which Douglas takes out of context, and surely does not understand, is from Galatians 3:26-28, and we shall now examine it at length. First, the Galatians to whom this is addressed were primarily Hellenized Gauls, who were Kelts, with some Greeks and Romans among them. Since Paul wrote to these people specifically, no one else can possibly pick up this letter, who has no relation to its intended recipients, and imagine that Paul could be addressing them also. Paul knew that these Galatians: Kelts, Greeks and Romans, were the “lost” Israelites, as he demonstrates so often in his epistles, and here he tells them as much in this very chapter, and in chapter 4, verse 28 where he says “And we, brethren, down through Isaac, are children of promise”. As I’ve said before, Paul certainly cannot be held responsible for the blatantly errant, judaized mistranslations of his letters found in all modern Bible versions today. Now to examine the components of Gal. 3:28:

“There is neither Judaeen nor Greek.” That’s right, *Judaeen* is what the Greek says, not *Jew*, and there is a big difference! Judaeans, true Judaeans, were Israelites. The apostate jews were primarily descendants of Cain and Canaan through Shelah, and especially through Esau. Paul knew this and explained as much at Romans 9 and 2 Thessalonians 2 and other places. Note Rev. 2:9 and 3:9. True Judaeans were Israelites, and most of the Greek tribes were “lost” Israelites, as were the Kelts and Romans! Josephus, the Judaeen historian, attests that if it weren’t for the circumcision, one wouldn’t be able to tell Greeks and Judaeans apart (*Antiquities* 12.5.1), something that should not surprise anyone upholding our Saxon-Israelite truths. There certainly is no difference between true Saxon Kelts, Romans (by-and-large not today’s “Italians”), Greeks (not those of today, for most of today’s are by-and-large racially Turks and Arabs), or Judaeans (not the impostor jews), all of whom descended from Israelites, and Paul knew and taught as much!

“There is neither bond nor free.” Anyone who professes in the law, such as Mr. Douglas, should know that there is no permanent, forced slavery in Israel. Slaves were to be released in the seventh year of their servitude, and freely, unless the slave himself desired to remain (Deut. 15:12-18). Yet even Paul respected the property rights of the slave-owners, for which see the epistle to Philemon, and also Eph. 6:5; Col. 3:22;

1 Tim. 6:1; Titus 2:9, and compare 1 Peter 2:18. Then see the words attributed to Yahshua Christ at Matt. 10:24-25; 23:1-12, and the parable at Luke 17:7-10. All Israelites, whether bondmen or freemen, are brethren and have but one Master: Yahweh, Yahshua Christ in the flesh, whom Paul clearly follows. Clayton Douglas, just like the jews, pretends to know Scripture, yet knows it not!

“There is neither male nor female.” For this I will go only to one place: the challenge made to Yahshua by the Sadducees recorded at Matt. 22:23-33; Mark 12:18-27; and Luke 20:27-40, which I suggest one should now read. Part of Christ’s response, which surely concerns the position of men and women in the age to come, as recorded at Matt. 22:30 is: “For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of Yahweh in heaven”, which Paul surely follows here. Clayton Douglas follows jews and liberals instead! The modern day Sadducees!

In 1 Corinthians chapter 12, Paul compares the body of the Anointed (who are the children of Israel) to the human body, and members of the body of the Anointed to various body parts. Thereby Paul illustrates that while we each have a specific function which we must perform, and so we have teachers and prophets and those with other gifts, there are also those with unattractive assignments which are just as necessary. While we each have our own task to perform in this life, whether male or female, master or servant, we are all nonetheless necessary, and we are all nonetheless valued.

<Section #26> Clay Douglas states: “*For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin. For that which I do I allow not: for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I. I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me.*’ Confused? These are all statements made by Paul contained within the Scriptures.”

In reply to section **<#26>**: If Romans 7:14-15, quoted here, confuses Douglas it is likely due to his own failure to read the verses in context and undertake the modicum of self-reflection necessary to understand what Paul is saying. These verses, along with others which Douglas has previously quoted where Paul taught about temptation and the need for self-control, were discussed in section **<#22>** on p. 67 of this response. At Romans 7:13-25, Paul discussed the struggle between the two natures of Adam Man: The carnal and the spiritual. While the law imposes a code of behavioral ethics upon us, which in spirit we should desire to follow, the very brain chemicals which enable our bodies to function properly also compel us to sin – to desire things we ought not! Being strong we seek to overpower those desires, yet sometimes being weak we succumb to them. The non-Adamic races, and especially the negroes, seek immediate personal gratification and fulfillment of their lusts without even a thought of abstinence or self-control, and today many Adamic people follow in that same manner, having rejected the controlling moral authority of the Spirit and the necessity to seek to follow that instead. Clayton Douglas, not understanding this but criticizing Paul, rather puts his lot with the scoffers, and sexual deviants such as John Spong.

<Section #27> Clay Douglas states: *“For though I am free from all men, I have made myself a slave to all, that I might win the more. To the Jews I became as a Jew, in order to win Jews; to those under the law I became as one under the law - though not being myself under the law - that I might win those under the law. To those outside the law I became as one outside the law - not being without law toward God but under the law of Christ - that I might win those outside the law. To the weak I became weak, that I might win the weak. I have become all things to all men....”* (I Corinthians 9:19-25).

“What does this mean? Be anyone, be anything, and do anything to just accomplish results, [sic .] Why, Paul was a human chameleon and an expert mentalist!

“‘A conjuring trick is generally regarded by magicians as consisting of an effect and a method. The effect is what the spectator sees ... The Method is the secret behind the effect and allows the effect to take place.’ Peter Lamont and Richard Wiseman “Magic in Theory [. sic]”

In reply to section **<#27>**: We have seen H. Graber criticize Paul for these same remarks in 1 Corinthians, which were addressed on page 26 in section **<T>**. As I have also explained in section **<#7>** of this response to Douglas, beginning on p. 42, Paul was an individual uniquely qualified to take the gospel to the “lost” nations of Israel; and indeed he fulfilled that task. Paul, being born in Tarsus and educated in the Classics as well as in Judaism, was qualified to explain the meaning of the gospel and Old Testament Scripture to pagans (“those outside the law” here) as well as to Judaeans (“those under the law” here). All the other apostles, not having any such education as Paul’s, had not the tools necessary to do what was required, for the “lost” Israelites (not the Judaeans only, nor the jews) to receive the gospel. Paul also explains, as I have discussed before, that he means to speak to people on their own terms, and not with the pretense of superiority and authority that the jew rabbis, and so many of today’s clerics, employ with abandon.

Yet Douglas charges Paul as *“a human chameleon and an expert mentalist”*, which is rather more descriptive of John Spong, the liberal humanist homosexual dressed up as a Christian bishop. Then Douglas goes on to quote a book about magic, the second such book he’s quoted from so far in this article, and both of them written by jews (Richard Wiseman, Sol Stein)! The fact that Douglas consistently quotes from such sources certainly elucidates the substance of his own education and intellectual pursuits, and perhaps his true motives in seeking to discredit Paul of Tarsus. In actuality Douglas is only discrediting his own self, making himself a disciple of sexual deviants and jewish magicians. In contrast, Paul of Tarsus once said to a jewish magician who had opposed him: *“O full of all subtilty and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?”* (Acts 13:10, A.V.).

<Section #28> Clay Douglas states: *“Another good example of the Talmudic flavoring Paul added to the New Testament, remains the Communion. Paul’s ritual, which is the ‘drinking of the blood and the eating of the body of Jesus Christ’ is nothing more than Satanic cult worship. This is vampirism and cannibalism at best! Shall we dare to be open and honest about it? Or, is it easier to remain deaf, blind and dumb?”*

In reply to section **<#28>**: As demonstrated throughout this response to Douglas’ Paul-bashing articles, Douglas while rejecting Paul also rejects much of the rest of the

New Testament, along with much of the Old Testament, and thereby has been shown to have adopted all the positions of the Jews themselves. See for instance section [#4](#) of this response, beginning on page 35, where it is fully manifest that Douglas is little but a Jew, at least from a religious perspective.

Paul discusses the bread, the “body of Christ”, and the wine, or the cup of the new testament in the blood of Christ, in 1 Corinthians chapters 10 and 11, but **nowhere** does Paul instruct or insinuate that “communion” was to become the pagan religious ritual that the Romish church made of it. Yet Douglas implies that it was Paul who prescribed this ritual! In 1 Corinthians 11 Paul only describes the actions of Yahshua Christ at the “last supper”, and His instructions to the eleven (not counting Judas the Jew), for them to partake of bread and wine in His memory. The **actual** body and blood of Christ, while a mystery to the Romish church, are the Israelite brethren sitting around the table as Paul explains at 1 Cor. 10:14-22, and also at 11:26-34, although Paul’s explanation is purposefully enigmatic and some words are poorly translated in the A.V. So therefore, Douglas’ “Talmudic” charge is plainly ridiculous.

It is nevertheless quite clear that at 1 Cor. 11:23-25 Paul is only repeating “that which also I delivered unto you”; i.e. what he received, he taught the Corinthians, and that is found at Matt. 26:26-29, Mark 14:22-25 and Luke 22:17-20. While the true meaning of “communion” needs to be treated at length, this is not the forum in which to do that. Yet it is obvious that Paul is only following Yahshua Christ as His words were recorded by all four gospel writers. Yet while John did not record Yahshua’s words concerning the bread and wine at the “last supper”, he left us with a much fuller account where Yahshua discussed this same thing at length, at John 6:31-65. Again **Clayton Douglas has fully adopted the position of the murmuring Jews** who could not understand how Yahshua Christ could call Himself the “bread of life” and advise His disciples to “drink His blood” (John 6:53). It’s not Paul’s fault that Douglas understands not these things, and lacks discretion of whom he follows, or from whence his sources originate!

<Section #29> Clay Douglas states: *“And, let us be - again - honest with ourselves regarding the Pagan [sic] Holiday of EASTER. Let us try to practice common sense. Why have we all been ‘taught’ to give sacrifices of Pig and Eggs (fertility) in celebration of the terrible, tortured death of Esu Immanuel (Jesus Christ)? I know. I know. We purportedly celebrate His having risen. We offer up canned ham and chocolate bunnies because Christ rose from the dead. Never mind that this innocent man, whose only crime was to preach Yahweh’s Laws to those who had ‘strayed’ was brutally murdered at the hands of the Jewish Pharisees who had prodded the Romans to ‘carry out their hideous desires’.”*

In reply to section **<#29>**: I can only wonder how anyone may possibly imagine that Paul had anything to do with Easter! And Douglas’ own ignorance is readily manifest here. How can one do so much writing on a topic, with so little studying? Sure, the word “Easter” does appear once in the Bible, at Acts 12:4, but only in its English translation. The Greek word there is *πάσχα* (Strong’s #3957), which is the Greek form of the Hebrew *pesach* (Strong’s Hebrew #6453), “Passover” everywhere else in the Bible in Greek or English. It’s not Paul’s fault that the “lost” tribes of Israel adopted the pagan Easter festival, and the Old Testament explains that they adopted such pagan

ways again and again. Neither is it Paul's fault, that centuries after his death the Romish church adopted the pagan festival rather than correcting our ancestors. Another thing which Paul cannot be blamed for is the Romish church's acceptance of swine eaters, and the common consumption of pork among Christians today. Paul never advocated eating swine, because once his words are examined in their historical context it becomes evident that the Greeks also considered swine to be unclean! (i.e. Strabo 12.8.9). This I hope to address at length later on, where Douglas again raises the topic.

<Section #30> Clay Douglas states: *"Never mind that Esu was lost to us forever. We are taught to celebrate His murder at Easter time each year. What kind of diabolical mind could come up with this horrible ritual. Why do we do it? Have we all lost our minds?"*

In reply to section **<#30>**: Here we have it again, and I must reiterate that Paul cannot be blamed for Easter, nor for the way in which the Romish church has chosen to commemorate the death and resurrection of Yahshua Christ. Paul advised Christians to keep the feast of the Passover (1 Cor. 5:7-8), and Douglas makes himself a fool for not reading as much before condemning the apostle! Yet Douglas here again betrays himself as a follower of the jews, and no Christian, by stating that Yahshua Christ "was lost to us forever". The implications of this statement in regard to Douglas' corrupt view of Christianity should be readily apparent! Again, Clayton Douglas is a jew, religiously if not otherwise!

<Section #31> Clay Douglas states: *"In Matthew 7:15-20 Jesus warned about the danger of false prophets that lead many astray. They are dangerous because if you believe their lies, they will change you internally. They can affect who you really are and your eternal destiny. They come and deceive by presenting falsehood as the truth. Jesus gave warning of them because they do not appear as the wolves they really are, but as friends of the flock. They come wearing sheep's clothing, the garments of the shepherd. They appear as those who come to feed & lead the flock, but instead, they feed off the flock and exploit it for their own gain (2 Pet. 2:1)."*

In reply to section **<#31>**: It is simply incredible that Douglas could make a citation from 2 Pet. 2:1 here, in yet another nefarious but lame attempt to portray Paul of Tarsus as something other than truthful, yet overlook what Peter specifically said about Paul at 2 Pet. 3:15-16, just a little further on in the same short epistle: "And account *that* the long-suffering of our Lord *is* salvation; even as our beloved brother Paul also according to the wisdom given unto him hath written unto you; As also in all *his* epistles, speaking in them of the things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as *they do* also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction." As I have asserted before, Clayton Douglas is either deceived, a deceiver, or simply an idiot, take your pick! And where Yahshua Christ, Peter and Paul all warned us about false prophets, false teachers, and wolves in sheep's clothing, maybe Douglas and all the Paul-bashers should go back and examine the works of Friedrich Nietzsche, George Bernard Shaw, Joachim Prince, Taylor Caldwell, Michael Grant, John Spong and the rest of the liberals, jews, and perverted sexual deviants that

they follow! Amazingly, the Paul-bashing H. Graber claimed to glean his spiritual sustenance, as he put it, from Peter: yet he also overlooked 2 Pet. 3:15-16!

<Section #32> Clay Douglas states: *“Esu Immanuel [sic] never knew Saul/Paul. Esu’s and Saul’s paths never crossed. But, Jesus/ Esu did know of Paul and Paul’s efforts to capture and to kill Him. Let us also remember that Jesus, despite this, never stopped attacking the Jewish hierarchy. Also, Esu hadn’t chosen which of his disciples was ‘the worthiest’; he used to keep a team of twelve disciples, for practical reasons: twelve is small enough to establish a dialogue among that group, and big enough to include various tendencies among the population of the time: [sic .] As he vaguely pointed at Peter as his successor, but gave extraordinary powers and mission to all his apostles, Jesus never chose nor approved of genocidal Paul to be his spokesman. To accept otherwise is a mockery of God.”*

In reply to section **<#32>**: Here Douglas continues the novel he began writing earlier in his article, for which see section **<#13>** beginning on p. 52. Apparently Douglas attempts here to clarify some of the ambiguities in the plot to his novel, but that still doesn’t make it real. Paul of Tarsus was described by Luke as a νεανίας (neanias, 3494) which Liddell & Scott define primarily as “a young man, youth”, which he must have been since he was still quite robust when he was sent off to Rome nearly 30 years later (Acts 27:1; the Roman procurator Festus who sent Paul to Rome held that office in Judaea from 59 to 62 A.D.). In a society such as Judaea, which was governed by elders who were always given deference, Paul could not have had the position or authority which Douglas claims for him.

Contrary to Douglas, Peter was never pointed to as a successor to Yahshua Christ. Dead men and dead gods need successors, yet Yahshua our God is a living God! Many fools, mimicking the Romish church, point to Matthew 16:18 and claim that the “church” was built upon Peter, yet this verse has long been misunderstood. And why would the Romish church want to correct a misconception if it can be used for an advantage? Liddell & Scott say at πέτρος (petros): “...a stone, distinguished from πέτρα”, and at πέτρα (petra): “a rock, a ledge or shelf of rock ... πέτρα is a fixed rock, πέτρος a stone”. Yahshua said to Peter in part: “... You are a stone (πέτρος, “Peter”), and upon this bedrock (πέτρα) I shall build My assembly ...”, if translated in a manner which actually preserves the distinction between the meanings of the words. The authority given to Peter (Matt. 16:19) was given to all of the disciples (Matt. 18:18). Upon closer examination, Peter was instead the most stubborn of the disciples (Matt. 16:21-28; 26:33-34 and 69-75; John 21:21-22) who often had to be told things three times before they sunk in (John 21:15-19; Acts 10:9-16). To James as much deference was given as to Peter (Acts 15), if perhaps not more.

Douglas is suddenly concerned here with making a “mockery of God”, which absolutely bewilders me! For throughout his article, Douglas has quoted Friedrich “God is dead” Nietzsche, John Spong the embracer of aliens and sexual deviants, and a host of other foul characters, and has adopted their perverted teachings as his own. How could anyone make more mockery of Yahweh than Douglas?

<Section #33> Clay Douglas states: *“After having more or less left Peter in charge of his disciples, Jesus disappeared, his message being rather confusedly understood by the humans of his time (after all, His writings had simply disappeared). Peter had the official responsibility of taking over, in so far as there was a take-over, as Jesus never tried to set up any hierarchy or sect around himself, a fact to be remembered (Jesus warned us about ‘churches’), but another disciple was soon to emerge and transform the influence of Jesus’ life on the world. Dark blue velvet curtains open. Spotlights come on. Enter Saul.”*

In reply to section **<#33>**: Douglas states that Christ’s message was *“rather confusedly understood by the humans of his time”* as if that were a statement of fact! Rather, Douglas himself is confused, and so that is the way he sees the rest of the world! If only Douglas had ever read some history books, instead of trying to rewrite history on his own confused terms. I would challenge Douglas to show where Yahshua *“warned us about ‘churches’”*, but he would never be able to do so. Even in Revelation, in the messages to the seven ‘churches’ in Rev. chapters 2 and 3, something good was said by Yahshua to each of the ‘churches’, yet most of them were also criticized. But the ‘church’ at Philadelphia was not criticized at all, and neither was the ‘church’ at Smyrna criticized directly. Of course, none of these should be confused with the later Romish catholic beast-church. Nowhere, however, were we *“warned about ‘churches’”* in general. Notice that Douglas, after developing the plot for his novel, creates a theatrical scene depicting the entrance of Saul of Tarsus, which must have been drawn out of one of the magician books with which he is so intrigued.

<Section #34> Clay Douglas states: *“To be an apostle of Jesus Christ, it was necessary that one be appointed directly by Jesus Christ. The original twelve apostles received their appointment directly from Him. The word apostle derives from a Greek verb that means ‘to send.’ It follows that, to be an apostle of Christ, Christ must have sent one. It is clear from Acts when the eleven obtained a replacement for Judas., they understood that to qualify as an apostle one must have been in the company of the disciples during all ‘the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning at the baptism of John until the day he was taken up from us’ (Acts 2:15f). This one qualification excludes those who were strangers to the fellowship.”*

In reply to section **<#34>**: Here Douglas asserts quite authoritatively that *“To be an apostle of Jesus Christ, it was necessary that one be appointed directly by Jesus Christ”*, yet then he goes on to advocate the choice of a replacement for Judas *“by the eleven”*! One thing here is very clear to me: the giant clouds of *“confusion”* are rather generated by Clayton Douglas’ thinking! This man – like all Paul-bashers can be found to do – contradicts himself continually! Yet even the criteria required for the office of apostle and the replacing of Judas given by Peter, described in Acts 1:15-26 (not 2:15), are Peter’s words and not Yahshua’s, and prescribed for Peter’s purpose rather than Yahshua’s, although it is clear that Peter meant to do well. That lots were cast, and that the lot fell to Matthias and not Barsabas, means little since in the casting of lots one of the two had to be chosen because the action itself allows for no other choice. And what became of Matthias, who is not mentioned anywhere else in Scripture? Would Douglas claim that to be part of some grand conspiracy? Douglas’ version of history insists that Yahweh our God, Yahshua Christ, is without the ability to have His will be of any effect

in the world: that all which He did was in vain. Fortunately for us, Clayton Douglas is very, very wrong. Yahshua Christ indeed chose Paul of Tarsus directly, and Matthias, while undoubtedly a good man and selected with good intentions, fulfilled no such mission.

<Section #35> Clay Douglas states: *“One of these qualifications Paul could never meet, for he had never been in the company of the disciples during the ministry of Jesus. He was a stranger to them. Nevertheless, if he could convince the disciples that the risen Christ had appeared to him and appointed him, then it would be clear to them that this qualification had been suspended in Paul’s case. In his view this made his appointment superior to theirs because his gospel and appointment came from the risen Christ rather than from the earthly Jesus! Thus we have the story of his amazing conversion, or revelation, on the road to Damascus.*

“Paul was never accepted by the Twelve and he resolved to go his own way, yet claiming the same - nay, superior credentials. But he needed the favor of Jerusalem and the Twelve to strengthen his ministry and so he presented himself as having their favor and approval wherever he went.”

In reply to section **<#35>**: While all of the Paul-bashers criticize the “Road to Damascus” event and the conversion of Paul from his error, they all try to claim this same attitude for the other eleven apostles, yet they have nothing to base this claim upon! In the contrary, Paul was indeed commended by Peter, as we have seen above at section **<#31>**, and which Douglas blatantly ignores even though he quotes from that same epistle. And Paul was also accepted both at Jerusalem by the Christian elders and at Antioch by the Christian assembly there, and each of these places on multiple occasions (Acts 9:26-28; 11:26-30; 14:26-28; 15:1-2, 4-6, 22-26). Paul was at an early time rescued from the jews by the Christians, when the jews at Damascus wanted to kill him (Acts 9:23-25) and when the Hellenized jews at Jerusalem (“Grecians” in the A.V.) wanted to do likewise (Acts 9:29-30). Why do Douglas and the rest of the Paul-bashers choose to overlook all of this Biblical evidence?

Remember the testimony concerning the assembly of Ephesus, which has been discussed here in section **<#18>** of this response, beginning on page 61. Douglas admits in the section marked **<#17>**, for which see page 60, that Paul of Tarsus founded the ‘church’ at Ephesus, where Paul had spent two years (Acts 19:10). It is clear from the account in Acts 19 that Paul did indeed found this assembly, bringing the Holy Spirit and the gospel of the Kingdom of Yahweh to the Ephesians (Acts 19:1-8). John wrote the Revelation 30 years after Paul’s death, a fact which can certainly be established in history, and which Clifton Emahiser has elucidated elsewhere. In the message to the assembly at Ephesus, Yahshua Christ scolds the Ephesians because the assembly “left thy first love”, which **demands** it was the gospel and teachings brought to them by Paul, because he founded the assembly! Therefore Yahshua Christ Himself, testifying to the **good work of Paul**, makes Clayton Douglas and all of the Paul-bashers nothing more than gainsayers and hypocrites, found to be fighting against that which they claim to be defending! When one begins to spew false doctrine, such as these Paul-bashers, Scripture will make a liar out of them every time! Here Christ Himself testified against the likes of Clayton Douglas at Rev. 2:1-8, laying wide open his appalling error! Therefore, think twice before falling for the Anti-Paulists’ suppositions!

Continuing with Clayton Douglas' Paul-bashing article *The Seduction: Judeo-Christianity OR Pauline Christianity? Saul of Tarsus: Paul. A different view*, there are still a couple of pages of this article to address before we can move on to the second part of Douglas' Paul-bashing series. Quite humbly, I hope to have already well demonstrated that Paul-bashing is not a very profitable endeavor, if by the fruit of one's labor one expects to profit in truth and understanding. Rather, the Paul-bashers rely upon the writings of the jews, anti-christs, liberals and sexual deviants to fortify their own distorted ideas, and in the balance of his article Douglas certainly continues this pattern, as we shall see below.

<Section #36> Clay Douglas states: "*Paul will be the first one to set up small communal units, stabilized with a chief for each, as well as a hierarchy, a ritual (baptism, prayer, Eucharist), and a teaching. Paul became the greatest 'interpreter' of Jesus' mission who explained, in ways that Esu/Jesus himself never did, how Esu's life fitted [sic] into a cosmic scheme of salvation and 'grace'.*"

In reply to section **<#36>**: As we have previously seen, in section **<#4>** of this response, which begins on page 41, and as he does elsewhere, Douglas denies that Yahshua Christ was the Messiah, redeemer of Israel, who was foretold as a promise to us by so many of the Old Testament prophets. Douglas holds here the same position as the jews, and so it is no wonder that he hates Paul of Tarsus so viciously that he spews page after page of lies and misconceptions by which to blaspheme him!

That Christians throughout the οἰκουμένη (inhabited world) assembled themselves into "*small communal units*" was not an innovation of Paul's, but a natural extension of already extant practices. Such communities were governed by elders throughout the histories of both Hebrews and Greeks. See James 5:14; 1 Pet. 5:1 ff. and compare those to 1 Tim 5:17 ff., to see that Paul contrived nothing new or unexpected. The Christian Community governed itself. Elders were elected by the assembly. The word translated in the A.V. "ordain" at Acts 14:23 and "chosen" at 2 Cor. 8:19 is χειροτονέω (5500) and primarily means "*to vote for, to elect ... Passive to be elected*" (Liddell & Scott), and Paul cannot be blamed for poor translations. These elders appointed "bishops" (Greek: "supervisors") and "ministers" (Greek: "servants"), provided they were qualified (1 Tim. 3:1-13; 4:14). Not even Paul admitted to having direct authority over the assemblies (2 Cor. 1:24), and advised them that Scripture (the law and the prophets; Acts 17:2, 11; 18:28; Rom. 4:3; Gal. 3:22; 4:30; 2 Tim. 3:15-16) and the gospel (the words of Yahshua Christ; 1 Tim. 6:3-5) were the authorities. This model of Christian governance lasted until the time of Justinian, when the "universal" Romish church began to take form. Paul cannot be blamed for the devices of men of later centuries, and all who try are absolutely ignorant of history.

Neither did Paul contrive the baptism ritual, which had been employed by both Greeks (Aeschylus, *Eumenides* lines 448-452) and by the people of Palestine (see the Dead Sea Scrolls, 4Q414 [4Q *Ritual of Purification A*] fragment 12 for one instance), long before John the Baptist began his ministry. Both Paul (i.e. Eph. 5:25-27) and Peter (i.e. 1 Pet. 3:21; Acts 10:44-48; 11:15-16) realized some time after the first Pentecost that water baptism was certainly not a necessary ritual for Christians. Paul cannot be blamed that the Romish church adopted the practice, ritualizing it into one of their so-called "sacraments". This is explained at length in my pamphlet "*Baptism – In What?*".

Neither did Paul ritualize prayer. Neither did Paul ritualize communion (properly only the sharing of things in common), nor can he be blamed for the so-called “Eucharist” ritual of the Romish church. Paul’s very Christian example of a simple communion (the sharing of a meal in common) can be found at Acts 27:33-36, and certainly no ritual can be extracted from that!

<Section #37A> Clay Douglas states: *“In other words, Paul taught that Christians would enter Heaven through ‘faith’ (Grace) alone. Jesus Christ/Esu Immanuel had taught that Christians would be judged on their ‘works’. It is also of import that Paul/Saul began to substitute the word ‘Faith’ for the required ‘Faithfulness’ which is carefully outlined in God’s Laws of the Old Testament. Hence, Paul taught that Christians needed to be full of ‘faith alone’ (Faith: Trust or reliance; a system of religious doctrines believed in.) in order to enter the Kingdom, contrary to both God’s Laws (Old Book) and Esu’s Teachings (New), which clearly stated that ‘faithfulness in the Commandments’ (and other Laws of God) (Faithfully: loyal, reliable, honorable, exact.) must be adhered to in order to enter the Kingdom. (Faith is the belief in an idea or cause. Faithfulness is following through on that code or credo with exacting actions.)”*

In reply to section **<#37A>**: Before discussing Paul’s views on faith and salvation, which surely will be discussed fully below, some of Douglas’ own contradictions must be addressed. Here Douglas has labeled “God’s Laws” the “Old Book”, and “Esu’s [sic Yahshua’s] Teachings” the “New.” Yet earlier, in section **<#33>** (see page 89) of this response to Douglas’ article, Douglas states that *“His [Jesus’] writings had simply disappeared”!* I must ask, Mr. Douglas, which is it? Do we have the utterances of Yahshua Christ, or not? In section **<#13>** (see page 54) we see Douglas claim that *“the scrolls of the teachings of Esu [sic. Yahshua]”* were stolen. This, to borrow a line from Mr. Douglas and then use it in reference to him, is certainly *“a classic example of ‘double think’”*. When it suits Clayton Douglas, the teachings of Yahshua Christ are missing; elsewhere when it suits Clayton Douglas, the teachings of Yahshua Christ are in the New Testament. What hypocrisy Douglas resorts to! Clay Douglas purports to be expressing the teachings of Christ in section **<#31>** (*“Jesus warned about the danger of false prophets”*), and at section **<#32>** (*“Jesus ... never stopped attacking the Jewish hierarchy ... Esu [sic] hadn’t chosen which of his disciples was the ‘worthiest’ ... he vaguely pointed at Peter ...”*), yet out of the other side of his mouth, Douglas would tell us that his teachings were missing or stolen! Is Clayton Douglas a deceiver, or an idiot? Clayton Douglas continues:

<Section #37B> Clay Douglas states: *“... for by grace you have been saved through faith, and this is not your own doing; it is the gift of God – not the result of works, so that no one may boast.”* [New Testament, Ephesians 2:8-9]

“Is it possible that Paul/Saul chose to infiltrate the ranks of this [sic] early Christians, teaching a doctrine that opposed Jesus on several fronts, replacing Jesus’ careful lessons with a selfish teaching of desire to gain a ‘free gift’ of salvation based only on faith and completely devoid of any behavioral requirement or obedience to law? Has Paul distracted us, recrafting us all into deformed idiots fully embracing Communistic Humanism? ... ‘To be a great magician, one must be able to present an

illusion in such a way that people are not only puzzled, but deeply moved.’ S. H. Sharp.”

In reply to section <#37B>: Quoting yet another magician, Douglas again reveals his true intellectual pursuits. But claiming that Paul would have us embrace “*Communitistic Humanism*” is another obviously hypocritical act on Douglas’ part, since he himself is a disciple of John Spong, “Humanist of the Year for 1999” as Spong’s own website boasts! Douglas himself is attempting a sleight-of-hand, destroying the noble Paul of Tarsus with the utterances of a cast of jews, anti-christs, liberals and sexual deviants! Yahshua Christ told us that we shall know them by their fruits. Over and over again Clayton Douglas verifies to us that he is in the same category with, if he is not himself, an anti-Christ jew.

To James, the idea of faith was separate from the idea of works, or good deeds, as evident at chapter 2 vv. 14-26 of his epistle. To Paul, the idea of faith **included** the idea of works, or good deeds. Often Paul contrasts faith to the “works of the law” (as the A.V. translates the phrase literally). Yet the “works of the law” are actually the “rituals of the law”, as the phrase is rendered in both my own translation of Paul’s letters, and in Ferrar Fenton’s version published about a hundred years ago. The “works” or “rituals” of the law are mentioned by Paul at Rom. 3:20, 27, 28; 4:2, 6; 9:11, 32; 11:6; Gal. 2:16 (trice); 3:2, 5, 10; Heb. 6:1 and 9:14. Paul, in the context of these chapters, certainly means those rituals which the law prescribed in ordinances and which have been done away with (Eph. 2:15; Col. 2:14; Heb. 9:1-10). While James was a contemporary with Paul, he received not the divine revelations that Paul was given.

The Old Testament law does not mandate kind deeds or acts of charity or love for one’s brethren, but only prescribes penalties for the crimes it describes and the rituals in its ordinances, along with some other things, such as feast days. Paul spoke of “obedience to the faith” (Rom 1:5) and expressly said that we do not make void the law through faith, but rather establish the law (Rom. 3:31). Paul says to the Ephesians: **“For in favor you are being preserved through faith and this, Yahweh’s gift, is not of yourselves, not from works, lest anyone would boast, for His work we are, having been established among the number of Christ Yahshua for good works, which Yahweh before prepared in order that we would walk in them.”** (Eph. 2:8-10, my own translation). Before Agrippa, Paul had testified that he preached the faith to those in Damascus and in Jerusalem, **“... then all the region of Judaea and to the Nations I announced to repent and to turn to Yahweh doing deeds worthy of repentance”** (Acts 26:20, my translation). Paul advised Timothy: **“Likewise women in moderate attire are to adorn themselves with modesty and discretion, not in wreaths and in gold or pearls or in very expensive garments, but that which is fitting with women professing fear of God, through good works.”** (1 Tim. 2:9-10, my translation) and **“The errors of some men are manifest beforehand, going ahead to judgement, but others then follow after. In like manner also are the good works manifest, and those being otherwise are not able to be concealed.”** (1 Tim. 5:25, my translation). Paul also said **“To those who are wealthy in this present age, you exhort neither to be high-minded nor to have hope in uncertain riches, but in Yahweh who provides for us richly all things for enjoyment: to do good work, to be rich in good deeds, to be generous, sharing ...”** (1 Tim. 6:17-18, my translation);

“All writing inspired of God is also beneficial for teaching, for evidence, for correction, for education which is in righteousness, that the man of Yahweh would be perfect, having prepared himself for all good works” (2 Tim. 3:16-17, my translation); **“Trustworthy is this saying, and concerning these things I wish for you to maintain strongly that those trusting in Yahweh should take care to prefer good works”** (Titus 3:8, my translation).

Again, Paul told the Romans: “But in accordance with your stubborn and unrepentant heart you store up to yourself anger at the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of Yahweh, who ‘will render to each according to his works’. Surely to those with endurance in good works, honor and dignity and incorruptibility they seek, eternal life. But to those of contention, and they who disobey the truth, but are persuaded by injustice: anger and wrath, affliction and strait, on every soul of man who labors to accomplish evil ...” (Rom. 2:5-9, my translation). He also told the Corinthians: “For another foundation no one is able to place besides that which is established, which is Yahshua Christ. Now if anyone builds upon that foundation gold, silver, precious stones, timber, fodder, straw, the work of each will become evident; indeed the day will disclose it, because in fire it is revealed; and of what quality the work of each is, the fire will scrutinize. If the work of anyone who has built remains, he will receive a reward. If the work of anyone burns completely, he will suffer loss, but he himself will be preserved, although consequently through fire.” (1 Cor. 3:11-15, my translation).

It should be plainly evident that Clayton Douglas has misrepresented the teachings of Paul, taking portions of passages entirely out of context and criticizing things which he has neither truly studied nor does he understand. Good works were clearly a part of Paul’s definition of faith, clearly a necessary part of a Christian’s life, and shall certainly be rewarded appropriately and proportionally. Yet there is more which I am compelled to say here, but in a short space.

One will not find the word “grace” in my translations. Although the word *χάρις* (5485) may mean *grace*, it is also *favor*, and much more appropriately in the New Testament. On occasions much too frequent to list here, Yahweh promised “salvation”, or *preservation* to the children of Israel all throughout the prophetic writings. These promises were made despite the sins (errors, transgressions of the law) committed by the Israelites. If all those who have transgressed the law, or who have failed to love their brethren, were to be destroyed, Abraham could never have descendants “as the sand of the sea, which cannot be numbered” (Gen. 32:12 et al.), and he may not have had any descendants at all! The promises made to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were made regardless of the behavior of subsequent generations, which Yahweh must have foreseen. The promises of preservation (or “salvation”) to Israel were made without condition! The promises to redeem Israel were to **all** of Israel, and so Paul says “all Israel shall be preserved” (Rom. 11:26), and this teaching is in accordance with the prophets and with the parables of Christ. Israelites who in the end have no lasting good works are left with no reward, for which compare the above quoted 1 Cor. 3:11-15 with Luke 19:11-27. Israelites who are sinners are not admitted into the Kingdom, as Paul teaches everywhere, i.e. 1 Cor. 6:9-11; Gal. 5:19-21; Eph. 5:5. In contrast, the “goat” nations, the non-Israelites, are to be totally destroyed (i.e. Matt. 13:47-50; 25:31-41), and among these are the tares (Matt. 13:37-43), which Paul also identified as the bad-fig Edomite jews (Rom. 9:1-13, 21-23), who time and again Clayton Douglas prefers to

follow! It is not Paul's fault that all those who fail to see that the (pure) descendants of Abraham through Isaac and Jacob were favored simply because of their genes, also fail to distinguish the fate of Israelites, good and bad, from the fate of the bastard races, among which are the jews. Paul took his message only to the "lost" sheep of Israel, to those Nations which were descended from Abraham (Gen. 17:5, et al.), which all of his epistles demonstrate.

<Section #38> Clay Douglas states: "*Since Paul envisioned Jesus' return in his own lifetime it is likely that Paul also conceived of a 'timeless' savior (The Interpreter's Bible; Volume 11: Page 265) who would deliver those who believed in him (in other words, you only had to 'believe'; no matter that you were the Texas Chain Saw Murderer. All 'believers' go to Heaven. According to Paul, Stalin's there too! More on this a bit later...)* Unfortunately, Jesus is reflected in Revelation stating just the opposite.

"Behold, I am coming soon, bringing my recompense, to repay every one for what he has done." (Revelation 22:12; RSV)"

In reply to section **<#38>**: Again Douglas is misrepresenting Paul's teaching, as we have seen in the quotes of Paul's letters in the previous section. Paul's statement at Romans 2:5-9 is certainly not in conflict with Yahshua's at Rev. 22:12! Douglas takes a couple of Paul's statements, which for want of understanding he disagrees with, and because they are taken out of context and the rest of Paul's writings are ignored, he makes accusations which have no merit whatsoever.

Regardless of what *The Interpreter's Bible* says, Paul envisioned the return of Christ *at any possible time*, as all Christians in all generations should well have done. Of course, scoffers such as Douglas would not understand the necessity to do so. Read the words of Christ as recorded at Mark 13:32-37, where 13:35 says in part "Watch ye therefore: for ye know not when the master of the house cometh ...", or the version at Matthew 24:36-44 which ends: "Therefore be ye also ready: for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh." So also at Luke 12:40: "Be ye therefore ready also: for the Son of man cometh at an hour when ye think not." So also at Luke 21:29-36! Whether Paul thought that the coming of Christ would be in 70 A.D. (i.e. Rom 16:20) or in 7000 A.D. is absolutely immaterial. What he taught was in line with the words of Yahshua Christ: that His coming may be at any time, and so therefore we should be prepared as if the time was imminent. Clayton Douglas whines that there is "*little real information in the New Testament about the life and teachings of Jesus Christ*" (see section **<#13>**, p. 52), yet it is obvious that he doesn't comprehend, or hasn't read, the Scripture that he does have! Clayton Douglas can fall into only one of three categories: deceiver, because he understands all he has read, but dislikes it; deceived, because someone else, some jew scoffer, actually wrote these articles for him; or idiot, for writing so much about something he knows so little about (maybe two or all three)! Paul of Tarsus was certainly teaching all things according to the will of Yahshua Christ, which time and again we have seen from the law, the prophets, and the gospel.

<Section #39> Clay Douglas states: "*The question begs to be asked, 'Why would Yahweh (God [sic]) and Esu Immanuel choose Saul the Pharisee to interpret Esu's Teachings?' Saul had cruelly executed thousands of early Christians. He loved torturing women and children alike, truly in a ruthless Bolshevik fashion. God's Ten*

Commandments include 'Thou Shalt Not Murder' (the original Commandment used the term 'Murder', not 'Kill'). Murder is NOT forgivable. God DOES NOT FORGIVE MURDER. IT IS SAID. Paul the Pharisee murdered and then murdered some more. Innocents. Thousands of them. He LOVED killing. But, we are to believe that Esu went directly to him and inspired Paul to 'interpret' Esu's life and his teachings. Poppycock. Scriptures state clearly that God does not change. And, the Scriptures also teach us that 'The Truth will set us free'."

In reply to section <#39>: Prior to his conversion, Paul was a zealous defender of the faith that he was raised in, not actually having known or heard Christ in person, and so not knowing any better himself. Paul was rounding up 'heretics' and bringing them to Jerusalem, where many of these people were imprisoned and executed after a vote was cast against them, for which see Acts 22:4-5 and 26:9-10. The phrase "I gave my voice against" at Acts 26:10 is from the Greek verb καταφέρω (2702) which is literally *to bring down* (L&S), and the noun ψφος (5586) which is a *pebble*, and the phrase describes how voting was conducted in an assembly, as the Greek custom also was, and is better translated here "I had cast a vote." Paul's actions, right or wrong, were in accordance with the leaders of his nation at the time, and conducted within the due process of law which that nation was operating under. We today see many otherwise decent men in our government, a wayward government which has perpetrated many evil deeds over the past 160 years, who have zealously taken up the cause to execute the government's desires. And so we have seen the *War of Northern Aggression*, and the destruction of half a million Saxons, then the *War to end all Wars*, the jew propaganda which brought us World War I, and then World War II, which combined destroyed tens of millions of people, Saxon against Saxon. Were all of these men murderers? Or were only a few certain instigators responsible?

Paul was no murderer, and Clayton Douglas' account of the actions described are absolute fiction. The jews create this same type of slander in reference to our German brethren during World War II, in their tales of the so-called 'Holocaust.' Clayton Douglas is their disciple. Now notice that Douglas accuses Paul as a "Bolshevik", who were mostly jews, and in the next section he enlists the help of a true *Bolshevik* against Paul!

<Section #40> Clay Douglas states: "*The Following Article Was Originally Published In The January, 1928 issue of 'THE CENTURY MAGAZINE' A REAL CASE AGAINST THE JEWS MARCUS ELI RAVAGE (excerpted)*

"*But I tell you, you are self-deceivers. You lack either the self-knowledge or the mettle to face the facts squarely and own up to the truth. You resent the Jew not because, as some of you seem to think, we crucified Jesus but because we gave him birth. Your real quarrel with us is not that we have rejected Christianity but that we have imposed it upon you!*

"*Your loose, contradictory charges against us are not a patch on the blackness of our proved historic offense. You accuse us of stirring up revolution in Moscow. Suppose we admit the charge. What of it? Compared with what Paul the Jew of Tarsus accomplished in Rome, the Russian unheaval [sic upheaval] is a mere street brawl ...'*

"*Excerpted, Jewish Persecution series, The Great Hoax, Jackie Patru, Sweet Liberty.)*"

In reply to section <#40>: Here Douglas goes again, the supposed Christian American patriot quoting the words of yet another jew-devil in order to build his case

against Paul. Douglas really doesn't care about the teachings of Yahshua Christ. If he did, then he would obey them! When Christ told the jews that they were descended from the devil, and couldn't possibly tell nor believe the truth (John 8:31-47), He wasn't kidding, nor was He speaking vainly. Jews like Ravage would have us to believe the lie that both Yahshua Christ and the apostle Paul were jews! Rather, Christ was of the tribe of Judah and Paul of the tribe of Benjamin, and both in physical appearance like Anglo-Saxons. The jews are not Israelites, but are rather from the tribes of the Edomites and Canaanites descended from both Cain and the mixed ("Arab") races. Since the jew Ravage's initial premises are wrong, everything which follows is categorically false. The real hoax is that the jews are allowed to get away with their claims, mostly because of people such as Jackie Patru and Clayton Douglas who quote and perpetuate their lies, rather than confront them!

<Section #41> Clay Douglas states: *"They would have us believe that the evil that is so prevalent in the world is the way it is because God has willed it to be so. It is God's plan for 'the end times'. This teaching has produced a 'flock' of religious people who have not only adopted this as the gospel, but have passed on to an unsuspecting world the atmosphere of complete ineptness, complacency, and downright laziness. We are lead [sic] to believe that not only is there nothing that we can do about this world situation, but there is nothing that should be done, because, after all, it's Bible prophecy. Is there any chance that all this complacency could be exactly what the enemies of Christ have masterminded for ages?"*

In reply to section **<#41>**: Those same prophets who had foretold the coming of Christ, even dating His coming to the year, over 500 years beforehand (see Daniel 9:24-27), also foretold the nature, identity and duration of the kingdoms of this world (i.e. Daniel chapters 2 and 7). These things were verified again by Yahshua Christ Himself in His Revelation to John (i.e. chapter 13). This was discussed earlier in this response, in section **<#8>** beginning on p. 44. The children of Israel were to be punished for 2520 years, the beast empires were to endure for 2520 years, and the Babylonian order was to endure for 2520 years, all three of these periods beginning at different times in the 8th to 6th centuries B.C., which is demonstrable through a study of Revelation and Daniel. Since Yahshua Christ fully verified these things not only in the Revelation, but at events such as those recorded in Luke 4:5-6 (Matt. 4:8-9) and Luke 20:24-25; (Matt. 22:17-21; Mark 12:14-17), then by his gainsaying Clayton Douglas makes himself one of the "enemies of Christ" that he so vainly whines about.

<Section #42> Clay Douglas states: *"'One should not embellish or dress up Christianity: it has waged a WAR TO THE DEATH against this higher type of man.' - Nietzsche, 'The Anti-Christ', Chapter 5, line 1. 'I regard Christianity as the most fatal and seductive lie that has ever yet existed.' - Nietzsche. 'Paul UNDERSTOOD the need for the lie...' - Nietzsche, [ibid.] Chapter 47, line 4. 'Christianity was the vampire of the Imperium Romanum (Roman Empire) - the tremendous deed of the Romans ... was undone overnight by Christianity. - Is this still not understood?' - Nietzsche, [ibid.], Chapter 58, line 8 'What he (Paul) divined was that with the aid of the little sectarian movement on the edge of Judaism one could ignite a 'world conflagration',... This was*

his vision on the road to Damascus: he grasped that to disvalue 'the world' he needed the belief in immortality, that the concept 'Hell' will master even Rome.'

"- Nietzsche, 'The Anti-Christ', Chapter 58, lines 15-16. (From THE ANTICHRIST by Friedrich Nietzsche. Published 1895. Nietzsche - himself - was a rabid Anti-Christian as well as an 'Illuminated' philosopher. Nietzsche even referred to himself as a 'madman'. However, he was also firmly against the Communist doctrines put forth by Marx and Engels.)"

In reply to section <#42>: Again Clayton Douglas resorts to the perverse arguments of the humanist madman Friedrich "God is Dead" Nietzsche, a professed anti-Christian and therefore a man not qualified to objectively assess the validity of Paul's Christian doctrines. Douglas quoted Nietzsche upon introducing his Paul-bashing articles, which was discussed on p. 37 above. Just because Nietzsche was "*firmly against the Communist doctrines put forth by Marx and Engels*" doesn't make him any good, or any sort of authority concerning Christianity. Contrary to popular Jewish philosophy, the enemy of my enemy is NOT my friend! Neither does Nietzsche honestly characterize the fall of Rome. The eastern portion of the empire at Constantinople was more thoroughly Christian than the west when it fell, and lasted a thousand years longer! Rome in the west fell because its own immorality and decadence made it ripe for the Germanic armies which destroyed it, exactly as Daniel said would happen (Dan. 2:40-45), a thousand years beforehand! Nietzsche, a classics professor, should surely have been aware of all this, yet chose instead to create lies. Clayton Douglas is his disciple!

Nietzsche disqualifies himself as a classicist where he talks about the belief in immortality and the concept of "Hell", for these beliefs were not only prevalent among the Old Testament Hebrews, but also among the Greeks going all the way back to Homer, and to the Germanic tribes even before their conversion to Christianity.

First, Yahshua Christ Himself mentioned Hades (a Greek word) and the "gates of Hades" ("hell" in the A.V.), for which see Matt. 11:23; 16:18; Luke 10:15; 16:23; Rev. 1:18; 6:8 and 20:13-14. Peter discussed the Spirit of Christ descending to preach "unto the spirits in prison" (1 Pet. 3:19). Strong's lexicon defines *sheol*, Hebrew #7585, "*hades or the world of the dead ... including its accessories and inmates.*" The Greeks called this world Hades (ᾍδης), in the 9th edition of the Liddell & Scott *Greek-English Lexicon* "the *nether* world ... *place of departed spirits ...*", which was also called Tartaros (Τάρταρος) "*the nether world generally.*" Hesiod calls it "dim Tartaros in the depth of the wide-pathed Earth" (*Theogony*, 119). From the times of Homer, and probably much earlier, this was the abode of the souls of the dead, and in the *Odyssey* Homer devotes an entire chapter to Odysseus' supposed visit to the place, conversing with the deceased. Homer and Hesiod wrote at least 800 years before Paul. In Euripides' *Alcestis*, written 500 years before Paul, Heracles descends to Hades to bring the heroine Alcestis back from the dead.

In the Germanic literature which dates to a time long before the Christianization of the North, Niflheim is the underworld abode of Hel, or Hela, goddess of the dead, and the souls of the dead dwell there. Niflheim and Hel (from whence is the English "hell") are mentioned in the Edda, i.e. the *Voluspa* par. 42 or *The Lay of Vafthrúthnir* par. 43. See *The Poetic Edda* translated by Lee M. Hollander, University of Texas Press and "Hel" in the index. These things were also published well before Nietzsche's time, and

being a Classics professor, he is without excuse if he was ignorant of them. The *Voluspa* appeared in Sharon Turner's *The History of The Anglo-Saxons* when it was published in the 1840's, as an appendix to Book 2 of that monumental work.

As Germanic heroes received immortality in Valhalla, and Greek heroes at Olympus or in the "isles of the blest" beyond the western sea, Enoch walked with Yahweh. These beliefs endured wherever our Saxon-Israelite race is found. Where are Nietzsche, Spong, Ravage, Douglas, and the rest of the jews, liberals, anti-Christians and Paul-bashers going?

Again, continuing to address Clayton Douglas' article *The Seduction: Judeo-Christianity OR Pauline Christianity? Saul of Tarsus: Paul. A different view*, which he published in the December, 2003 issue of his *Free American Newsmagazine*, while we are approaching the end of Douglas' article there are still quite a few things to address. It seems that Douglas, like many Paul-bashers, will stop at nothing to discredit Paul, manufacturing all sorts of evidence and presenting a totally perverted and corrupted viewpoint of the Scriptures and other ancient writings in order to make something stick out of his nefarious list of charges.

In the section of his article which follows, Douglas offers a perverted interpretation of some lines from the Dead Sea Scrolls, which I shall discuss at length. While it cannot be substantiated here, Douglas seems to get these particular ideas from Joseph Jeffers and his successor Philip B. Evans, both so-called "Doctors", of an organization which they call "Yahweh's New Kingdom" based in Prescott, Arizona. Douglas is also from Arizona. Both Jeffers and Evans claim to be prophets, offer contorted versions of history, and are Paul-bashers, universalists, and inventors of tales. Their work may be addressed later in this series. For now we shall continue with Douglas' articles.

<Section #43> Clay Douglas states: *"Perhaps most damning of all, are the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Dead Sea Scrolls were written by the Essenes (the first 'Christians'), and are the only surviving literature of theirs. In them, they rant about a 'Liar' and a 'Spouter of Lies', that is changing and perverting their teachings for his own purposes. Researchers have shown conclusively that this 'Liar' or 'Spouter of Lies' was Saul of Tarsus (aka 'Saint Paul'), the FOUNDER of Christianity, and the main conspirator in this plot ... He was taking their little religion (which was never meant for 'other nations'), and twisting it to make it more appealing to them ... This information was so explosive that the Dead Sea Scrolls and their translations were kept under wraps for decades in fear that 'they would shake the foundations of Western religion' ..."*

In reply to section **<#43>**: First, there is no substantial evidence that the Dead Sea Scrolls were written by Essenes. Reading the professional archaeology journals, scholars and academics refer to the authors of the scrolls as the Qumran sect or the Dead Sea sect, and such is proper since a definite identification of these people with any of the historically known sects of Judaea cannot be made. Most of the Dead Sea Scrolls fall into one of several categories, which I would generally identify as follows: a) Copies or targums of Biblical books; b) Copies or targums of known apocryphal books;

c) Sectarian commentaries on Biblical books; d) Prayers and prophecies peculiar to the sect; e) Scrolls of instruction for and governance of the members of the sect. There are some other miscellaneous documents, such as the calendrical documents, or the *Copper Scroll* which is a description of buried treasure which the sect supposedly had in various places, which don't really fit into one of these categories. Most of the scrolls are numbered in the fashion #Q#, where the first number is the cave where the scroll was said to be found, 1 through 11, and the second a serial number of the scrolls and/or fragments from each particular cave. Additionally, many of the notable scrolls also have a familiar name. For example, the *Copper Scroll* mentioned above is 3Q15.

Josephus' description of the Essenes, found at *Wars* 2.8.2-3 (2: 119-122) is very much like Luke's of some of the first Christians (Acts 2:44-45; 4:32-37), yet that does not necessarily mean that these first Christians were Essenes, or that Essenes were the first Christians. While some of the sectarian documents found at Qumran do indicate that the possessions of sect members were controlled by the sect and not by the individual, such as *4QRule of the Community*, i.e. 4Q256 Col. IX (frag. 4) and 4Q258 Col. I (frags. 1a1, 1b), so it may appear that these people were Essenes, yet such communal societies were certainly not novel and occurred elsewhere. For instance, Diodorus Siculus said of certain Greek colonists at Lipara that they "took over the cultivation of the islands which they had made the common property of the community ... their possessions also they made common property, and living according to the public mess system, they passed their lives in this communistic fashion for some time" (Loeb Library edition, 5.9.4-5). Diodorus wrote from about 50 B.C., and so it is quite possible that other groups besides the Essenes lived in a communal fashion, this way of life known among both Greeks and Hebrews.

Yet others of the Qumran documents suggest that these people did not live in a truly communal manner, such as *4QInstruction*, at 4Q416 Fragment 2 and 4Q417 Fragment 1 which discuss the borrowing of necessities, and advise of the need to repay such loans as quickly as possible. These do not seem to be Essene teachings, since in a community where all things are held in common there should be no need for borrowing, or to make repayment for what one requires. This is especially true if the Qumran sect was as wealthy as the treasures which are listed on the *Copper Scroll* purports it to be.

Some may point to a certain passage in Pliny's *Natural History*, at 5:73, which seems to support the identity of Qumran as an Essene settlement, yet there is much dispute concerning this passage, for which see *Biblical Archaeology Review*, July-August 2002, p. 18, "Searching for Essenes" for the details of this argument. Josephus testified that the Essenes "have no certain city, but many of them dwell in every city; and if any of their sect come from other places, what they have lies open for them, just as if it were their own ..." (*Wars* 2.8.4). And so there are difficulties with identifying the members of the Qumran sect as Essenes.

The *War Scroll* found in 4Q491 through 4Q497 and some other Qumran scrolls, peculiar to the Qumran sect, was written by a vain and false prophet who described a grandiose apocalyptic scenario depicting a final battle between the remnant of Israel in Palestine and the "Empire of the Kittim", which was the name that the sect gave to the Romans, also sometimes called the "Empire of Belial" (i.e. 4Q491 Fragments 8-10 Col. l). This battle was to end with the aggrandizement of the remnant of Israel, which they

saw as their own sect, and the fall of Rome. The sect interpreted parts of Isaiah chapter 10 in this same manner, for which see 4Q161 Fragments 8-10. Since the Qumran sect seemed to know nothing of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans in 70 A.D., and even mentions the city on occasion, (i.e. 4Q504, Fragments 1-2, Col. IV) the *War Scroll* requires a dating for the Qumran sect somewhere between Pompey's conquest of Judaea where it was subjected to Rome, and the revolt from Rome beginning about 65 A.D. which resulted in Jerusalem's destruction in 70 A.D., a period of about 132 years. Since the scrolls lack mention of any contemporary historical figures or specific historic events, I know nothing (though others may) by which the scrolls can be dated more precisely. There was a fourth large sect in Judaea, that of Judas the Galilaian, which Josephus said was noted for their refusal to heed any authority but God, and also for inspiring revolt from Rome. Josephus describes them at *Antiquities* 18.1.6 (18:23-25). This is in such agreement with the Qumran sect's apocalyptic documents that this sect is as good a candidate for Qumran as the Essenes.

Yet one thing is certain, and that is that there is no mention of Christ or anything Christian in the Qumran scrolls, and even if the sect had heard about Christianity, they surely made no mention of it. Even if Essenes were among the first Christians, and even if the people of Qumran were Essenes, the people of Qumran were not Christian! The people of Qumran were still awaiting the Messiah, who would lead them in the destruction of the Kittim (their name for the Romans), as evident in the eschatological scroll *4QSefer ha-Milhamah*, or 4Q285 Fragment 5, and in many places elsewhere.

The Qumran sect's post-Apocalyptic *New Jerusalem* scroll (parts of which are found in 1Q32; 2Q24; 4Q232, 365a, 554, 554a, 555; 5Q15 and 11Q18) talks about Passover sacrifices and offerings (i.e. 11Q18 Fragments 16, 17 and 27), so the Christian understanding of Daniel 9:24-27 and 1 Cor. 5:7 is wanting at Qumran. Other scrolls, such as *4QRitual of Purification B* (4Q512) and *4QOrdinances* (4Q514) place an emphasis on ritual purification (baptism), which after the baptism of John we see Christ rejecting before the Pharisees (i.e. Mark 7:1-23). The Qumran sect, while anti-Roman and separatist, surely clung to traditional Judaism. While not Pharisees, neither were they Sadducees, since they believed in spirits and the continued life of the soul after the death of the body: things which the Sadducees fully rejected (*Antiquities* 18.1.4; Acts 23:8). Now it should be apparent that while the Dead Sea Scrolls may have been produced during the time of Paul of Tarsus, this is not necessarily so, and since the sect was surely not Christian, nor were they anti-Christian, having no apparent knowledge of Christ, they certainly had no reason at all to make any reference to Paul of Tarsus in their writings.

The Dead Sea Scrolls are an enigma to most people, who will never have the time or the initiative to read them. The fullest published edition of the scrolls is *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, Oxford University Press, which is 38 volumes the last time I read about it but may be even more now. Notice above that Douglas uses the phrase "*Researchers have shown conclusively*", and makes claims without making any citations or any display of the content which those claims are based upon. In following this manner of criteria, one may say almost anything since nearly all of the intended audience will not or simply cannot check the authenticity of such blanket claims: indeed since no references are given one must read the entire body of literature (sometimes several volumes) to check them! The edition of the scrolls which I am using for all of the

citations here is *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* by Florentino G. Martinez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar. This edition offers a catalogue of all the scrolls which contain copies of Biblical books, listing the full contents, and also a Hebrew (or Aramaic or Greek) transcription and English translation of all the scrolls which are not merely copies of the Biblical books. So in two volumes all of the targums, apocryphae, sectarian documents and other literature of Qumran are fully reproduced. Yet where I supply the common identifiers of the scrolls to which I am referring (i.e. 4Q285), one should be able to check my citations for himself in any comprehensive scholarly edition of the scrolls, to see the text in its original context. Why hasn't Douglas done the same? Chances are, it's because he can't, for his lies would be exposed!

Douglas states that in the scrolls the writers "... rant about a 'Liar' and a 'Spouter of Lies'," and that "Researchers have shown conclusively that this 'Liar' ... was Saul of Tarsus." Now the scrolls do mention a "Spreader of the Lie" (1QPesher to Micah or 1Q14 Frags. 8-10), a "Teacher of Lies" (4QIsaiah Pesher or 4Q163 Frags. 4-6 Col. I), a "Man of the Lie" (1QPesher to Habakkuk or 1QpHab Cols. II and V), and a "Man of Lies" (4QPsalms Pesher or 4Q171 Cols. I and IV). Also mentioned in the Pesharim (plural for Pesher) is a "Wicked Priest" (i.e. 1QpHab, Cols. I, IX, and XII). These Pesharim, or interpretations of Old Testament books, are the only places in the Dead Sea Scrolls where I have found the terms "Spreader of the Lie", "Man of the Lie" or "Man of Lies"; hardly viable evidence identifying Paul of Tarsus! Here we shall investigate some of these instances:

1Q14 contains parts of an interpretation of Micah chapter 1. From fragments 8-10: "What are the high places of Judah? Is it not Jerusalem? I will reduce Samaria to a country ruin, to a plot of vines. Its interpretation concerns the **Spreader of the Lie who has misdirected the simple.**"

4Q171 contains parts of an interpretation of Psalm 37. From Column I: "... the arrogant ones choose ... who love slovenliness and misdirect ... wickedness at the hands of Ephraim. Be silent before YHWH and wait for him, do not be annoyed with one who has success, with someone who hatches plots. Its interpretation concerns the **Man of Lies who misdirected many** with deceptive words ..."

So here it should be fully manifest, that the epithets "Spreader of the Lie" or "Man of Lies" as used in the Dead Sea Scrolls cannot possibly be referring to Paul of Tarsus, unless one wants to believe **that Paul was alive in the days of Micah**, having misdirected the people of Samaria! and **that Paul was alive in the days of David**, having misdirected the children of Ephraim! Yet hopefully it has been shown here again and again, that Clayton Douglas can invent and believe just about anything that suits his own purpose.

Often in these very same Pesharim this Liar is contrasted to the "Teacher of Righteousness", such as at 1QpHab, an interpretation of the prophet Habakkuk, in Columns II and V. It is clear in other Pesharim that this "Teacher of Righteousness" is no contemporary man or sect leader, but is rather an epithet for the expected Messiah. From *4QIsaiah Pesher*, 4Q165 Fragments 1-2 which contain an interpretation of Isaiah 40:11: "The interpretation of the word concerns the Teacher of Righteousness who reveals just teachings" (cf. John 4:24-26). Since the Qumran sect had not yet met their Messiah, and knew nothing of Yahshua Christ, their Liar certainly cannot be Paul of Tarsus. Rather, it is clear from the context of the Pesharim that "Spreader of the Lie",

or “Man of Lies”, or “Man of the Lie” is another epithet for Satan, the Adversary, i.e. Genesis 3:4-5, John 8:44. In all fairness, no other identification could possibly be made within the context which the scrolls themselves provide. While in other instances the epithet “Teacher of Righteousness” indicates a much earlier prophet or leader of the people, such as in the *Damascus Document*, or CD-B, Column XX, another copy of which is *4QDamascus Document* or 4Q266, where the epithet occurs in Fragment 2, Column 1, yet since these certainly do not refer to Yahshua Christ, neither can any of the antagonists mentioned there be imagined to be Paul of Tarsus.

That the “Dead Sea Scrolls and their translations were kept under wraps for decades in fear that ‘they would shake the foundations of Western religion’” is a blatant lie which cannot be substantiated. The scrolls were first discovered in 1947, and they were collected and deposited in a museum in the West Bank region of Palestine, where for twenty years they were studied by western scholars, and photographs were made of all the scrolls and fragments. In 1967, during the six-day war when the jews seized control of the West Bank, it was they who seized control of the museum that the scrolls were housed in, having restricted access to all but a select few of their own scholars. In the early 1990’s the jews again began to grant access to the scrolls to others. This story is well known and can be found in books such as *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* by Geza Vermes, a jew who was also denied access to the scrolls during the 25 year period in which they were restricted. It is hardly conceivable that the jews would cut off access to the scrolls in order to protect Christianity, and books about the scrolls and their contents had already been published, such as *The Scrolls From The Dead Sea*, by Edmund Wilson in 1955. If anything, the jews would only want to make certain that nothing could get out which exposed the lies which they tell about themselves for the frauds which they are.

<Section #44> Clay Douglas states: “‘*Take heed that no man deceive you’ ... ‘Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep’s clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves.’*”

“The primary Pharisee-inspired Myth which is incorporated into Pauline Laws is the Myth/Hoax that Jesus’ death would - forevermore - cleanse us of our sins. As long as we have ‘faith’. Come on. Do you really believe this to be true? Do you believe that ‘Grace’ allows a pedophile murderer of children to enter The Kingdom at the very same time as the God-fearing man, who upheld God’s Laws and Commandments all his life? Do you really accept this to be true? As long as the Abortion Doctor ‘repents’ and gives himself to Jesus, that God will accept him into the Kingdom of Heaven? Does this really make a lick of sense to you? It does not to me.”

In reply to section **<#44>**: It is absolutely evident that while all of the Paul-bashers very often cite “the law and the prophets” which Christ came to fulfill, evidently these people have read neither the law nor the prophets! Speaking of the children of Israel and of Judah (but not the jews), Yahweh says: “And I will cleanse them from all their iniquity, whereby they have sinned against me; and I will pardon all their iniquities, whereby they have sinned, and whereby they have transgressed against me.” (Jer. 33:8). “Neither shall they defile themselves any more with their idols, nor with their detestable things, nor with any of their transgressions: but I will save them out of all their dwelling places, wherein they have sinned, and will cleanse them: so shall they be my

people, and I will be their God.” (Ezek. 37:23). There are no exceptions expressed in these Scriptures, and so Paul said “all Israel shall be preserved” (Rom. 11:26), teaching nothing which hadn’t been uttered by Yahweh Himself. Disputing this, Clayton Douglas again disputes with Yahweh and with the entire Bible, not merely with Paul. Of course Paul, like Yahweh, also meant no one else but the children of Israel, as he taught in nearly all of his epistles. Paul’s ideas of faith, favor (‘grace’) and salvation were discussed already, where Douglas raised the issue in section [#37B](#) of this response, on p. 91. There we also saw that Paul taught that sinners would not be admitted into the Kingdom of Heaven, clearly evident in his remarks at 1 Cor. 6:9-11; Gal. 5:19-21 and Eph. 5:5. Yet it should be evident that the true target of Douglas’ diatribe is not Paul, but Christianity itself, and so Douglas is willing to offer corrupt interpretations of just about anything in order to deceive his readers, and even become a follower of the jews and sexual deviants in doing so!

<Section #45> Clay Douglas states: *“A basic Law of the Cosmos is that of Cause and Effect, which states that for every cause there is an effect, and for every effect there is a cause. Farmers know this law when they reap what they have sown. This holds true in all of creation. Why then would we not be held accountable for our own free-will choices?”*

In reply to section **<#45>**: Paul knew all about cause and effect, and stated as much in his epistles. One instance is Galatians 6:7-8: “Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting.” These words are certainly not out of line with those of Yahshua Christ, such as those recorded at Matt. 6:19-21: “Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal: But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal: For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also.” The teachings of Paul were fully coherent with the teachings of Yahshua Christ.

<Section #46> Clay Douglas states: *“How could we expect the blood of a dead man, God’s son or otherwise, to magically remove our responsibility for our evil deeds? Why would we not be held accountable under the cosmic law of cause and effect for our own wrongful choices? Why/how could we be ‘raptured’ home?”*

In reply to section **<#46>**: There are several aspects to the Passion of Christ which are quite lengthy and shall not be discussed here. One has to do with the “devil”, a word which is actually often διάβολος (diabolos, 1228) and which means “False Accuser” when accompanied with an article (i.e. “the”), being used as a Substantive. This is the “accuser of our brethren” of Rev. 12:10 and has to do with the reason why certain spirits were “in prison” (1 Pet. 3:19). When the children of the devil (the jews, John 8:44, Matt. 27:25) murdered Yahweh Himself, whom Yahshua Christ was, the accusations of the Adversary against the children of Yahweh could not stand, and He was then able to free their spirits (1 Pet. 3:18-19, 4:6) once they accepted His gospel: that He let Himself be murdered by the Adversary (“Satan”) in order to redeem them. This is an important facet of the crucifixion which can’t possibly be understood unless

one first understands two-seedline! Because the Romish church, and all of its daughters, do not understand this, they substitute false doctrine in its place, things which Paul certainly did not teach.

Another aspect of the crucifixion is the relationship which Yahweh had with Israel. Yahshua Christ came only for the “lost sheep” of the house of Israel (Matt. 15:24), the New Covenant was made with only Israel and Judah (Jer. 31:31-33), and Paul went only to those nations descended from the Old Testament Israelites, as discussed in the response to the Paul-basher H. Graber at section [<H>](#), on p. 10, and in section [<#7>](#) of this Douglas response on p. 42.

Yahweh married Himself to the nation of Israel, and as a condition Israel agreed to submit to the Old Covenant, of which the Old Testament law was a part. Exodus chapter 19 contains what may be considered the oldest prenuptial agreement on record. That Yahweh was married to Israel, and gave Israel a bill-of-divorce when Israel had wholly transgressed the law and the terms of the agreement is evident at Isaiah 50:1-2; 54:1-7; Jer. 2:32; 3:1-11; 31:31-32; Hos. 1:1-11 and 2:1-13. Yet the law of divorcement was not part of the original laws of Yahweh, nor is it mentioned in the Levitical law, but was permitted later for reasons explained by Christ at Mark 10:4-12. Reading the law of divorcement as it is at Deut. 24:1-4, once Israel became polluted by joining to the false gods of the other races, Yahweh could not take Israel back!

Yet Yahweh did promise to remarry Israel, as is evident at Isa. 49:18; 61:10; 62:5 and Hosea 2:14-20. Yahweh, as Yahshua Christ, died so that Israel could remarry another, the risen Christ, thereby fulfilling the letter of the law, and for which see Rom. 7:1-6; 2 Cor. 11:2; 1 Pet. 2:9-10 (v. 10 being a reference to Hos. 1:9-11) and Rev. 19:6-10; 21:9-12 and 22:17. The parable at Luke 16:16-18 is another assurance that Yahshua Christ accepts no one but the children of Israel, regardless of who else tries to press into the Kingdom. So once Yahweh died on the cross, Israel was released from the Old Covenant agreement made during the Exodus, to be remarried to Yahshua Christ after His resurrection upon acceptance of the New Covenant. Once this is understood, the truth of Paul’s teaching concerning sin and the law in Romans chapters 6 and 7 and elsewhere is fully apparent. Clayton Douglas and the rest of the Paul-bashers, not understanding these things – and in part due to all of the false ‘church’ teachings on the subject – would rather scoff than study.

<Section #47> Clay Douglas states: “(Romans 11:32) ‘For God has consigned all men to disobedience, that he may have mercy upon all.’ (Paul of Tarsus)”

In reply to section **<#47>**: First, “men” here must be taken in context: Paul is only talking about Adamic, or Caucasian man (Romans 5:14-21), and of those only the men who were foreknown and predestinated by Yahweh (Romans 8:28-39), which as the Old Testament prophets show again and again can only be the children of Israel (i.e. Amos 3:2). So Paul is only talking about Israelite men, who were the only men under the law and expected to be obedient in the first place! Now, which Israelite – male or female – can claim to have never been disobedient in any way? I wouldn’t dare imagine one, and especially not myself, for I am no exception. James said: “For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one *point*, he is guilty of all” (2:10). How could Clayton Douglas dispute this? Does he imagine himself to be wholly

obedient to all of the law? One of his own websites, www.azthunderriders.com, surely indicates otherwise.

<Section #48> Clay Douglas states: *“In stark contrast to Paul’s teaching of salvation by faith APART FROM behavioral manifestations, Jesus (in Matt. 7:21-27), state [sic] unequivocally that the mere profession of accepting him is not enough, but that such a profession MUST BE backed up by deeds. So, why in the world do Christians everywhere make the absurd claim that entry to Heaven is absolutely guaranteed by anyone, and I mean anyone, just verbalizing that they’ve accepted Jesus as their Savior? How could Paul - or anyone - convince us of this blasphemous humanistic nonsense? This question is a moot point. After all, the bottomline is everyone HAS - INDEED - ACCEPTED THIS SLEIGHT-OF-HAND SORCERY. Correct?”*

In reply to section **<#48>**: It has already been elucidated here, in section **<#37B>** of this response on p. 91, that Paul deemed one’s behavior as an integral part of one’s faith. Douglas is absolutely misrepresenting Paul’s teachings in this respect, as he has done in so many others. All of the words of Yahshua Christ were to Paul a most important part of that faith (1 Tim. 6:3-6). Paul certainly did not teach that “... anyone, just verbalizing that they’ve accepted Jesus” can gain “entry to Heaven.” Rather, it is wholly evident that Israel was favored solely for genetic reasons, and everyone else is excluded, and such has been shown from Paul’s writing, the gospels, and the Old Testament prophets again and again throughout both this response and the earlier response to the Paul-bashing H. Graber. The “SLEIGHT-OF-HAND SORCERY” is the fault of organized religion, the Romish catholic church and her daughters, which Paul certainly cannot be blamed for. It would be much more productive an endeavor if the Paul-bashers studied Paul instead, and learning the truths of the matters placed the blame where it belongs: on the modern judaized churches and seminaries which have produced devoted humanists such as John Spong.

All of the devices of the Paul-bashers fail upon an honest investigation of the facts. That the Paul-bashers’ real issue is with Christianity itself, and not with Paul, should be fully evident throughout these responses. And this should be no surprise, since we have seen that both Graber and Douglas rely upon a host of jewish, anti-Christ, and Socialist sources (as did W. G. Finlay) in order to make their cases. Anti-Paulism is only a stepping-stone for these Paul-bashers. They truly desire to dissuade as many of us as possible in what is really just another attempt by the jews to divide and conquer the last remnants of true Christendom. Oh, how the jews must rejoice with glee when they observe us snagging onto their bait, and swallowing it hook, line and sinker! These arguments would never have gone anywhere until recently, for until recently, most people had more sense than to listen to a jew ranting about anything Christian! If H. Graber and Clayton Douglas aren’t themselves jews, they surely have become their followers and their tools, just like W. G. Finlay, Joseph Jeffers, Philip Evans, and the whole lot of these rash and obstinate fools!

[Some may condemn such rhetoric as unessential and unproductive in building the Kingdom, but Scripture testifies otherwise! Even the Nigerian-lover and complete imbecile Ted R. Weiland in his *Eve, Did She Or Didn’t She?*, on page 1, said: “Spiritual leaders are

admonished by the Scriptures to address false doctrine, especially doctrine injurious to the gospel of Yahshua the Christ – Titus 1:7-14.”

This passage says: “⁷ For a bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God; not selfwilled, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre; ⁸ But a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate; ⁹ Holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers. ¹⁰ For there are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision: ¹¹ Whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre’s sake. ¹² One of themselves, *even* a prophet of their own, said, The Cretians *are* always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies. ¹³ This witness is true. Wherefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith; ¹⁴ Not giving heed to Jewish fables, and commandments of men, that turn from the truth.” I ask you, Shall we keep quiet or speak out?! – *Clifton A. Emahiser*

Now we approach the finish our address of Clayton Douglas’ first Paul-bashing article *The Seduction: Judeo-Christianity OR Pauline Christianity? Saul of Tarsus: Paul. A different view*, which he published in the December, 2003 issue of his *Free American Newsmagazine*. We’ll then move on to the second of Douglas’ articles bashing Paul, which is a little shorter but shall take some time to address completely. When Clifton asked me to write this response to the Douglas articles, neither of us had any idea that it would take so many issues of the *Watchman’s Teaching Letter* to do so. Yet I pray that this effort is found to be worthwhile, that those Paul-bashers in Israel Identity shall be answered comprehensively, and that all of their devices intended to discredit Paul are found to be vain!

It seems to me that many in Israel Identity have not yet noticed the threat which Paul-bashing has become to the vulnerable of our faith. I call them “vulnerable” because, as the apostle Peter warned in his second epistle, those who contend against such scriptures do so at their own peril. A good friend of mine, whom I have been blessed to have exchanged letters with for several years now and whom I one day hope to meet, is Jeanne Snyder in Montana. Of course, Clifton has known Jeanne much longer than I. Jeanne knew both Wesley Swift and Bertrand Comparet personally, has been involved with Israel Identity for over 40 years, and has been of great service to many over those years. Yesterday (February 1st, 2006) I received a letter from Jeanne, who read the four *Watchman’s Teaching Letters* responding to H. Graber, and in it she said: “What is this about Paul bashing? He was the main one that spread the gospel to Israel. There wouldn’t be much of a New Testament without his letters to the different cities where the Israelites dwelled in their new homes. How easy Israel is still led astray, I wonder what Wesley and Bert would think about what is going on today.” Well, thank Yahweh for people such as Jeanne Snyder! While she may not be familiar with all of the various contentions of the Paul-bashers, she being well grounded in her faith surely isn’t going to fall for such deceit! Yet in stark contrast, another woman who has been involved with Israel Identity for a long time, one Judith Nipps, purportedly vowed that she would never speak to Clifton again after he began to publish this defense of Paul, and there are many other long-time Israel Identity adherents caught up in this Paul-

bashing deceit. [Note: Jeanne Snyder passed on to the Father on December 26th, 2006. Her friendship was enriching, and she is very much missed.]

Now while it is certain that the Keltic, Saxon and related peoples all descended from the Old Testament Israelites, as did the original Romans and many of the Greek tribes, which can be verified without the epistles of Paul of Tarsus, Jeanne Snyder certainly is correct in her assessment. The New Testament may be quite obscure to us today without the letters of Paul. Paul brought the gospel to the Greeks, Romans and Kelts, and told all of these people time and again that they were indeed the children of Israel, and so they returned to Yahweh and followed Christ – just as the Old Testament prophets said that they would! Anyone who would question this, as Peter tells us, is unlearned and unstable, and I do not mind telling them so!

Clayton Douglas reveals several times in his articles his knowledge of Saxon-Israel Identity (for which see his comments in section [#11](#) of this response, on p. 50) yet he loathes and denigrates Paul. Doing so, it is clear that Douglas makes himself a follower of the jews, liberals, anti-Christians and sexual deviants. And this is apparent, because it is writers of such persuasion that Douglas, and H. Graber before him, quote from time and again in their attacks on Paul. All Paul-bashers everywhere must take note of this: you are all deceived, and have made yourselves followers of the jews and all the vile scum of the earth, such as “Bishop” John S. Spong and “Rabbi” Joachim Prince. I shall now return to Douglas’ article.

<Section #49A> Clay Douglas states: *“Did you know that Cocky Paul made the decision to throw out the Laws handed down to Moses through God? Did you know that? Does anyone really care?”*

“Romans 3:19-21: ‘Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God. Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law [is] the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets.’”

In reply to section **<#49A>**: As we have seen, Paul certainly did not “throw out” the Laws handed down to Moses. Israel violated the Old Covenant, with which came the Levitical laws, and so the nation, the “wife”, was freed from this law when Yahweh Himself, incarnated as Yahshua Christ, died on the cross, for which see section [#46](#) of this response on p. 103. That the New Covenant is without the Levitical law is clear, being a matter of prophecy, for which see Jeremiah 31:31-33, and which has been discussed in this response in various places, but at length in the response to H. Graber in section [#J](#) beginning on p. 13. These being two different aspects of the relationship of the Levitical law and the Old Testament to the New Testament, two different explanations are required. For this reason it is written, “O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of Yahweh! How unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out!” (Rom. 11:33).

Douglas quotes Romans 3:19-21, takes the verses out of context, and does a great disservice by not reading further, unto Romans 3:31: “Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, **we establish the law.**” True Christians should want to establish the laws of Yahweh, written in our hearts, but not the Old Covenant rituals nor the legalism of the Pharisees, things our own fathers failed to abide in (see Acts

15:10). The 10 Commandments, with a few other admonishments from the gospel, surely encapsulate all which is good and wholesome in the laws of Yahweh. These were the first laws given the children of Israel leaving Egypt (Exodus 20), long before the statutes and ordinances recorded in Leviticus and Deuteronomy were handed down in writing.

<Section #49B> Clay Douglas states: *“I know. I know. Some have used Esu’s message in Mark 3:28 to reaffirm that even murderers are guaranteed a passport to Heaven. Right? Here it is.*

“Truly I say to you all sins will be forgiven the sons of Men and whatever blasphemies they utter; but whoever blasphemies against the Holy Spirit never has forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin...” (Esu Immanuel)

In reply to section **<#49B>**: It has been shown that all sins committed by any of the children of Israel (and no one else) are forgiven by Yahweh, and that this is also a matter of prophecy, discussed here in section **<#37B>** of this response beginning on p. 91. Yet Paul clearly taught that we must not sin more simply because our sins are forgiven, which is one of his themes in Romans chapter 3. He also taught that those who learn the truths of Christianity, and then fall away again, have no second repentance, for which see Hebrews 6:4-6; that even Israelite men, although forgiven, must answer for their sins, for which see 1 Tim. 5:24; and that there is no room in the kingdom of heaven for murderers and other sinners, for which see Rom. 1:29-32; 1 Cor. 6:9; Gal. 5:19-21; Eph. 5:1-8 and 1 Tim 1:8-11. Clayton Douglas, writing so critically about Christianity and things that he obviously does not understand, makes himself a fool. Yet in so blatantly misrepresenting the teachings of Paul and taking snippets of his writings out of context so as to abuse them, he makes himself a liar and a purveyor of deceit. I’d expect little else from a follower of Jews, miscreants and sexual deviants!

<Section #49C> Clay Douglas states: *“But, wait one moment. Understand the meaning of ‘blasphemies’. ‘Blasphemies’ - as defined - means this: ‘contempt or indignity offered to God; contempt offered to God. Root word: ‘Blame’.’ Clearly, if you show contempt to God by disobeying His Laws, you are censored by Jesus and His Father because of your eternal sin. Just remember Esu’s most important proclamation:”*

In reply to section **<#49C>**: Now Douglas makes himself a linguist, and neither can he do that right. The word *blasphemy* was not derived from the word *blame*. Rather, the English word *blame* was derived from the word *blaspheme*, and this is according to *The American Heritage College Dictionary*, and so Douglas has his etymology backwards. The English words *blaspheme* and *blasphemy* come from a group of Greek words, chief of which is the noun βλασφημία (*blasphemia*, Strong’s #988) which is defined by Liddell & Scott: *“a profane speech ... defamation, evil-speaking, slander ... impious and irreverent speech against God, blasphemy”* and this, of course, is the word translated as *blasphemy* wherever it appears in the N.T. Clayton Douglas perverts the language, and then distorts the meaning of what is being said at Mark 3:28, and adds things to it which it does not imply. Then he concludes by quoting Matthew: *“Think not that I have come to abolish the Law and the prophets; I have come not to abolish them but to fulfill them ...” (Matt. 5:17).*

And so we have come full circle. For already here it should be fully evident, and in many ways, that Paul did not teach the abolition of the Law and the prophets: Paul taught the fulfillment of those things, and their fulfillment in Yahshua Christ!

<Section #50> Clay Douglas states: *“We Christians claim that ‘God’ is a loving God. Why, then, would a loving God allow His own son to be killed, as a ‘ransom,’ for a bunch of very evil people? This is all part of the myth. The perpetuation of ‘The Myth’ continues to make us blind. Why is it so difficult to ‘tell it like it is’? Very evil blood-thirsty Edomites pushed to have Esu Immanual [sic] tortured and slaughtered. Esu did not want to die. It was not meant for him to die. The Romans, at the prodding of the Jewish Pharisees, murdered Jesus Christ. He is dead to us, all the while we try to keep his true teachings alive. Why are we being misled by the deception that He died ‘for our sins’? The reality is Jesus Christ was murdered Period. The interjection of the hoax myth that ‘He died for our sins’ allows us for [sic, maybe ‘to’] conveniently ‘forget’ the circumstances behind his horrible torture and eventual death by hanging, so that we can then ‘celebrate’ the murder, all the while we sin and repent, and sin and repent, (falsely) thinking we’ve still got a free ride into the Kingdom. What a trick they’ve turned! Do you really want to end up short on Judgement Day? Isn’t that the important question? ... Is this a gamble you are willing to take? ... How can we forgive ourselves? How could God forgive us?”*

In reply to section **<#50>**: All of these last appeals of Douglas’ have been addressed throughout this response. Yahshua died not on behalf of evil people, nor for the benefit of devils, the Edomite jews, but rather only for the children of Israel and the White Adamic race. The prophet Daniel dated the coming of Christ precisely, and foretold that He would be “cut off” (Daniel 9:24-27). In Isaiah, Psalms and elsewhere all of His sufferings were foretold. These things were matters examined as soon as the crucifixion and resurrection occurred, for which see Luke 24:13-35. These are the things which Paul taught from scripture everywhere he went, for which see Acts 17:11! Douglas, rejecting these things and others, has fully adopted the positions of the jews regarding Paul, Yahshua Christ, and the Old Testament prophets, and has done so repeatedly. Clayton Douglas is a jew, if not by race, surely by his corrupt views of the Bible, and of the history of our race! If he is not a jew himself, then he is either an idiot or a very foolish man, making himself a proselyte of the jews and sexual deviants and all sorts of miscreants, and spreading their teachings to his Christian–patriot readers.

This ends my response to Clayton Douglas’ first of two Paul-bashing articles. Since beginning this defense of Paul with Clifton’s publication of my letter in response to H. Graber, at least one of Clifton’s readers wrote to him and accused me of being arrogant and haughty. While I do know that at times I can sound that way, I really try to make an effort to be humble. But I must say that I shall not offer pusillanimity in the face of lies and blasphemies. To me, my race is worth defending, so I must confront the universalists who claim to be Israel Identity. My faith and its truths are worth defending, so I must confront the Paul-bashers and those led astray with anti-Christ doctrines who are within Israel Identity.

Unlike many of the so-called theologians and academics of today, I sincerely believe that our faith represents empirical truths which are fully evident in a proper study of Scripture, history, archaeology and language, and that once learned, these truths are

well worth standing up for and defending. Such is one who builds his house on a rock, and not on a foundation of shifting sand.

A couple of Clifton's other readers whined that they were tired of the "he said" / "we said" disputing, which is found in expositions such as this defense of Paul and in some of the pamphlets which Clifton has published. To this I must say: How can one judge the merits of such important arguments, lest one have the opportunity to see both sides of these issues being addressed? Presenting both sides of these issues which are raised is a much fairer way to assess the validity of each perspective, rather than simply writing a one-sided diatribe. And contrary to some who have accused me, neither I nor Clifton (and I think that I can speak for Clifton in this one matter) make any boasts concerning ourselves or our expertise. For my part, I have no expertise to boast of in the first place! I have simply seen a need, and have been given an opportunity, to do my best to answer each of H. Graber's or Clayton Douglas' accusations against the apostle Paul, all from the Scriptures and the lexicons and the history books, while giving all of the appropriate references. It is the reader's obligation to check my sources and to weigh the evidence, and then to determine the facts of the matter for one's own self. I invite, even adjure, anyone reading my writings to do this!

Here we shall move on to address Clayton Douglas' second Paul-bashing article, *SAUL OF TARSUS AND HIS DOCTRINE OF LAWLESSNESS*, which he published in the January, 2004 edition of his *Free American Newsmagazine*. Douglas opens his article with a bad translation of 2 Corinthians 12:16, and then some statements which are grossly misrepresentative of Paul's ministry:

<Section #51> Clay Douglas states: *"But granting that myself did not burden you I was crafty, you say, and got the better of you by deceit. (Saul of Tarsus 2 Corinthians 12:16)"*

"Tornado: tor-na' do. no. an intensely destructive advancing whirlwind formed from strongly turning currents ... Paul/Saul of Tarsus WAS a Tornado ... Mayhem. Disorder. Destruction. Since Paul's announcement he'd been visited by Jesus Christ (Immanuel Esu), nothing would ever be the same again. Let's revisit PAULINE CHRISTIANITY, shall we?"

In reply to section **<#51>**: I will address the poor translation of 2 Corinthians 12:16 later on where Douglas discusses it at length. Reading the accounts in Acts, whenever mayhem and disorder encompass Paul of Tarsus it is caused by the unbelieving jews, not by other Christians opposed to Paul, but by the apostate Edomite jews who were the enemies of Yahshua Christ Himself and persecutors of Christians everywhere. Clayton Douglas is their (the jews) defender, taking the blame for such violence from the jews and assigning it to Paul, just as Douglas ridiculously blames Paul for the crucifixion of Yahshua Christ, for which see section **<#13>** of this response on p. 53. Only a jew could contrive such a nefarious plot: to blame the followers of Christ for his death, diverting the blame from themselves! Thankfully we have many other witnesses who tell us differently. The only deceit in Douglas' articles is his own.

The Edomite jew propensity for rioting is evident in the pages of Josephus' *Wars*, and early bishops such as Tertullian tell us that jews were behind the persecution of early Christians (Apology 21.25), and so in early Christian writings we see the same pattern of behavior attributed to the jews that we see in the Acts, where Paul was their

victim, and not an instigator. In this day and age the jews have consistently incited others to riot for them, just as they incited the pagan Greeks in Acts and even many true Judahites in first century Jerusalem. Even a casual investigation reveals that jewish activists are behind all of the social and minority unrest in America these past hundred or so years. A recent newscast, the last week of January, 2006, showed rioting by jewish settlers being forced to leave the West Bank by their own government. Just as jews incited riots against Paul of Tarsus and first century Christians, jews have incited riots continually in all Christian nations. Clayton Douglas' corrupted portrayal of history serves as a smoke-screen for the jews to hide behind.

Douglas then introduces his second article with a discussion of the first, where he evidently opened a dialogue concerning Paul on a radio program and on his website:

<Section #52> Clay Douglas states: “**SAUL OF TARSUS AND HIS DOCTRINE OF LAWLESSNESS.** *Since putting out our first investigative piece entitled ‘The Seduction: Pauline Christianity’, we thought we’d heard it all. We were caught flat-footed, though, by the venomously intense feelings of some who were made furious because we simply questioned Paul’s story ... and Paul’s motives.*

“Clay Douglas’ ‘Free American’ radio show (8am CST, M-F - for more information, access Clay’s website www.freeamerican.com) also dared to start a dialogue regarding Pauline Judeo-Christianity. We carefully listened to the callers who responded in support of Paul/Saul.

“Their main argument was that - no matter what - Paul was ‘annointed [sic]’. No matter that Paul/Saul tortured and murdered hundreds - if not thousands - of innocent people. Annointed [sic]. No matter that Paul/Saul was a liar ... Annointed [sic]. No matter that Paul/Saul effectively ‘shut down’ Gods Laws in the Old Testament ... Annointed [sic] ... No matter that Paul/Saul rendered of no effect Jesus Immanuel’s Teachings. Annointed [sic]. Ha! ... Annointed [sic] is one of those words that bug me. You know, ‘words’ or ‘phrases’ that can effectively shut down a fruitful conversation ... just like that dreadful term ‘Anti-Semite.’

“We also noticed that people who had been asked to ‘let us reason together’ have no interest in reason whatsoever. Their voices would get shrill, brittle and – well, just plain mean and nasty ... The emails we received pursuant to our publishing of ‘The Seduction’ held the same shrill tone. Doggone it, we think we’ve struck a nerve!

“And, since the behaviorial [sic] trait of resistance runs strong in our bloodline, we will continue. May we encourage anyone who has a valid argument in this matter - rather than foul protests that have no point at all - to send them along. Let’s try to get to the meat of the matter. And, stay tuned to Clay Douglas’ ‘Free American’ radio program for more dialogue on this important topic and others.”

In reply to section **<#52>**: So we see that Clayton Douglas encourages “*dialogue on this important topic*”, but evidently hasn’t had any replies as of yet which he feels are worthy. At the end of his first article Douglas did print one short response, from a teenager, which we did not reproduce here. Douglas’ attacks on Paul in his first article were quite broad, and simply cannot be answered properly in a limited talk-radio call-in format, or on an Internet message board. Neither can Douglas’ sweeping accusations be answered by a neophyte, or by anyone who is only a casual reader of Scripture. Here we have spent nearly 54,000 words already (to the end of this lesson),

reproducing Douglas' arguments and answering them, and not a little research has gone into those answers! We may be two years late here, but once this response to Douglas' Paul-bashing articles is fully prepared we shall certainly make it available on the Internet, and Clayton Douglas will be sent a copy of it in its entirety. We can only wonder: will he dare share it with his own subscribers, before whom he has so unjustly defamed not only Paul of Tarsus but Christianity and even Yahshua Christ Himself? We adjure him to do so!

It has already been made manifest throughout this response that all of Douglas' accusations against Paul are without merit. Rather than address Douglas' slander again here, we shall move on to his article and his more specific comments.

<Section #53A> Clay Douglas states: *"Imagine Paul living today, and put yourself in the shoes of the people who were victimized by him. Imagine yourself genuinely obeying Jesus, striving to 'be Perfect as your Father in Heaven is Perfect,' and 'be like their Teacher,' so that you can do 'greater works than these' thus, living your life for God. Suddenly, a Bolshevik breaks into your home and assaults you. He gags and binds you, your spouse, and your children, he says he is going to imprison you because you follow a man preaching 'the Kingdom of Heaven' - on Earth, here and now, as soon as we stand up against the forces of physical and spiritual oppression and take hold of the reigns of our Destiny.*

"While holding you hostage - on behalf of the Antichrist state, and their other infiltrators in your religious community - he proceeds to ransack your house, and steals everything of material value that he and his henchmen can haul off. Then he takes you and your family outside so you can watch while he burns down your home. Thereafter he hauls you and your family off to prison. Many of your closest friends are imprisoned there under the same conditions and by the same Adversary. In addition, you have no idea of the whereabouts and condition of your children. Your spouse and some of your friends and neighbors are executed. You, however, miraculously escape from prison."

In reply to section **<#53A>**: Here Douglas further develops the plot to his novel, and this part of it was already addressed in section **<#14>** of this response, on p. 54, and also in section **<#39>** on p. 94. Paul's initial persecution of Christians, before he himself "saw the light" and was converted, is discussed in the Bible at Acts 8:1-4; 9:1-4, 13-14, 21, 26; 22:4-5; 26:9-11 and Gal. 1:13 and 1:23. These Biblical accounts make no mention of children being bound or gagged, no mention of burning houses, ransacking and pillaging, or any other brutal injustices. Clayton Douglas sounds just like a Jewish storyteller, make a little Zyklon B to kill the lice and suddenly you're blamed for gassing 6 million people to death! Like the Jews, Douglas is quite adept at rewriting and embellishing history to fit his own agenda. Yet also like the Jews, Douglas cannot substantiate any of his claims here with solid evidence. Douglas continues his novel:

<Section #53B> Clay Douglas states: *"Many years later that terrorist comes back claiming to be a new man and the greatest 'apostle.' This Satan does not ask for your forgiveness for what he did to you, your wife, children, property, and friends, and expresses no remorse whatsoever for having murdered people. Instead, he brags about how bad he was. He boasts about his acts of terrorism, and exalts himself for having become so rich from stealing all your possessions. Would you trust that man to be the*

greatest of God's 'apostles' or Messengers? Would you trust that he had become an apostle at all?"

In reply to section <#53B>: Now I wonder if Douglas has ever read any of the New Testament for himself, because none of these accusations can be substantiated. Rather, everything here is either a misrepresentation of Scripture or something that Douglas made up! We have seen in section <#39> of this response, on p. 94, that Paul is no murderer. Nowhere did Paul brag, as Douglas said he did. Nowhere did Paul enrich himself by stealing the property of others, as Douglas claims. Why doesn't Douglas make citations? Because novelists don't need such things! Douglas makes himself a liar as well as a patsy for the Jews and miscreants.

<Section #54> Clay Douglas states: *"How does Jesus Christ interrupting Paul's trip to go massacre Immanuel's followers make Paul/Saul a Super-Prophet? ... Let's get down to brass tacks. Paul/ Saul is NOT disguising the fact that he's a Predator. Let's return to our opening Scriptural Passage: 'But granting that myself did not burden you I was crafty, you say, and got the better of you by deceit.' (Saul of Tarsus 2 Corinthians 12:16) ... Okay. Okay. Many of you are prepared to counter that the translation is wrong and that's not what Paul/Saul meant. So, let's move on."*

In reply to section <#54>: First, Paul himself never claimed to be a "Super-Prophet", yet a study of his epistles reveals that he surely was a prophet. Secondly, after Paul's experience on the road to Damascus, a much longer phase in his conversion began, which included the reading and revelation of Scripture (i.e. Gal. 1:17), which took three years to complete. Douglas' version of these events omits many facts, to which he adds many of his own fictions! Now here again Douglas quotes some version or other of 2 Cor. 12:16, admits that the translation of that verse may be questioned, but instead of addressing those concerns he urges *"So, let's move on"*. What suddenly happened to *"let us reason together"* and his appeals for *"more dialogue on this important topic"*? Douglas is a fraud, for he has used a bad translation to get his point across, and when its veracity is questioned he quickly wants to *"move on"* rather than defend his position, or consider a differing opinion! Some dialogue! I suppose that he operates his radio program in that same manner. Yet here 2 Corinthians 12:16 shall be addressed, because it surely is a bad translation.

The A.V. rendering of 2 Cor. 12:16: "But be it so, I did not burden you: nevertheless, being crafty, I caught you with guile", and neither is this a good translation of the verse. The word "nevertheless" is an adverb. Here it was translated from the Greek word ἀλλά (235, for which one may check *Strong's Concordance*). ἀλλά (alla) is, according to Liddell & Scott's Greek-English Lexicon, a "Conjunction ... otherwise, but ... I. to oppose single clauses, but ... the preceding clause being negative". When I did my own translation of 2 Corinthians, in early 2001, I translated this verse: "**But it is that I have not imposed on you, otherwise being villainous I have taken you with guile.**" Today, as I look at the Greek of the NA27, I stand by that translation as a perfectly literal, word-for-word rendering of the Greek. In context (that means reading from the beginning of the paragraph, and interpreting that against all that precedes in Paul's relationship with the Corinthians) Paul is telling the Corinthians that he never imposed on them for anything (read all of 2 Corinthians 11!), and if he had done so, **then** he would have been as a villain, taking the Corinthians with guile. Paul is not, as

Douglas suggests, inferring that he has deceived anyone, nor was he predacious in any way: he is stating just the opposite! Douglas continues:

Clay Douglas states: “*Paul claims that HE, not Christ had ‘begotten you.’ He ‘beseeches you’ to be HIS followers, HIS imitators.*” Yet neither is there any fault with Paul in this statement, for Douglas leaves out half of what Paul said! “*Become imitators of me, just as also I am of Christ*” (1 Cor. 11:1, my translation). Paul lived piously and justly among the Corinthians, being there to act as an example, where Yahshua Christ was not there personally. The only predator here who would corrupt Christians with “guile” is Clayton Douglas. Attempting to slander Paul, he will stop at nothing, and is willing to pervert everything. Yet all of his wicked deeds shall be proven to be vanity. Where Paul makes such a statement is found at 1 Cor. 4:15, here from my own translation, along with vv. 14 and 16: ¹⁴ **I do not write these things regarding you, but as I would advise my beloved children.** ¹⁵ **Although you may have a myriad of tutors among the Anointed, certainly not many fathers; indeed in Christ Yahshua through the good message I have begotten you.** ¹⁶ **Therefore I encourage you, become imitators of me.** Regarding verse 16 here, it must first be noted that later Paul more fully tells the Corinthians: ¹ *Become imitators of me, just as also I am of Christ.* (1 Cor. 11:1). Now regarding Paul’s consideration of those to whom he brought the gospel as his “children”, let us compare the epistles of John, in particular 1 John 2:1: “¹ **My children, I write these things to you in order that you do not do wrong.**” Throughout this epistle, John addresses his readers as both children and brethren, so we see that this attitude of Paul’s existed also among the other apostles. Douglas, for criticizing Paul on this account, again betrays himself to be nothing but a hypocrite!

Here we shall continue our address of the second of Clayton Douglas’ Paul-bashing articles, *SAUL OF TARSUS AND HIS DOCTRINE OF LAWLESSNESS*, which he published in the January, 2004 issue of his *Free American Newsmagazine*. While I already hope to have fully demonstrated on many occasions that Clayton Douglas’ accusations against Paul of Tarsus are all vain and empty, that none of them stand upon examination, yet all of Douglas’ two articles on this topic must be addressed, for we would not want to leave anything out. While many of the arguments Douglas makes in this second article are just repackaged from his first, he does add new material and raise some new issues. Now we shall continue with Douglas’ article:

<Section #55A> Clayton Douglas states: “*Here’s what Paul says: ‘I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ lives in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me.’ Galatians 2:20*

“Even the most devoted Paul followers will detect a whiff of a bad odor here. Paul/Saul is narcissistic. He claims to have been crucified with Christ; and - let us try to be fair ... perhaps he meant ‘spiritually’. But, it’s the next line that is spell-binding. ‘Nevertheless I live.’ In other words, Paul celebrates that it is he, not Immanuel, who lives. He is chortling, as they say. Paul chortles further. Paul states, ‘(He) gave himself for me’.”

In reply to section **<#55A>**: Here Paul makes an important analogy, which Douglas has perverted with his own misunderstanding, so typical of this deceitful man. Sin is violation of the law. The penalty for such sin is death, when reparation cannot be

made. Since the entire nation of the Israelites sinned and cannot possibly make reparation for their errors, the entire nation is condemned by the law. The penalty for adultery alone is death, and every one of our Israelite ancestors is guilty of this: the worship of false gods. We have all broken the vows which our fathers took long ago, and to which we are bound by ancient tradition. This is independent of any sin which each of us have committed personally, and who among us can claim not to have sinned at all? Under the Old Covenant, rather than a man confessing his sins and condemning himself, an animal was sacrificed at the altar in his place as atonement for the sin, i.e. Lev. 4:13-35. Yet this was only symbolic, as Paul explains in Hebrews chapter 10, looking forward to the day when Yahweh Himself would make reparations for the sins of the children of Israel, for which see section [#46](#) of this response on p. 103.

Because all Israel has sinned, all Israel is condemned by the law. Yet Yahshua Christ redeemed, made reparations for, each and every one of the children of Israel, and without exception! So Paul says of Yahshua that “He gave Himself for me”, and he is wholly correct in his assessment. Each and every White Adamic man on the face of the earth today should have such an understanding! Where Paul says “I am crucified with Christ”, each one of us should understand that Christ had substituted Himself in our condemnation. Then Paul says “nevertheless I live” because, except for the will of Yahweh, it is each of us who should have suffered that penalty. Paul explains all of this in Romans chapters 3 through 7. Then Paul says “yet not I, but Christ lives in me”, and this Douglas completely fails to comprehend, so he scoffs even further. This shall be addressed shortly, after we see the rest of Douglas’ comments on the matter. First, Douglas takes a short diversion:

<Section #55B> Clayton Douglas states: *“I want you to ponder that one statement for a moment. Remember that Immanuel’s life was made miserable by His archenemy, Saul of Tarsus, ‘The Pharisee of the Pharisees.’ Paul/Saul had stalked Immanuel and His followers for years upon years, trying to set up Jesus Christ. Saul wanted desperately to kill Jesus Christ. It was his one purpose in life. Saul wanted to ‘shut Him down.’ Ultimately, Paul and his Pharisee gangsters satisfied that mission. Christ was hideously butchered by the hidden hands of the Pharisees who hated Him so. But, Paul does not want you to remember that. He would much rather have you think that Christ’s death is a ‘celebration’ and that ‘Christ died for Paul.’ Perhaps, there is a kernal [sic] of Freudian truth there.”*

In reply to section **<#55B>**: Douglas wants us to “remember” nothing factual, but only the novel which he has been concocting since the beginning of his first article, which became evident and was addressed here beginning at section [#13](#) of this response on p. 53. There is not one bit of evidence that Paul had anything to do with the crucifixion of Yahshua, or that Paul was even in Palestine at any time during Christ’s 3½ year ministry, never mind his being a leader in Judaea. In section [#32](#), on p. 87, it has been shown that it is quite unlikely that Paul was a leader among the Pharisees during the time of Christ’s ministry. It is also evident that, before Paul’s conversion, it was the Sadducees who were the leading persecutors of Christians (Acts 4:1; 5:17), although the Pharisees were doing so also. Notice that, as usual, Douglas cites no sources for any of his statements. He invented the entire story himself! And where he refers to “Freudian truth”, he shows himself to be a follower of yet another anti-Christ jew miscreant. Douglas continues:

<Section #55C> Clayton Douglas states: “... *Paul says it is not really ‘him’ that you see, the [sic] ‘he’ was crucified, and it is ‘not I but Christ’ living in his body. He is claiming that he is essentially Christ, and for this reason he is superior to all of Christ’s Disciples who opposed him at every turn. Since ‘Christ’ lived in Paul, this ‘Christ’ was calling the shots. The direction that ‘the church’ would go in was now up [sic to] the dictation of a man who may have met Jesus only once, and then only to be rebuked for being an oppressor of the Disciples.*”

In reply to section **<#55C>**: And picking up where we left off a few paragraphs above, Paul says “yet not I, but Christ lives in me”, and Douglas scoffs. At 2 Corinthians 6:16, where Paul admonishes the children of Israel to separate themselves from the unclean races (not the unclean “*thing*”, as the A.V. conjectures), he quotes several Old Testament verses, such as Leviticus 26:11, Jeremiah 31:33 and Ezekiel 37:27, and he says “... ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said. I will dwell in them, and walk in *them*; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people.” Adamic bodies are the vessels for the real “us”, so to speak: the spirit which Yahweh gave to Adamic man (cf. Gen. 2:7; 6:3). That this is so is supported by the scriptures at Jer. 2:13; Isa. 52:11; Romans 9:22-23 and 2 Tim. 2:20-21, discussed at length in the second of my *Broken Cisterns* pamphlets. Adamic spirits, having come from Yahweh, are part of and one with Him. Paul certainly taught that the vessels which bear such spirits – as those of the children of Israel do – should be treated accordingly (i.e. 1 Thess. 4:1-5). And so Yahshua Christ Himself, as recorded in the gospel of John, says: “If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and **we will come unto him, and make our abode with him**” (14:23). So Clayton Douglas scoffs not at Paul, but at Yahshua Christ Himself. In his ignorance, Douglas rejects Christ and the prophets, which Paul taught justly and correctly.

Paul never claimed superiority over the other apostles, but rather acceded to the advice of the elder James (Acts 21:18-26) without contention and regardless of what he thought of it. Conversely, he professed to being least of all apostles (1 Cor. 15:9) and least of all saints (“saints” being the children of Israel who accept the gospel, not phony Romish church ‘saints’) because of his prior role in persecuting the Christian assemblies. If the “church” went in the direction dictated by Paul, what a fine collection of assemblies (not a single, overpowering “church”) they would have been! This has been discussed here in section **<#4>** of this response on p. 39 and in section **<#18>** on p. 62. Paul taught nothing which resembles what the Romish or Greek orthodox or later Protestant “churches” became. Clayton Douglas is an ignorant man, and a liar of his own making.

<Section #56A> Clayton Douglas states: “*Jesus’ Brother James is almost entirely written out of the picture, and is referred to - quite disrespectfully and in a very revealing fashion - by Paul/Saul in Acts by a descriptive noun rather than by his name. Not that the ‘slur’ mattered much to James. James continued to issue warnings about Paul.*”

In reply to section **<#56A>**: I can’t imagine where in Acts it is recorded that Paul referred to James “*quite disrespectfully*”. Notice again that Douglas makes no citation, and so he is either a deceiver, or an idiot. If he could have made a citation, you can bet

all your marbles he would have waved it at us like a red flag. Yet if perhaps Douglas is not an idiot, he certainly must think that his readers are idiots! For he babbles on:

<Section #56B> Clayton Douglas states: *“In regards to Paul’s egotism and boastfulness, James wrote: ‘If any man among you seems to be religious, and does not bridle his tongue, but deceives his own heart, this man’s religion is vain.’ James 1:26*

“So the tongue is also a little member, and boasts great things. See how a small fire can spread to a large forest! And the tongue is a fire. The world of iniquity among our members is the tongue, which defiles the whole body, and sets on fire the course of nature, and is set on fire by Hell.’ James 3:5-6

“There are further examples. Find them for yourselves. ... Line for line, the debate matches up; point by point through the admonitions of James regarding the wickedness of Paul. Yet still there are so many who will never choose to see that their master Paul was a murderer, deceiver and imposter [sic] from the beginning, and still to this very day, nothing has changed.”

In reply to section **<#56B>**: Yet James’ epistle is clearly addressed to “the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad”, and Paul is never a subject of nor is he even mentioned in this epistle. James 1:26, speaking in general to these people and about no particular individual, is clearly an admonition to “any man among” those twelve tribes, and has nothing at all to do with Paul! Douglas would have us believe that the Liar of the Dead Sea Scrolls is Paul, which is impossible in context, and now this in James, where every negative admonition is supposed to be directed at Paul. This is absolutely ridiculous, and if Douglas is not being purposely deceptive, he is a total moron! This isn’t even close to believable, and shows that Clayton Douglas would stop at nothing to slander Paul of Tarsus! He’ll unabashedly invent any ridiculous imagining and vain device hoping to gain some poor unsuspecting simpleton to fall for such idiocy in the name of “**patriotism**”, which is the most **unpatriotic** thing one can do since Paul is our brother and a co-descendant with us in descent from Abraham our common “**patriarch**”. Or is it (as we have demonstrated before at section **<#15>** on p. 56 of this response) that he simply can’t read? So, neither is Clayton Douglas literate, nor is he an informed patriot.

<Section #57> Clayton Douglas states: *“Paul even admitted to theft and swindling churches. These are his own words: ‘I robbed other churches, taking wages of them, to do you service.’ 2 Corinthians 11:8*

“So you see, it is nothing new when we see these charlatans and thieves stealing the money of those trying to do what they have been taught is right. When there are individuals making millions off of the ignorance of the masses, using a religion crafted after the Pharisees themselves to psychologically enslave them to the status quo, such thieves are only following after their master Paul, who admitted to stealing from churches.

“Again, Paul does little to hide his true purpose from you. And, yet most of you will continue to defend Paul/Saul until your dying day. Why? Because Paul/Saul is a Tradition.”

In reply to section **<#57>**: Here Douglas’ nefarious charges shall again be proven vain, empty of any substance. From my own translation, 2 Cor. 11:7-9 reads: “**7 Can it be that I have made an error, humbling myself in order that you may be**

elevated, because I have announced the good message of Yahweh to you freely?
⁸ I have deprived other assemblies, taking provisions for your service. ⁹ And being present with you and wanting, I had burdened no one, (indeed my need had been filled by the brethren who came from Makedonia,) and in everything I have kept and will keep myself unburdensome to you.” The events Paul refers to are recorded in Acts chapter 18. Both Timothy and Silas were among “the brethren who came from Makedonia” who supplied Paul’s needs (Acts 18:5). Paul certainly didn’t “rob” the assembly in Makedonia, and he makes another brief visit there, recorded in Acts chapter 20. The word which the A.V. translated *robbed* at 2 Cor. 11:8 is *συλλάω* (4813) and also means *to deprive*, according to Liddell & Scott. There are many Greek words which mean *to rob* or *to steal*, yet this is certainly not what Paul is inferring. Paul is only telling the Corinthians that he attended to their service yet asked nothing of them, and did so while the Makedonians in turn provided for him. Now again, Clayton Douglas will find anything at all that he can twist to support his slander of Paul. Like a ‘good’ jew should, as one can expect, Douglas will go to any length to discredit Paul and Christianity, while at the same time pretending to be patriotic and a Christian, which he is neither! This is the sort of man which all Paul-bashers are following!

<Section #58> Clayton Douglas states: “Remember that Paul/ Saul taught that faith ALONE is your Passport into Heaven, contrary to the teachings of both God and His Son. Paul’s mind:twist [sic] teachings can be described in this manner. Let us say that you wish to become a great ice skater. You have great faith in your ability to become a great ice skater. But, does that faith make you a great ice skater? Of course not. You must be faithful in your practice ... faithful in your ACTS. You must train, train, train. Your acts, together with your faith, make you into a very good ice skater. Faith without faithfulness translates into an iceskater [sic] with many bruises and lacerations.”

In reply to section <#58>: Paul’s idea of faith clearly included the performing of good works, or deeds. This has been fully discussed in section <#37B> of this response, beginning on p. 91. So here Douglas insists that his reader should “remember” something which just isn’t true. Paul clearly states that “we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things *done* in *his* body, according to that he hath done, whether *it be* good or bad” (2 Cor. 5:10). Douglas’ ice skater analogy is interesting. Paul, teaching the need for self-control, said at 1 Cor. 9:27: “Rather I beat my body, and bring it into subjection”, much like an athlete must do in order to succeed. This has been discussed in section <#22> of this response, on p. 67. Paul tells Titus at 3:8: “... those trusting in Yahweh should take care to prefer good works. These things are good and advantageous to men.” Surely Paul and James (2:20) did not differ in this teaching, except in their approach to the subject. Who is a liar, but Clayton Douglas?

<Section #59> Clayton Douglas states: “SAUL OF TARSUS HAD TO BELIEVE THAT FAITH ALONE – AND NOT HIS ACTS – WOULD GET HIM INTO HEAVEN. He HAD to delude himself. After all, Saul was a mass murderer. Correct? I find it incredible that the very same people who volunteer to personally strap David Westerfield into the electric chair because he murdered the little Von Damme girl are calling for complete forgiveness of genocidal trickster Saul/Paul because he’s ‘annointed’ [sic]. And, who

made the announcement that Saul/Paul was annointed [sic]? Why, that was Saul/Paul himself.

“One might ask: under the Laws of the Old Testament, why wasn’t Saul/Paul ever brought to justice for his mass murders?”

“One might also ask: CAN YOU FIND ANY SCRIPTURAL PASSAGES IN WHICH PAUL/SAUL APOLOGIZES TO THE APOSTLES OR TO ANYONE FOR HIS HORRIBLE CRIMES AND MURDERS?”

In reply to section <#59>: It should be fully evident in the preceding section of this response, and in sections <#22> on p. 67 and <#37B> on p. 91, which are also referenced above, that Clayton Douglas has absolutely misrepresented Paul’s positions regarding faith and salvation. And since his premise is wrong, everything that follows is wrong. It should also have been made fully evident, as it was discussed in section <#39> of this response on p. 94, Paul was certainly no murderer. Douglas takes the same position, and thus the same mind-set, as did the jews at the insistence of Chaim Weizmann, to conduct the kangaroo Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal trials against German leaders. Men who perform the will and the functions of their government under the laws of that government are not murderers by any stretch of the imagination, and that is all that Paul had done, until he learned that his government (the high priests and elders in Jerusalem) was wrong. Then Paul very nobly stopped supporting his government’s cause, and stopped persecuting the innocent whom he had at one time supposed to be rebels. Paul murdered no one! While his government was wrong, Paul and surely many others within it thought they were doing right. This same circumstance has existed all through the history of our race even unto this very day. Clayton Douglas, writing for Christian-Patriot publications about the government we have today, should know this better than most of us, but is woefully ignorant of the true situation!

Now who is Clayton Douglas to insist that Paul never offered an apology for his persecution of Christians, and this being a lawful (under Judaeen law) act when Paul committed it? Peter commended Paul (2 Pet. 3:14-16) and wasn’t wanting an apology. The apostles received Paul in Jerusalem on at least two occasions (Acts chapters 15 and 21) and evidently were not wanting an apology. Who then, is Clayton Douglas to insist that an apology was never made? The events outlined in the Acts cover a period of about 30 years, and in a very short space, hardly a complete record! Paul’s 14 epistles are certainly not all that he wrote, and these which we have were all written towards the end of that 30 year period. Again, hardly a complete record! Douglas barks loudly, but his logic has no teeth. Yet we shall see that even many years after his conversion Paul did indeed apologize for his actions, since many years later he was still doing so!

From *The American Heritage College Dictionary*, the definition of *apology*: “1. An acknowledgment expressing regret or asking pardon for a fault or offense. 2. a. A formal justification or defense. b. An explanation or excuse.” And the verb *apologize*: “1. To excuse or regretfully acknowledge a fault or offense. 2. To defend or justify formally.” These English words came from like Greek words, and since Paul was speaking and writing in Greek, we should look at those. From the Liddell & Scott lexicon, the noun ἀπολογία (627): “a speech in defence, defence” and the verb ἀπολογέομαι (626): “to speak in defence, defend oneself ... explain, excuse ...”.

And so an apology is not simply uttering “I’m sorry” or “I apologize”, as we are accustomed to this hollow form of apology today, but rather is an explanation and acknowledgment of one’s actions, not necessarily expressing regret, although that may be an element expected depending upon the circumstances. While Paul’s persecution of Christians was done as a function of the legal government of Judaea at that time, an apology is not necessarily in order, yet we shall see that some of Paul’s later statements certainly fulfilled the criteria to qualify as an apology.

Paul’s arrest in Jerusalem happened about 57 A.D. (Acts 21-22), or about 25 years after the stoning of Stephen at Acts chapter 7. At his defense before the people Paul acknowledged his persecution of Christians (Acts 22:4-5). Paul was then sent to the governor, Felix, and over two years later (Acts 24:27) Paul spoke about Christianity before Felix’ successor Festus and Herod Agrippa II. Here again Paul acknowledged his persecution of Christians (Acts 26:9-11), admitting all of his errors in what may easily be perceived as a regretful manner. Paul seems to have written his epistle to the Galatians about 54 or 55 A.D., from either Makedonia or Ephesus. At Galatians 1:13 Paul acknowledged his persecution of Christians many years beforetime. 1 Corinthians was also written about this time, 55 A.D., from Ephesus (1 Cor. 16:8, 19). In it Paul states “For I am the least of the apostles, that am not meet to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God” (1 Cor. 15:9), and here we certainly have “an acknowledgment expressing regret”, the dictionary definition of an apology! Paul apologized for his sins over and over again, and was apologizing over 25 years afterwards! Who is a liar, but Clayton Douglas?

<Section #60> Clayton Douglas states: “... *This prophecy mentions Paul by name in the original Hebrew. The Hebrew did not use diacritical vowel markings. In Hebrew the word for ‘Hades’ or ‘The Grave’ is ‘Sheol’ meaning simply the Neatherworld [sic]. It is not synonymous with ‘Hell’ which is ‘Geyhenum’ or the ‘Pit.’ The name ‘Sheol’ (and ‘Sha’ul’) or ‘Saul’ as English renders it, are identical terms in Hebrew. As well, to those who understand the true origins, nature and identity of Paul, they will understand the full prophecy of Habbakuk as relating to this figure, who all the Prophets since the time of Noah have warned their people of.*

“In an interpretation of the above Habakkuk 2:4, the Dead Sea Scrolls (found only 50 years ago, in caves near Jericho) tell us its interpretation ‘Concerns all doers of the Torah in the House of Y’hudah (Judah), whom El (God) will save from the House of Judgment because of their works and their Faith in the Teacher of Righteousness.’ Habakkuk Peshar 7:17-8:3

“The ‘Teacher of Righteousness,’ or ‘Rightous [sic] Teacher,’ leads a Messianic Movement befuddled by ‘The Spouter of Lies, who leads many astray in order to build his city of vanity on blood and erect an Assembly upon Lying, for the sake of his glory, tiring out many with a worthless service and instructing them in works of Lying, so that their works will be of Emptiness. And they will be brought to the same Judgments of Fire with which they insulted and vilified the Chosen of God.’ Habakkuk Peshar 10:9-13”

In reply to section **<#60>**: Since Douglas apparently failed to include “*this prophecy*” in his article, which is evidently Habakkuk 2:5, we shall repeat it here from the A.V.: “Yea also, because he transgresseth by wine, *he is a proud man, neither*

keepeth at home, who enlargeth his desire as hell, and *is* as death, and cannot be satisfied, but gathereth unto him all nations, and heapeth unto him all people.” Douglas here asserts that the word “hell” in Hab. 2:5 should read “Paul”. I must comment, that it is odd that Douglas cited Hab. 2:4 rather than 2:5, for 2:4 ends “... the just shall live by his faith.” How could Douglas pay so much attention to the one verse, yet despise the other?

Now let us read Habakkuk (Ambakoum in Greek) 2:5 from the Greek Septuagint, to see how the earliest translators understood it, from Brenton’s translation: “But the arrogant man and the scorner, the boastful man, shall not finish anything; who has enlarged his desire as the grave, and like death he is never satisfied, and he will gather to himself all the nations, and will receive to himself all the peoples.” The word “grave” here is the Greek word “Hades”, which Brenton chose to translate “grave”. Now taken out of context, I can see where Douglas may want “hell” to read “Paul” in the A.V. version. Yet let’s read Hab. 2:6-8, still from the LXX: “Shall not all these take up a parable against him? and a proverb to tell against him? and they shall say, Woe to him that multiplies to himself the possessions which are not his! how long? and who heavily loads his yoke. For suddenly there shall arise up those that bite him, and they that plot against thee shall awake, and thou shalt be a plunderer to them. Because thou hast spoiled many nations, all the nations that are left shall spoil *thee*, because of the blood of men, and the sins of the land and city, and of all that dwell in it.” Reading the entire prophecy, it is obviously incredulous that the subject of verse 5 could be Paul of Tarsus, because the subject doesn’t change through verse 8, and the subject of verse 8 certainly can’t be Paul of Tarsus! The subject of this prophecy is surely “the arrogant man, and the scorner, the boastful man”, which is here an epithet for Satan, the Adversary in a collective sense, the children of the devil who have plundered every city and nation throughout history.

We have seen that the Peshers in the Dead Sea Scrolls use the epithets “Man of the Lie”, “Man of Lies”, or “Spreader of the Lie”, and that these terms were used to describe Satan, or the Adversary, and not Paul. This was discussed at length in section [<#43>](#) of this response beginning on p. 98, where **all** of the Peshers where these epithets were used by the Qumran sect were discussed, and not just this one verse in Habakkuk, which Clayton Douglas excises from its context in order to mold it into his twisted theory. It is evident that there is no limit to Clayton Douglas’ subterfuge.

Another aspect which may be taken into account here is the grammar of Hab. 2:5, whether we examine the A.V. or the LXX. The phrase “as the grave”, or “as hell” in the A.V., is an adverbial clause, and by no means can it be the subject of the sentence, even if it did say “as Paul”, as Douglas desires it to say.

Douglas’ plot here takes advantage of the fact that in Hebrew, the words *Sheol*, which is the Hebrew equivalent to Hades, and *Saul*, which was also the name of the first Israelite king, are spelled alike in palaeo-Hebrew (old Hebrew used no diacritical marks), at least on many occasions in the Hebrew which we know today. There were, according to Strong’s concordance, two spellings for *sheol* (# 7585): שְׂאֹל or שְׁאֹל. *Saul* is spelled שְׂאֹל. Strong defines *sheol*: “from 7592; *hades* or the world of the dead (as if a subterranean *retreat*), including its accessories and inmates” and *Saul*: “passive participle of 7592; *asked*; *Shaül*, the name of an Edomite and two Israelites.” So we see that both of these words are derived from another word, a verb, 7592, spelled

שאל (sha'al), and this is exactly how the alternative form of *sheol* is spelled. Strong defines *sha'al*: “a primitive root; to *inquire*; by implication to *request*; by extension to *demand*.”

So we see that not only are *sheol* and *Saul* spelled alike, but both words are derived from *sha'al*, and sometimes *sheol* and *sha'al* were spelled alike. But that doesn't mean that these words are interchangeable, wherever doing such may offer us a convenient interpretation. Because Hebrew had no proper vowels, many words were spelled identically, and nearly every Hebrew name, if not every one, is also a word with a meaning in the Hebrew language. Imagine the confusion in English, with words such as fan, fen, fin, fine, fun and fauna, or gam, game, gem, gum and gym, if we had no vowels. Douglas could find thousands of word-substitution games to play in the Bible, because context matters so little to him!

Let us look at Hab. 2:5 one more time, from the A.V.: “Yea also, because he transgresseth by wine, *he is* a proud man, neither keepeth at home, who enlargeth his desire as hell, and *is* as death, and cannot be satisfied, but gathereth unto him all nations, and heapeth unto him all people”. It is obvious that the proud man – and no one in particular – is compared to hell and to death, not to Saul and to death, an interpretation utterly out of context! Now from *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* by Florentino Garcia Martinez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, volume 1, p. 17, from the *Pesher to Habakkuk*, 1QpHab Column VIII, where the Qumran sect comments upon Hab. 2:5-6, we have this: “Surely wealth will corrupt the boaster, and not will he last, he who widens his throat like the abyss, and he, like death cannot be satisfied. All the peoples ally against him, all the nations come together against him.” Now is this, as Douglas claims, really describing Paul? Can we take “the abyss” and substitute “Paul” here, because in the Hebrew that is the word *sheol*, and would it make sense to do so? Or is Clayton Douglas weaving a web of deceit? And how many other things have we observed Clayton Douglas lie about? No sleight-of-hand magic trick is too risky for Douglas to attempt. Douglas quotes from the Habakkuk Pesher interpretation of Hab. 2:4, but the word *sheol* does not appear in Hab. 2:4! The word *sheol* only appears in 2:5! Douglas is trying to pull off a “bait and switch”! Like a ‘good’ jew, he’ll go to any length to misrepresent Paul, and discredit Christianity in the process!

[Now if you are approached by a person promoting Paul-bashing, be prepared to give that person a quick and solid Scriptural answer so that he/she will never bring up the subject to you again. As 2 Tim. 4:2 instructs, “... be instant in season, out of season ...” Refer that person expeditiously to Rev. 2:1-7, where Christ Himself commends the assembly at Ephesus for their “works”, “labor”, “not bearing them which are evil”, “putting on trial false and lying apostles”, “borne with patience and labored for Yahshua’s name, fainting not.” Point out posthaste that the only mark Yahshua had against them was that they had “lost their first love”, which indicates that when Paul founded the assembly at Ephesus, at its inception, their love was not wanting. Thus in Christ’s own (red-letter) words, He gave Paul a perfect score for his effort. Ask this would-be Paul-basher: “Could you do as well as Paul?” Maybe one ought commit Rev. 2:1-7 to memory so one might be “instant” with or without a Bible at hand. In short, the would-be Paul-basher must call Yahshua Christ a liar in order to support his/her theory. – Clifton A. Emahiser]

Now we shall proceed to address the second of Clayton Douglas' Paul-bashing articles, *SAUL OF TARSUS AND HIS DOCTRINE OF LAWLESSNESS*, which he published in the January, 2004 edition of his *Free American Newsmagazine*. Douglas, while attempting to discredit Paul of Tarsus, instead consistently discredits his own person by making all sorts of false accusations and inconsistent statements. And, while claiming to be a Christian, he even rejects the cardinal tenets of Christianity found throughout the prophets and confirmed by the gospels: that Yahshua Christ was the Messiah and Redeemer of our race. While in this second article Douglas often merely repackages the trash he spewed in his first article, which I hope to have already discussed sufficiently, he does add new twists and additional claims as he proceeds, and so this second article must also be addressed in its entirety.

<Section #61A> Clayton Douglas states: *"Paul of Tarsus was an agent and spy of both the Roman state and these ultra-fundamentalist hypocrite sects (Edomite/Pharisees)."*

In reply to section **<#61A>**: We have previously seen Douglas state that Paul was a Roman soldier assigned to spying on all of the sects in Judaea, in sections **<#12>**, **<#13>** and **<#14>** of this response on pp. 51-55, and where it was established that such a statement has no merit. Here Douglas makes Paul some sort of double-agent, working for the Romans and the Pharisees. While it is evident that Paul was a Pharisee, and in his persecution of Christians he was acting in an official capacity for the temple, here Douglas seems rather to be covering all bases by making such a blanket statement, adjusting the script to his novel so that it won't clash quite so starkly with the factual accounts. Nevertheless, Douglas could never establish with truth that Paul was a Roman soldier, agent, or held any post for the empire. Such a statement by Douglas is only a fabricated lie!

<Section #61B> Clayton Douglas states: *"Paul was also an active conspirator in the assault on 'Stephen,' in Acts 7:58."*

In reply to section **<#61B>**: Yet the record at Acts 7:58 and 8:1 shows clearly that Paul was only a passive observer in Stephen's death, who merely kept the garments of the men perpetrating the acts against Stephen, and approving of their deeds. While Paul is not without guilt in the matter (i.e. Lev. 5:1, Rom. 1:32), he was no active participant. If Douglas cannot get the smallest of accounts straight, how can he be trusted with the larger?

<Section #62> Clayton Douglas states: *"In Acts 9:22-26 it is said that Paul 'baffled' the Jews living in Damascus. 'But Paul increased more in strength, and baffled the Jews who lived at Damascus, proving that this is the Christ...'*

"(There were no people called 'jews' during this time period. In any event, this group wasn't the only group Paul has been trifling with over the centuries. To baffle is to bewitch ... and to deceive.)"

In reply to section **<#62>**: Here Douglas takes the verb "baffle", where instead in the A.V. the word συγχύνω (4797) is "confound", and not only does he blatantly misdefine the word, but he does so after abusing its context. First, the Greek word συγχύνω (sugchuno), a form of the verb συγχέω (sugcheo, still 4797 in Strong's), means "to confound" (Liddell & Scott), and not at all does the word mean "to bewitch ... and to deceive", as Douglas so nefariously states. And even the word "baffle" has

no such meaning as Douglas claims. In *The American Heritage College Dictionary* baffle is “1. To frustrate or check (a person) by confusing or perplexing; stymie”, and “2. To impede the force or movement of”, where it has other definitions as a noun. Yet Clayton Douglas makes no citations from any dictionary, because he would rather fabricate a lie! It is clear from the account in Acts that the Judaeans of Damascus were *confounded*, or *confused*. Having been expecting Paul’s arrival to harass them he rather arrived as one of them, a Christian, having been converted by Yahshua Christ Himself while en route to the city.

It is odd that here Clayton Douglas makes a correct observation concerning the word “jews”, being so late in his articles, and having already used the word so very often himself, and quoting jews such as Marcus Ravage in his assault on Paul, where Ravage claims that both Paul and Yahshua Christ were “jews” (see p. 96 and section [<#40>](#) of this response). In all of my writing, I endeavor to use the correct term, “Judaeans”, when referring to the people of Judaea generally. Yet whenever the specific bad-fig Canaanites or Edomites among the Judaeans are those being referred to, those who reject Christ and His teachings, I may anachronistically use the term “jew”, because those are the people from whom today’s jews obtain their religion and identity, and from whom a great number of today’s jews have descended in part. Yet Douglas throughout his articles has used the terms “jew”, “jews” and “jewish”, capitalized or not, quite indiscriminately.

<Section #63> Clayton Douglas states: *“Did you know that Jesus’ own Disciples were both ‘afraid of him’ and didn’t believe ‘that he was a disciple?’ Or, don’t you really care?”*

In reply to section **<#63>**: Douglas’ inane argument here comes directly from the account in Acts. Of course the original disciples were initially wary of Paul, and had every right to be cautious of him because he was at the beginning a persecutor of the Christians. This is no secret, and as we have seen in section [<#59>](#) of this response on p. 118, Paul both admitted and regretted his actions. Yet these same accounts to which Douglas refers, and gets half of his story from, tell us that in a short time all of Yahshua’s disciples did accept Paul, and accept him fully! This is readily apparent at Acts 9:23-31, where we are told that the Christians delivered Paul from the unbelieving jews, and where Paul was afterwards accepted by the disciples at Jerusalem. In Acts chapters 14 and 15 we see Paul was accepted at Antioch by the Christians there, but his teaching was challenged by certain judaizing disciples. Yet upon being heard by the elders of the disciples in Jerusalem, Paul was not only accepted but fully vindicated! Clayton Douglas, a pawn and a patsy for jews and miscreants, relates only the parts of Acts, or any of the New Testament, which can be abused in order to uphold the positions of the jews and the miscreants! Yet Douglas’ rantings get even more ridiculous.

<Section #64> Clayton Douglas states: *“... The Dead Sea Scrolls show us that ‘Damascus’ was the name of the Qumran community of Essenes. It was on his way to visit these revolutionaries, that Paul claims to have been stopped by a ‘vision’.”*

In reply to section **<#64>**: This may be one of the most ridiculous statements I have ever seen concerning the geography of first century Palestine. It is so ludicrous,

it's an absolute pity that it requires any attention at all. Discussing the geography of Syria, Strabo says: "The city of Damascus is also a noteworthy city, having been, I might almost say, even the most famous of the cities in that part of the world in the time of the Persian empire" (*Geography*, 16.2.20). Damascus was a prominent city in Syria, which had been there for many, many centuries, even in the time of Abraham! The city is first mentioned in the Bible at Genesis 14:15 and it is still there today. Strabo wrote just before 25 A.D. In the context of Genesis chapter 14, the name Damascus appears in the Dead Sea Scrolls in the *Genesis Apocryphon*, or 1QapGen ar, Column XXII. But the name Damascus also appears several times in the document that, by reason of the city's mention, is popularly called the *Damascus Document*. The copies of this document found at Qumran are found in the fragments designated 4Q266 through 4Q273, 5Q12 and 6Q15. Yet other copies of the *Damascus Document* were found outside of Qumran, and included in publications of the Dead Sea Scrolls because they are obviously copies of the same document. These are in the university library at Cambridge, England, and were discovered at Cairo in Egypt. They are designated in scroll publications as CD-A and CD-B.

Using Douglas' silly logic, perhaps we should call Cairo "Damascus", and not Qumran. There is nothing in the Dead Sea Scrolls which link the scrolls to Qumran, except that they happen to have been found nearby. Going to a motel in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania and finding a Gideon Bible in the drawer, would you imagine yourself to be standing at the very place where certain events took place? I hope not! Such is the logic of Clayton Douglas: "Damascus" being found in documents at Qumran, we will relocate the name to that place. Ridiculous! Douglas is an idiot!

While the name "Damascus" appears often in the *Damascus Document*, there is nothing which would lead us to believe that Damascus was a code-word for Qumran, rather than the name of the well-known Syrian city which it so obviously was. The *Damascus Document* often refers to Israelites in the "land of Damascus" for one simple reason: it is relating the sect's perception of prophecy fulfilled, as the sect saw it, and a certain prophecy in Amos (at 5:27) warns the disobedient Israelites that they were going to be carried away "beyond Damascus."

Further indication that Paul's Damascus was the city in Syria can be found in the N.T. itself. Paul's Damascus was a large place, with streets and houses (i.e. Acts 9:11), and more than one synagogue (Acts 9:20), and walls and gates (Acts 9:24-25). Qumran was nothing of the sort! All of the archaeology of Qumran shows that the place was never more than a small compound, perhaps the size of a large Roman villa at the most. There are countless books and articles describing as much. Damascus had an ethnarch (2 Cor. 11:32) whom Paul mentions by name, something not seen anywhere in the Qumran sect's documents. Again, Qumran was in Judaea. Yet Damascus is called a "foreign" city, i.e. outside of Judaea! This is evident at Acts 26:11 (cf. 26:20). With all of this, Clayton Douglas can only be one of two things: a purposeful deceiver or a total idiot.

<Section #65> Clayton Douglas states: "*To the mystics, Prophets and revolutionaries of that day, Paul's vision seemed as nothing more than a cop-out for why he was claiming his Romanized message to be in line with the clearly anti-Roman teachings of Jesus.*"

In reply to section <#65>: As for “mystics” and “revolutionaries” I cannot comment, except to say that Clayton Douglas is preoccupied with magic and magicians, having quoted from several of them from the very beginning of his Paul-bashing articles. And Clayton Douglas is also fascinated by revolutionaries, as he has so often in his articles put his lot with men such as Friedrich “God is dead” Nietzsche, who ended up in an insane asylum at the age of 45, and “Bishop” John S. Spong who was a revolutionary indeed, being at the vanguard of the integrationist Civil Rights movement, being the first Episcopalian Bishop to ordain homosexual ministers, and being a chorus-leader for the acceptance of homosexual “marriage”. These are the “revolutionaries” Clayton Douglas loves and follows!

Paul’s message was certainly not “Romanized”. If such were so, Paul could not have been imprisoned at Rome and executed by Nero! Why would Rome hold prisoner and kill such an ally? Why would Rome execute such a supposedly faithful agent, which Douglas claims that Paul was? Neither was Yahshua Christ “anti-Roman”. If He were, how could Pontius Pilate, the Roman governor, insist on letting Him go free, finding no fault in Him (i.e. John 19:4, 6, 12)? Clayton Douglas is a deceiver, **and** an idiot! It has previously been demonstrated, in section <#8> of this response on p. 44, that Paul did not, and could not, teach anything concerning temporal governments that would be in defiance of the prophecies concerning temporal governments, and neither would Yahshua Christ. Clayton Douglas, scoffing at Paul, makes himself a fool because he doesn’t understand the prophets. Notice again, that Douglas attributes certain “anti-Roman” teachings to Christ, but makes no citations! If Christ had taught such things, Douglas would gladly have pointed them out!

<Section #66> Clayton Douglas states: *“Many valid and initiated Nazirenes, including Jesus’s [sic] own brother did not believe Paul. The debate between James, the head of the Nazirenes after Jesus’s [sic] resurrection, and Paul is depicted throughout many of the books of the ‘New Testament,’ as well as other historically valid writing that didn’t make the Council of Nicea’s [sic] ‘cut’ in 325 C.E.”*

In reply to section <#66>: We have seen already in sections <#56A> and <#56B> of this response, on p. 116, that Douglas invents a “debate” between James and Paul which never existed. There Douglas cites James 1:26 and 3:5-6 and asserts that James was referring to Paul, an assertion which is certainly proven to be false upon reading those verses in context. As far as such “debate” being “*depicted throughout many of the books of*” the N.T., this is a claim that Douglas certainly could not establish if he were challenged, for it is a lie. Notice again, that Douglas makes no citations to support his claims, and then supports his claim by further referring to unnamed Apocryphal books, making no citations there either! I can only deduce one thing from these unsubstantiated claims of Douglas’: he is lying. If he weren’t lying, he would have supplied citations!

Now I must say, that while there was certainly no “debate” between James and Paul, there was one apparent point of contention. Yet in our meager records and one short epistle of James’, this point is not debated or discussed at length. Apparently James was convinced that those born into Judaism and their children should continue to be circumcised and keep the Mosaic law (Acts 21:20-24), yet those Christians of the nations (of Israel) not born into Judaism were not to be burdened by those things (Acts

21:25, cf. 15:1-35). If this is so, then I must assert that the Christian has to side with Paul on this issue, upon inspecting the prophets. For Jeremiah tells us that with the New Covenant both those of the house of Israel and the house of Judah would have the laws of Yahweh written into their hearts (Jer. 31:31-33, cf. Isa. 51:7). This is not ambiguous, it is a direct statement relating to both the law and the New Covenant. How could a man follow two different sets of laws? Ezekiel 37:15-28 tells us that Israel and Judah shall no longer be two nations, but shall be one and have one king and not be divided anymore. They shall be made “one stick, and they shall be one in My [Yahweh’s] hand.” This certainly leaves no room for them to be two different classes of people following two different sets of customs and laws, in defiance of the prophecy that they shall be one nation. For these reasons and more, such judaizers were rejected by Paul and early Christian apologists, and were rightly considered “heretics”. Today Clayton Douglas, a follower of jews, sexual deviants, atheists, magicians and assorted other miscreants, makes himself a judaizer too.

<Section #67> Clayton Douglas states: “... *In the Dead Sea Scrolls, Paul is referred to simply as ‘the Liar,’ for in truth he claimed that nearly every traditional facet of the Nazirite Way of life - those practices of the Nazirite oath in particular - were invalid. While Jesus stated that he taught the ‘Spirit of the (Old Testament)’ - Paul completely mocked and ridiculed the Torah time and time again. But, you still think of Paul as a ‘Good Guy’, correct? You are, of course, welcome to continue on with your Traditions. You can do exactly that ... even though the onus has now been placed on you.*”

In reply to section **<#67>**: It has been established here, and with much detail in section **<#43>** of this response beginning on p. 98, that the “Liar” of the Dead Sea Scrolls certainly could not have been Paul of Tarsus. Yet here Douglas confuses several other disparate facets of Biblical history which must be addressed. Evidently, Douglas believes that the Qumran sect, an appropriate name for whoever it was that wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls, were not only Christians, but also took the ancient Nazirite vows which are described in Numbers chapter 6. Yet it is easy to see that the Nazirite vows were not taken by the Qumran sect. For the Nazirite vows include these instructions found at Num. 6:3: “He shall separate *himself* from wine and strong drink, and shall drink no vinegar of wine, or vinegar of strong drink, neither shall he drink any liquor of grapes, nor eat moist grapes, or dried.” Yet in the Dead Sea Scrolls, in *1QRule of the Congregation*, 1Q28a Column II, we read “And when they gather at the table of community or to drink the new wine, and the table of the community is prepared and the new wine is mixed for drinking, no-one should stretch out his hand to the first fruit of the bread and of the new wine before the priest, for he is the one who blesses the first-fruit of bread and of the new wine and stretches out his hand towards the bread before them.” There are several other places that show that the Qumran sect indeed drank wine. The members of the Qumran sect certainly could not have taken the vows of the Nazirite! Clayton Douglas is once more found to be a liar, and a spouter of things he knows little about. Douglas only exhibits his complete incompetency in establishing a proper premise.

One does not have to look far to see that the disciples of Christ certainly drank wine (i.e. John chapter 2; Matt. 26:26-29; Mark 14:23-25; Luke 22:17-20), and so they

could not have taken the vows of the Nazirite! While it is true that the early Christians were called *Nazarenes*, which is only evident in the New Testament, quite ironically, where the jews accuse Paul at Acts 24:5, this name came because they were followers of Yahshua of *Nazareth*, and the jews refused to call them Christians. This has already been discussed at the end of section [#16](#) of this response, on p. 60. Whenever a jew calls a follower of Yahshua a Christian (anointed person), that jew admits that Yahshua is the Christ (Anointed One or Messiah), and so the early jews would not call them such, but used the term “Nazarene” instead. While it was a matter of prophecy that Yahshua was to be called a Nazarene (Matt. 2:23), among other things, this certainly does not mean that His disciples should take the ancient Nazirite vows, and it is fully evident that they did not! Clayton Douglas, again, is the Spouter of Lies!

Paul’s position on the Levitical Law has been discussed several times throughout this response to Douglas’ articles, in section [#18](#) on p. 62, section [#46](#) on p. 103, summarized again in sections [#49A](#) and [#50](#) on pp. 106 and 108, and touched on in discussions of related topics in sections [#37B](#) on p. 91 and [#44](#) on p. 102. It was discussed at length earlier in the response to H. Graber’s Paul-bashing in section [#J](#) beginning on p. 13. Here Douglas states that “*Paul completely mocked and ridiculed the Torah time and time again*”, yet, as usual, offers nothing of substance but this vain and hollow accusation. No citations, nothing specific, no examples, just a blanket accusation. Just like the government prosecutors and jewish false accusers who make every accusation possible hoping that something sticks, Clayton Douglas is a liar who cannot substantiate his claims! Also, notice that Douglas identifies the Pentateuch, or first five books of the Bible also known as the books of Moses, by the name which the jews use for it, the “Torah”, which reveals his leanings.

<Section #68> Clayton Douglas states: “*Regarding the Dead Sea Scrolls, there is - reportedly - a central character consistently referred to as ‘The Windbag’, ‘The Spouter of Lies’, ‘The Comedian’ and even ‘The Man of Scoffing.’ Who is this central character we are being warned about? Who is The Comedian?*”

In reply to section **<#68>**: Now, I understand that there can be different interpretations of certain terms, and so certain appellations can appear differently in various translations of the same text. Yet I’ve read one of the better translations of the Dead Sea Scrolls, which I’ve discussed on p. 100 in section [#43](#) of this response, and nowhere do I recall seeing such appellations as “The Windbag”, “The Comedian”, or “The Man of Scoffing”, nor anything even similar to any of these. Notice again that Douglas makes no citations, and probably because he cannot, for he is a liar and an inventor of deceptions!

Douglas’ contentions concerning the Dead Sea Scrolls and Paul of Tarsus hold up only if one is led to believe that the Qumran sect members were Christians. It has already been demonstrated here that the sect was positively not Christian, and made no indication in their writing that they knew anything of Christianity (section [#43](#), p. 98). Here I shall quote one more Dead Sea Scrolls passage which fully supports my contention, and which should remove any lingering doubts which anyone may have. From 4Q271, Fragment 5, Column I, a portion of the *Damascus Document*: “No-one should help an animal give birth on the Sabbath day. And if it has fallen into a well or a pit, he should not take it out on the Sabbath ... And any living man who falls into a place

of water or a well, no-one should take him out with a ladder or a rope or a utensil.” In the Christian mind, this should immediately evoke the words of Yahshua Christ recorded at Matt. 12:9-13 and Luke 14:1-6, for He would surely want us to help the animal, and especially the man, immediately on the Sabbath! The writers of the Dead Sea Scrolls were **NOT** Christians. Neither is Clayton Douglas!

<Section #69> Clayton Douglas states: *“However, it takes more for a matter to be ‘true’ than to have a charismatic ‘man’ traveling around getting paid big money to say that lawlessness justified by ‘faith’ is truth. How convenient a message to literally ‘sell’ to the lawless Roman pagans, literally ‘Goyim’. Are you still happy to be ‘Stupid Cattle?’”*

In reply to section **<#69>**: We have already discussed Paul’s position on the law and faith at great length in this response, and an index is given above, at the end of section **<#67>**. Paul was not teaching or promoting any “lawlessness”, rather Clayton Douglas is a liar! Notice Douglas’ use and definition of the term “Goyim”. This word is a Hebrew word, the plural of *goy*, Strong’s Hebrew dictionary #1471, which means *nation*. Abraham was told that his descendants would be “a great nation” (*goy*), “a great and mighty nation” (*goy*), and Jacob was told that “a nation and a company of nations” (*goy, goyim*) would be from him (see Genesis 17:20, 18:18 and 35:11). Yet Douglas’ definition of *goyim* comes from the colloquy of the jews and their Talmud, their true religious book. The terms that a man uses, and the manner in which he uses them, reflect the materials he chooses to read, how he has acquired his opinions, and the company he keeps. As he uses the terms “Torah”, “*goyim*”, “*Esu Immanuel Sananda*”, etc., Clayton Douglas is a follower of jews and miscreants.

<Section #70A> Clayton Douglas states: *“THE NEW PAULINE DOCTRINE OF LAWLESSNESS ... Paul has a lot to say but little or no Scripture to back it up. Likewise, he seems to either have been ignorant of, or blatantly hiding the words, contradictory to his own, that Jesus spoke. He claims to preach ‘the Gospel’ and even ‘the new Gospel’ yet he speaks little or nothing at all about the actual life, ministry and teachings of Jesus Christ. Instead he writes about his new doctrine of Lawlessness, and spends most of the rest of his ‘Epistles’ defending his violation of the Torah. This should be a great warning to us!”*

In reply to section **<#70A>**: It should be readily apparent to anyone who ever read Paul’s letters, that Clayton Douglas is the Spouter of Lies. Clayton Douglas is the Comedian! A quick perusal of the A.V. reveals that there are roughly 60 direct quotes of the Old Testament in Paul’s letter to the Romans alone, not counting the many allusions and indirect references, such as those found at Rom. 1:32, 7:1-6, 9:20-23 and 16:20. Additionally, several chapters in Romans are all about the Old Testament, including chapters 4 and 9. Clayton Douglas speaks not the truth!

As I discussed in section **<0>** of my response to the Paul-bashing H. Graber, on p. 18, Paul’s letters are not his gospel. Surely the gospel which Paul preached, which he often referred to as the gospel of the kingdom (which Luke also did, i.e. Acts 28:31), is that gospel which is found with Luke. Paul’s epistles illustrate an application of the gospel for the Christians of his time, as well as an application of the law. Anyone who thinks not should go back and read Romans chapter 2 or 1 Corinthians chapter 5 over

again. These chapters clearly demonstrate that Paul upheld lawfulness, and that both good and wicked deeds are rewarded in kind by Yahweh. Clayton Douglas is a liar, the Man of Scoffing, who probably hasn't even read Paul's letters in their entirety, let alone studied them! Time and again, Douglas shows his utter incompetency in developing good judgment.

Reading Paul's epistles, we must bear in mind that we surely do not have all of them. It is certain that a letter to the Corinthians prior to 1 Cor. existed and is now missing (see 1 Cor. 5:9), and perhaps there was one more of these, but 2 Cor. 7:8 may only be referring to the 1 Cor. which we have. There was also an epistle to the Laodiceans, mentioned at Col. 4:16, which is lost. Yet it would seem that since Paul's ministry lasted for close to 30 years, we may expect that he wrote more than 16 or 17 epistles.

<Section #70B> Clayton Douglas states: *“Strangely, this man, who was only shortly before murdering Jesus’ disciples, now expected everyone to believe him to be infallible and above any criticism. Considering his Satanic track record, it should be expected that Paul would have to prove himself through works or ‘fruit’ if he was to be accepted. However, not only are there no works except for preaching for money, but this Satan never even publicly repents nor seeks forgiveness for his oppression.”*

In reply to section **<#70B>**: We have seen here that Paul murdered no one, in sections **<#39>** (p. 94) and **<#59>** (p. 118) of this response, where it was also demonstrated that Paul did indeed apologize for his early persecution of Christians. Recycling the same false accusations time and again, Clayton Douglas only magnifies his own lies. Neither did Paul preach for money, but as an honest reading of 2 Corinthians chapter 12 demonstrates, just the opposite is true. Such is also evident at Acts 20:33-35. This was discussed in part in section **<#54>** of this response on p. 112. Clayton Douglas is rather the Comedian.

Paul did not consider himself infallible, but he did consider both the Old Testament scriptures and the gospel of Yahshua Christ to be infallible, and rightly so. On p. 18, in section **<O>** of my response to H. Graber, I said that “An honest study of Paul's letters reveal no fault on Paul's part when compared with the four gospels, though in places Paul's mere humanness is surely revealed, and as Paul at times himself admits.” Those admissions are found at places such as Romans 3:5 or 6:19, where Paul admits speaking “as a man” or “after the manner of men”, and not from scripture, meaning that he was indeed not considering his words to be infallible. At 1 Cor. 7:12-40 Paul admits that his advice there was his own, for which see both 7:12 (“I speak, not the Lord”) and 7:40 (“after my judgment”), obviously because he had no scriptural or gospel example to draw from by which to answer the question at hand. Paul wrote his advice here concerning marriage in a time when Christians were undergoing a harsh and violent persecution, the weakly translated “present distress” of 7:26, and because of that he advised against marriage for that time. Otherwise, of course, Paul esteemed marriage as a very important necessity (i.e. Heb. 13:4; 1 Tim. 3:2, 5, 12). So we see several examples where Paul warned that his teaching was his own when it could not be based upon Scripture, and by no means did he claim that such teachings were infallible. Clayton Douglas, the Man of Scoffing, has surely not studied what is necessary in order to discern these things.

The records in Acts demonstrate that Paul surely did “*prove himself through works*” (Acts 14:3; 19:6, 11; 28:8), and Peter accepted Paul (Acts 15) and testified concerning Paul’s legitimacy and wisdom (2 Pet. 3:15-16). Douglas, the Comedian, Spouter of Lies, spouts accusations which are untrue concerning things which he has neither studied nor understands! Clayton Douglas, Christian? ... or Patriot? Hardly! To qualify as either, one must erase from his mind all his errant concepts and start all over again from the beginning!

Now we shall continue to address the second of Clayton Douglas’ Paul-bashing articles, *SAUL OF TARSUS AND HIS DOCTRINE OF LAWLESSNESS*, which he published in the January, 2004 edition of his *Free American Newsmagazine*. It had been noted quite early in this series responding to Douglas’ articles, that his writings may be welcomed by readers of *The Trumpet* or *The Jerusalem Post*, because Douglas rejects many of the fundamental tenets of Christianity, and not only Paul of Tarsus. This will again become apparent below, along with many other inconsistencies and conflicts in Douglas’ thought and writing. While much of Douglas’ article is merely a recycling of his earlier statements, he does add a few new twists, and a few new twisted arguments, and so his entire article must be presented and addressed.

<Section #71> Clayton Douglas states: “***The ‘Saved Through the Blood Sacrifice of Jesus’ Pauline School ... It does not appear to be a tiny coincidence that canonical Gospels make any such references to atonement through ‘God-human’ sacrifice. The notion that such pagan concepts had anything whatsoever to do with the teachings of Jesus Christ is the biggest lie ever told. The impression that the unsuspecting Christian is left with is that ‘all the prophets’ had been awaiting this ‘sacrificial lamb’ to come as ‘God incarnate’ to atone for sin. There is literally not one statement in all Gospel accounts. It is Paul and his companions, rather than John the Baptist, Jesus, James and their Community, who introduced this concept of redemption through unsubstantiated ‘faith,’ simultaneous with acts of lawlessness. This left brain/left brain [sic] tweaking - courtesy of the Pharisees - creates ‘Christian Schizophrenia’.***”

In reply to section <#71>: Here it is apparent that Clayton Douglas is a proselyte, if not an actual Jew, recycling the same vain arguments that the Jews used against Paul and the rest of the apostles in the first century. Like the Pharisees who claimed to be experts in the law, yet were consistently reprovved through scripture by Christ, Clayton Douglas has very likely never even read the Bible he so wantonly criticizes and claims knowledge of!

That Yahweh Himself would walk among us is a matter of prophecy, seen as early as Lev. 26:11-12, and there are dozens and dozens of messianic prophecies throughout the Bible which foretell quite clearly many of the events of His sojourn here, such as Isa. 8:13-17; 9:1 ff. and 35:1-10.

In section <#4> of this response beginning on p. 39 we saw that Douglas denied that Yahshua Christ was the Messiah. Yet all throughout his first article Douglas referred to Christ as “Immanuel”, Hebrew for “God is with us”. The 70-weeks vision of Daniel, found at Dan. 9:24-27, foretold not only the coming of Messiah the Prince, but Daniel also anchored His coming to verifiable dates in history, predicting that coming and the year it would happen well over five hundred years in advance! And Daniel also

told us that “Messiah shall be cut off, but not for Himself”. What could that forebode, besides the fact that Christ was to be murdered on behalf of others? That Christ was to suffer that which He did is foretold in many places, chief among them being Psalm 22, Micah 5:1, Zech. 13:7, **and especially Isaiah chapter 53, which makes it perfectly clear that Yahshua Christ died for the iniquity of the children of Israel.** Clayton Douglas, the Man of Scoffing, denies all of this.

Douglas insists that *“There is literally not one statement in all Gospel accounts”*, apparently meaning that there is nothing in the gospels which tell us that Yahshua Christ was the *“sacrificial lamb”* who would atone for our sin. Yet this is a recurrent theme in the gospels! Clayton Douglas, The Comedian, obviously has not read Matt. 1:21, Luke 1:77, or especially John 1:29 and 1:35-41! In John 6:31-65 we have the great “Bread of Life” discourse given by Christ, where it is clear that His flesh and blood were given for our lives, and our faith in Him is rewarded by eternal life. While there are many other similar statements in the gospels which outline these things, it should be perfectly clear that Clayton Douglas, the Man of Scoffing, is a liar contending with Yahweh, Yahshua Christ, and all of the gospels, not merely with Paul of Tarsus. Clayton Douglas may just as well be another anti-Christ jew. John tells us “Who is a liar but he that denieth that Yahshua is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son.” (1 John 2:22) Who is a liar, but Clayton Douglas?

<Section #72> Clayton Douglas states: *“The direct consequences from this Christian Schizophrenia can be seen throughout Europe ... and the United States of America today. Although The Scriptures teach us that God’s Laws are, indeed, engraved forevermore upon our Israelite hearts, we - instead - listen to The Traditions which teach us that lawlessness and disobedience are AOK. Not to worry, you’ll get into Heaven too. This is all the result of Super-Apostle-Paul/Saul of Tarsus.”*

In reply to section **<#72>**: This babble of Douglas’ makes little sense at all, and surely Douglas is a very confused man. We have seen over and over again here that Paul of Tarsus did not promote lawlessness, and instead taught just the opposite, in sections **<#18>**, **<#37B>**, **<#44>**, **<#46>**, **<#49A>** and **<#50>** of this response to Douglas’ articles, and in section **<J>** of the previous response to H. Graber (see p. 127 at the end of section **<#67>**).

Douglas’ so-called “*Christian Schizophrenia*” is certainly not caused by Paul of Tarsus, and Douglas is duplicitous in blaming such on Paul. We have seen that Douglas is a follower of Bishop John S. Spong, whom he must have read at length because he quotes from Spong extensively in his attacks on Paul, for which see section **<#9>** of this response on p. 47, and section **<#23>** on p. 68. And we have also seen that Spong is a very liberal theologian, a promoter of racial integration, homosexuality, and embracer of the anti-Christ jews! Spong ordains homosexual clerics, promotes homosexual marriage, and is a leading humanist, and Clayton Douglas is his follower! Clayton Douglas, The Comedian posing as a Christian, is the real schizophrenic here! The lawlessness in Christianity is not Paul’s fault, it is rather the fault of liberal theologians such as John Spong! And all of these things concerning Spong were made manifest here from Spong’s own official websites and his own writings, after section **<#23>** on pp. 71-72, and in detail in a separate article on pp. 73-81. We’ve seen Spong attack Paul, and Douglas attack Paul. We’ve seen Spong deny Yahweh in Biblical terms, and

we've seen Douglas deny that Christ is Messiah, and Spong denies the divinity of Christ and the circumstances of His birth and ministry! We've seen Douglas embrace Freud, and we've seen Spong embrace Freud! John Spong is a liberal miscreant anti-Christ destroyer of Adamic civilization and a homosexual-embracing deviant, and Clayton Douglas is his disciple! John Spong is a liberal proclaimer of lawlessness, and Clayton Douglas covers for him by diverting the blame to Paul of Tarsus. Clayton Douglas is the Man of Scoffing and Spouter of Lies!

<Section #73> Clayton Douglas states: *"In yet another typical Judaist contortion, Paul/Saul proclaims all opposition to him as devilish. He suggests that those who oppose him include 'counterfeit apostles' and 'dishonest workers' (2 Corinthians 11:13) and even Satan's servants disguised as 'servants of uprightness' (2 Corinthians 11: 14-15). He wishes that his opponents would 'mutilate themselves' (Galatians 5:12). The advocates of the Old Testament were deemed self interested people who just wished to boast about their success (Galatians 6:13), wished to 'stir up disagreements' (Romans 16:17) and who preached differently to Paul 'out of malice and rivalry' or 'out of jealousy, not in sincerity' (Philippians 1:15-19)."*

In reply to section **<#73>**: In 2 Corinthians 11, Paul calls those who oppose not merely himself "false apostles, deceitful workers", but those who oppose the gospel of Christ. Paul's attitude here is fully supported by Yahshua Christ Himself, in the Revelation given to John, in the message to the assembly at Ephesus which Paul founded: "thou has tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars." Paul being the founder of that assembly, the gospel which he brought must be the "first love" of the assembly, and so Paul is true, and Clayton Douglas a liar (cf. Rev. 2:2, 4). It is clear that in early church history many jews attempted to subvert the gospel of Christ by adopting and then perverting it. Clayton Douglas, like John Spong, is their disciple. In his second epistle, Peter warns about these very same people with language at least as strong as Paul's, yet the hypocritical Douglas dare not criticize Peter (cf. 2 Pet. 2)! And Peter's complaints concerning these false teachers are much the same as Paul's. Compare 2 Pet. 2:19 to Gal 5:13, for instance. At Galatians 5:12 Paul wished that certain judaizers would rather mutilate themselves, because they were trying to foist the Old Covenant circumcision upon Christians. Douglas defends the *"advocates of the Old Testament"*, not realizing that to advocate the Old is to deny the New Covenant! Paul certainly knew better than Douglas, as is fully evident at Heb. 8:6-13. The passing of the Old Covenant (i.e. Zech. 11:10) and establishment of the New Covenant (i.e. Jer. 31: 31-33) were clear subjects of Biblical prophecy denied by Clayton Douglas and every 'good' jew. Clayton Douglas' own words again prove that he is little but a jew. All Paul-bashers everywhere should take note of this: you are all followers of and pawns of the jews!

<Section #74> Clayton Douglas states: *"Did you know that Paul was quite preoccupied with taking donations in? Did you know that he felt it necessary to answer a charge that he was embezzling the money? (Sound familiar?) (2 Corinthians 8:20-21 shows the suspicion with which he had to contend. He must claim the authority of the Jerusalem Community for the validity of his teaching to the Gentiles (Galatians 2:1-10) and he writes that 'they asked nothing more than that we should remember to help the*

poor.' This was some 17 years after his conversion, for as he states, he was in no hurry to confer with any human being as he had been selected in his mother's womb for this work (Galatians 1:15-17). (Another little narcissistic Pauline twist.) Even so, he was fearful that he and his gift might not be accepted by the Jerusalem leaders, writing: 'I pray that the aid I am carrying to Jerusalem will be acceptable to God's holy people'. (Romans 15:31)"

In reply to section <#74>: That Paul embezzled anything is a false accusation, a lie by Clayton Douglas who has taken advantage of a poor translation. This was discussed at length in section <#54> of this response, beginning on p. 112. Now Douglas removes 2 Cor. 8:20-21 from its context, verses that have nothing to do with money, but which only discuss the selection of competent ministers. My own translation of 2 Cor. 8:16-21 reads thusly: "¹⁶ **Now gratitude is to Yahweh, by whom that same diligence is being given in the heart of Titos on your behalf,** ¹⁷ **seeing that the encouragement he indeed has received, now being more diligent, voluntarily he has gone out to you.** ¹⁸ **And we have sent along with him that brother of whom there is approval in the good message throughout all of the assemblies;** ¹⁹ **and not only, but our fellow traveler has also been hand picked by the assemblies to be endued with this favor, in which he would serve under us to the honor of the Prince Himself; and our eagerness** ²⁰ **is avoiding this: not a one would find fault with us in this strength which is serving under us.** ²¹ **Indeed we have noble intentions not only in the presence of the Prince, but also in the presence of men."**

The term "this strength" refers to the unnamed brother (see also 2 Cor. 12:18) selected to assist Paul and Titos, probably one of the men mentioned at Acts 20:4. Many suppose, and it may be correct to do so, that such men were selected to ensure that funds donated by the assemblies were employed properly, and this is certainly to Paul's credit, so he surely cannot be accused in the matter. Clayton Douglas, The Comedian, would stop at nothing to accuse Paul. It is only natural, with Paul's bringing his gift from the assemblies to Jerusalem, that he would hope that the gift would be accepted, and Douglas' accusation to the contrary is both tenuous and unfounded.

Paul believed that he was chosen from the womb of his mother for the conduct of his ministry (Gal. 1:15) because he believed in the ability of Yahweh to predestine all of His children for His Own purpose (Romans 8:28 ff.). This is evident in the Old Testament many times, for instance of Pharaoh in Ex. 9:16, mentioned by Paul at Rom. 9:17; and Jacob and Esau at Gen. 25:23, mentioned by Paul at Rom. 9:12. We see it also at Jdgs. 13:3 ff. concerning Samson, and at Isa. 45:1 ff. where Isaiah mentions the Persian king Cyrus by name and in deed at least 150 years before Cyrus was even born! Now since this is so evident in so many places in the Old Testament, which Douglas professes, why doesn't Douglas believe it? The Man of Scoffing believes nothing! His only purpose is to discredit Paul, and then Christianity itself, like any 'good' jew would do!

<Section #75> Clayton Douglas states: "*Did you know it was Saul/Paul who taught, 'One person may have faith enough to eat any kind of food; another less strong, will eat only vegetables.'* It was his messages which convinced the world that it was now 'perfectly OK' to eat, well, just about anything you felt like eating ... in DIRECT

VIOLATION OF GOD'S DIETARY LAWS. God's Dietary Laws were not handed down to you to make your life difficult. God gave them to you to PROTECT YOU from sickness and disease. Paul didn't care much about what God wanted. 'Let them eat Pork' became Paul's motto. And, so God's People became sick ... and confused. More poisoning courtesy of The Serpent."

In reply to section <#75>: Again Clayton Douglas is a fabricator of lies, for Paul never spoke about the eating of pork, never mind Douglas' false claim that he approved of it! The scripture to which Douglas refers here is found in Romans chapter 14, and he apparently paraphrased v. 14:3. Again, notice that he does not state as much. But because Paul said that all foods may be eaten, does that mean that he advocated eating pork? Certainly not! For if pork is not normally considered food, then it cannot be included in the category of "all foods", even if we today do consider it to be so. Pork was not considered "food" to first century Judaeans, nor to many first century Greeks. Although earthworms and roaches are edible and contain nourishment, I certainly would not eat them even if people of other cultures do, and so I would not consider them to be "food". Neither do I consider swine to be "food", even though many people today do, and so I do not eat swine, and furthermore I do not consider Paul's statement at Romans 14 as any sort of encouragement or commission to eat swine, knowing that Paul is talking about food, which swine is not! As we can fully discern from Romans chapter 14 and from 1 Corinthians chapter 10, early Christians were at odds as to whether they should eat any flesh, or meat, at all. This was for cultural reasons, and not because anything in the Scripture promoted vegetarianism. If we are ignorant of Greco-Roman history and culture, neither can we discern the context in which the gospels and epistles of the New Testament were written! We would all be as ignorant as Clayton Douglas!

Greek temples were not merely places where pagan rituals and the worship of false gods were conducted. They also served as centers for community, lounges and restaurants, centers for organized prostitution, banks and other things. Greek city-dwellers took many of their meals at these temples, drank, and often participated in the other activities in which these temples engaged. Markets were attached to the temples, where animals could be purchased to make sacrifices to the idol, or where meat from sacrificed animals could be purchased. Some of these practices were even conducted at the Temple in Jerusalem (i.e. John 2:15). Such was the dilemma of first century Christians in Greece and Rome, where it was difficult to find meat which had not been sacrificed to an idol: to a false pagan god. Such was the reason for Paul's discourses at Romans 14 and 1 Corinthians 10:14-31, which in Paul's perspective (contrary to Clayton Douglas) had nothing to do with swine!

Additionally, we see in Strabo's *Geography* that swine was not accepted at all Greek temples, and that of the temples of Aphrodite swine was accepted at only a few (9.5.17). The famous temple of Aphrodite at Corinth was not among those which accepted swine. Strabo himself considered the eating of swine to be unclean (12.8.9), and tells us that at Comana in Pontus swine weren't even allowed into the city. So in the Greek world, we see division on this issue in the pages of Strabo. Clayton Douglas, the Man of Scoffing, understands none of this, and like most so-called Christians today, takes Paul's statements in these chapters entirely out of context. Paul never advocated or approved the consumption of swine's flesh.

<Section #76> Clayton Douglas states: *“Paul used pseudo-philosophical arguments that went in circles. He told James that he had no right to judge him - attempting to allude to teachings of James’ brother that were taken out of context.”*

In reply to section **<#76>**: Again Douglas makes no citations. Paul’s meetings with James are recorded in Acts 15 and 21, where Paul never argued with James and showed his elder complete deference in every way. Paul’s letters mention James at 1 Cor. 15:7, and at Gal. 1:19; 2:9 and 2:12. Nowhere was Paul ever recorded as telling *“James that he had no right to judge him”*! Clayton Douglas, The Comedian, is lying again.

<Section #77A> Clayton Douglas states: *“Here’s - absolutely - one of favorite [sic] Paulinisms, repeated every day by millions of bone-headed people:*

“Do not judge, or you too will be judged. For in the same way you judge others, you will be judged, and with the measure you use, it will be measured to you. Why do you look at the speck of sawdust in your brother’s eye and pay no attention to the plank in your own eye? How can you say to your brother, ‘Let me take the speck out of your eye,’ when all the time there is a plank in your own eye? You hypocrite, first take the plank out of your own eye, and then you will see clearly to remove the speck from your brother’s eye. Do not give dogs what is sacred; do not throw your pearls to pigs. If you do, they may trample them under their feet, and then turn and tear you to pieces.’ Matthew 7:1-6

“How many times have you heard this? I’ll betcha HUNDREDS.”

In reply to section **<#77A>**: This is incredible! I’m almost speechless! Here is – absolutely – one of the most idiotic pieces of commentary I’ve ever seen on the Bible. Douglas doesn’t like the words of Yahshua Christ as they were recorded by Matthew at 7:1-6, so he blames them on Paul! The incredible part, however, is that a little further on in his article, as we shall see below, Douglas quotes Matt. 5:17-20 and later both Matt. 6:24 and 7:21-23, using those sections to **support** his attacks on Paul! So regardless of where it is in the Bible, if Douglas likes it, it’s Christian. And if Douglas doesn’t like it, it’s Paul’s doing! Clayton Douglas **is** an idiot! Of course, here in Matthew, Yahshua Christ is talking about hypocritical judgment, as Paul also does at Romans 2:1 ff. Douglas, the Man of Scoffing, cannot discern as much. So he continues his diatribe:

<Section #77B> Clayton Douglas states: *“Here’s the real deal. Christianity, and I mean REAL CHRISTIANITY, is the most intolerant religion there is. It ought to make you proud. It isn’t lukewarm. It isn’t a namby pamby politically correct ‘liberal’ religion. It IS a set of laws, specified by God Himself, which supplies us with the correct parameters by which we CAN judge the actions of others. But, suddenly, Paul is retraining us that we MUST NOT JUDGE OTHERS. Lawlessness is just dandy. Don’t say a word. Do not condemn ... or else! But, that’s OK [sic] and quite acceptable, at least according to the legions of Christians who will immediately rise to Paul/Saul’s defense.”*

In reply to section **<#77B>**: Yet we have seen time and again in this response, in sections **<#18>** on p. 62, **<#46>** on p. 103, and summarized in sections **<#49A>** and **<#50>** on pp. 106 and 108, as well as discussing related topics, i.e. in section **<#37B>** on p. 91, that Paul of Tarsus certainly **does** uphold the laws of Yahweh (i.e. Rom. 3:31)! Paul never promoted lawlessness, as we have seen. Rather, it’s the liberal theologians

of today, such as John Spong, who attack Paul while, at the same time, **promoting** their **lawlessness**. Ironically, Douglas actually follows the **lawless** Spong, and then does an about-face by attacking the **law-upholding** Paul. Is not Douglas' duplicity fully evident for everyone to see? Clayton Douglas is rather the schizophrenic while he accuses others, and can hardly be labeled a Christian. Here Douglas continues by quoting Matthew to support his contentious argument:

<Section #77C> Clayton Douglas states: *"I repeat to you again, Matthew 5:17:20: 'Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law (Torah,) or the Prophets (Nevi'im,); I have not come to abolish them but to fulfill them. I tell you the truth, until heaven and earth disappear, not the smallest letter, not the least stroke of a pen, will by any means disappear from the Law; until everything is accomplished. Anyone who breaks one of the least of these commandments and teaches others to do the same will be called least in the kingdom of heaven, but whoever practices and teaches these commands will be called great in the kingdom of heaven. For I tell you that unless your righteousness surpasses that of the Pharisees and the teachers of the Law, you will certainly not enter the Kingdom of Heaven'."*

In reply to section **<#77C>**: So Douglas alone determines which parts of Matthew's gospel were written by Matthew, and which parts of Matthew's gospel were written by Paul! Only an idiot could imagine being able to do such a thing, and an arrogant one at that! Notice also that Douglas insists on giving us the Hebrew names for the Law and the Prophets, as if to lend credibility to his own use of Yahshua Christ's words, which were originally recorded not in Hebrew, but in Greek! This does, however, demonstrate fully the Jewish influences upon Clayton Douglas' thinking. Now I can imagine why Douglas made the silly statement in his first article, discussed in section **<#5>** of this response on p. 41, that Paul *"wrote almost two-thirds of the New Testament."* Douglas thinks that Paul wrote Matthew 7:1-6! But Douglas' astonishing idiocy extends far beyond even this:

<Section #78> Clayton Douglas states: *"James the Brother of Jesus spoke out against Paul of Tarsus in this profound and pivotal incident: 'You stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, you always resist the Holy Spirit! As your fathers did, so you do. Which of the prophets didn't your fathers persecute? They killed those who foretold the coming of the Righteous One, of whom you have now become betrayers and murderers. You received the Law as it was ordained by angels, and didn't keep it! Now when they heard these things, they were cut to the heart, and they gnashed at him with their teeth. But he, being full of the Holy Spirit, looked up steadfastly into heaven, and saw the Glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God, and said, 'Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Adam standing at the right hand of God!' Acts 7:51-56"*

In reply to section **<#78>**: Here Douglas takes the words spoken by the martyr Stephen before his death, which were recorded by Luke in Acts chapter 7, and he attributes them to James! And these words weren't meant for Paul in particular, but for the high priests, elders and council of the Judaeans in general, evident once reading the full story from Stephen's arrest as related at Acts 6:8-15 and 7:1 ff. Can Clayton Douglas read? Or is he a purposeful deceiver? Or is he just an idiot? One thing is evident: Clayton Douglas will lie and twist anything, stopping at nothing to slander Paul

and to corrupt Christianity, just as those whom he truly follows: the jews, the anti-Christ, the sexual deviants, liberal theologians, atheists and other miscreants whom he consistently quotes for support.

<Section #79A> Clayton Douglas states: “Here’s an account about James (the Elder’s) run-in with Saul/Paul.

“... In the Recognitions of Clement, we also learn of someone named Saul - ‘one of our enemies’ - who, upon entering the Temple with a few other companions while James was reading and interpreting Bible prophecy concerning Jesus, ‘began to cry out,’ and ‘while James was refuting him’ he ‘began to drive all into confusion with shouting, and undo what was arranged with much labor.’ A riot ensues, ‘in the midst of which, this enemy attacked James and threw him headlong from the top of the [Temple] steps, and, supposing him to be dead, cared not to inflict further violence upon him.’

“Though James doesn’t die here, both his legs were broken ...

(This is act [sic] of a man you say is now anointed [sic]?, Paul broke both of James’ legs!)”

In reply to section **<#79A>**: Clement, who lived and wrote long after the deaths of both Paul of Tarsus and James the elder, knew full well who Paul was, quoted from and followed Paul, and never identified the “Saul” who attacked James as Paul of Tarsus, though he had every opportunity to do so if such a thing were true! Douglas even admits this, admitting that Clement wrote only of “someone named Saul”, yet it is only Douglas who would identify this “Saul” as Saul of Tarsus, as if in the first century there was only one man named Saul in the entire world! Saul was the name of the first Israelite king (v. 1 Samuel), who was of the tribe of Benjamin, and so it was only natural that a first century Benjaminite may have this name. There were other men with this name in first century Judaea.

[Note: Douglas knows less about Church History than Scripture! When James the Just was martyred, Paul was in Rome. We find this in Eusebius’ *Church History* by Paul L. Maier on page 81 (2.23), under the heading “The Martyrdom of Jesus’ Brother James”:

“When Paul appealed to Caesar and was sent to Rome by Festus, the Jews were disappointed in their hope regarding the plot they had devised against him and turned against James, the Lord’s brother, to whom the bishop’s throne in Jerusalem had been assigned by the apostles ...”

In other words, James was murdered in place of Paul! Thus, either Eusebius lies or Douglas lies. For anyone who is truly interested concerning James’ martyrdom, see *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 8, “Hegesippus, Fragments from His Books of Commentaries on the Acts of the Church”. The “Saul” of which Clement cites is not the same “Saul” (Paul) the apostle! This “Saul” of which Clement refers went into the temple and accused James of being a follower of “Simon, a magician”, a false charge which the apostle Paul would never have made, and no such thing is ever recorded in Scripture. Douglas is grasping at straws. - *Clifton A. Emahiser*

The record in Acts chapter 21 is clear, that from the time of Paul’s meeting with James where Paul deferred to the wishes of the elder, he was arrested by the Romans after being attacked by the jews, and spending the rest of his time in Roman custody until being sent to Rome, Paul could hardly have seen the temple again during this subsequent period which he spent in custody in Caesarea (Acts 23:23 ff.). Paul

remained in custody of the Roman governor for some time into the term of Festus, who sent Paul in bonds to Rome (Acts 27:1). According to Josephus, the historian who was a witness to the events in Judaea at this very time, in 62 A.D., Festus died in office and was succeeded by Albinus (*Antiquities* 20.9.1). Paul would already have departed for Rome when this happened. It was during the tenure of Albinus that a young and ill-tempered man, the younger Ananus, obtained the office of high priest. Ananus was a Sadducee, and while Albinus was traveling abroad Ananus had the elder James and some of his companions slain, stoned after an assembly of the Jews' council (*Antiq.* 20.9.1). Josephus also tells us about another Saul, or Saulus, an Edomite related to the family of Herod, who led a band of robbers and caused much mischief a few years later when Florus was governor, and although Josephus does not record the breaking of James' legs or any other such attack on the apostle before his death, this other Saulus is a much more likely candidate to have perpetrated such a deed than Paul of Tarsus (v. *Antiq.* 20.9.4; *Wars* 2.17.4)!

<Section #79B> Clayton Douglas states: *“And we all know what happened to both James Greater and ‘The Less’ (Jesus’ Brother), don’t we? Who condemned both of them? Why those pesky deceiving Pharisees (Sanhedrin) of course!”*

In reply to section **<#79B>**: We have just seen from the words of Josephus that it was a Sadducee who had the elder James stoned, and not a Pharisee. From Acts chapter 12 we see that it was the Edomite king, Herod Agrippa I, who was responsible for the death of James the lesser, and neither the Pharisees nor the Sadducees are blamed for this. That makes Clayton Douglas a liar on two counts, which are easily verified! Is there any lie too great for Clayton Douglas, the Spouter of Lies? Does he not reveal what sort of man he truly is, through all of his lies (John 8:44)? Remember Rom. 2:16: “In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men according to my gospel.”

Once more we shall continue to address the second of Clayton Douglas' Paul-bashing articles, *SAUL OF TARSUS AND HIS DOCTRINE OF LAWLESSNESS*, which he published in the January, 2004 edition of his *Free American Newsmagazine*. Here we shall finish with this series of Douglas' Paul-bashing articles, and our response to it.

<Section #80> Clayton Douglas states: *“Speaking of pesky and deceiving, let us return once more to Paul’s statement which opens up this investigative article:*

“‘But granting that myself did not burden you I was crafty, you say, and got the better of you by deceit.’ (Saul of Tarsus 2 Corinthians 12:16)

“Does Christianity accept ‘taking in by deceit’ as a means of ‘ministering,’ and propagandizing? Does Genesis 3:1 not refer to the Serpent as ‘more crafty more subtle than any beast of the field?’ Paul himself boasts proudly about sharing this trait with the Serpent. Like the Serpent, Paul - too - is ‘subtle’ and ‘crafty’ - not trying to deceive you with something appearing as a lie. To convince you he mixes a small portion of truth with a predominance of pagan lies. The Torah, the ‘Law,’ which Paul mocked and considered a ‘yoke’ and ‘bondage,’ says: ‘Do not steal. Do not lie. Do not deceive one another.’ Leviticus 19:11”

In reply to section **<#80>**: We have seen in section **<#54>** of this response, on p. 112, that 2 Cor. 12:16 was not only poorly translated, but that Douglas takes it out of context, and Douglas also is aware that the translation has been challenged and refused to address that in his article. Here Douglas repackages the same argument he

used there, which was proven to be false. Paul certainly was not “subtle” and “crafty”, and just the opposite has been proven. Clayton Douglas alone is “subtle” and “crafty” here! And all of his accusations are unfounded! Notice also, that like a ‘good’ jew, he continually insists on referring to the Pentateuch as the “Torah”. In the next section of his article he refers to the “Tanakh”, the jewish name for the writings of the prophets, Psalms, and other books of the Old Testament. Christian writers scarcely use the word “Tanakh”, and many Christians probably don’t even know what it means. Such evidence of jewish influence is found throughout all of Douglas’ articles.

<Section #81A> Clayton Douglas states: *“But when Paul had gathered a bundle of sticks and laid them on the fire, a viper came out because of the heat, and fastened on his hand. When the natives saw the creature hanging from his hand, they said one to another, ‘No doubt this man is a murderer, whom, though he has escaped from the sea, yet Justice has not allowed to live.’ However Paul shook off the creature into the fire, and wasn’t harmed. But they expected that he would have swollen or fallen down dead suddenly, but when they watched for a long time and saw nothing bad happen to him, they changed their minds, and said that he was a god.” Acts 28:3-6*

“Here we are told that the natives, though receiving Paul well at first realize that it was an aberration of nature for a snake to attack someone who is in fact laying sticks on a fire. Snakes themselves are repelled by fire and it would be quite abnormal for a viper to attack a man without any provocation who is so near to the fire that he is in fact laying sticks in it. When the natives saw this they realized that Paul’s ship wreck was not merely coincidence, he had in fact been subject to the wrath of God, the same as Prophet Jonah was said to have been in the Tanakh for his reluctance. Just the same as in that case the stormy sea was a sign of God’s anger.

“Here Paul’s Antichrist cult does not allow us any such interpretation. Nonetheless this was the first and natural understanding of the natives of Malta. Paul’s devotee Luke tells us in the book of Acts that when Paul did not die from the bite of this abnormal viper, they said - that is, they uttered, not merely thought to themselves - that he was ‘a god.’ Nowhere in this passage does the devotee Luke tell us that the apostate Paul said one word to the contrary. Doesn’t that seem a little strange for an allegedly ‘god-fearing’ man to not deny a claim that he is a god?

“Moreover, in the city of Lystra, Paul causes a riot by supposedly healing a man. During the riot the people shout in their native dialect that Paul and Barnabas are gods come to earth. Again, there is no denial of these claims recorded in Acts.

“The fact that Paul did not dispute their claims that he was a ‘god’ is not at all an insignificant matter. When Apollonius of Tyana was supposedly tried before the Emperor Domitian at the end of the first century, one of the charges against him was that he had supposedly allowed himself to be worshipped as a god - more or less the same charges falsely applied to Jesus Christ - despite the fact that he never claimed godhood, nor did anyone else attribute it to him.”

In reply to section **<#81A>**: Firstly, just because Luke didn’t record any denial of Paul’s in Acts 28, when the people of Malta had imagined him to be a god, doesn’t mean that such a denial wasn’t made, or that Paul accepted their supposition. Yet Douglas is plainly lying about the incident at Lystra, where the people imagined Paul and Barnabas to be gods (Acts 14:11-12). That upset Paul and Barnabas so that they

tore their own clothing (14:14), the ancient way of exhibiting one's humility, and ran among the people denying it, admitting to be mere men (14:15). Clayton Douglas shows himself to be the Spouter of Lies.

We needn't go to Apollonius of Tyana and his trial to see the gravity of the accusations here, where one should fail to deny his elevation by the people to status as a god. There is a clear example right in the Bible, recorded by Luke at Acts chapter 12, where it is said that Herod Agrippa I was struck dead for not denying the claims of the people that he was a god. The historian Josephus, at *Antiq.* 19.8.2 (19.343), attributes this Herod's death to that very same cause. So both Luke and Paul were surely aware of the punishments for such impiety, lack of humility, and acceptance of the foolishness of the common people.

The people of Malta, called Melita in ancient times, were no uncivilized savages. The Greeks considered them barbarians only because they spoke a different language. Diodorus Siculus, in his *Library of History* at 5.12.2-3, says of Malta that it "... lies about eight hundred stades from Syracuse, and it possesses many harbors which offer exceptional advantages, and its inhabitants are blest in their possessions; for it has artisans skilled in every manner of craft ... and the dwellings on the island are worthy of note, being ambitiously constructed and finished in stucco with unusual workmanship. This island is a colony planted by the Phoenicians, who, as they extended their trade to the western ocean, found in it a place of safe retreat, since it was well supplied with harbors and lay out in the open sea; and this is the reason why the inhabitants of this island, since they received assistance in many respects through the sea-merchants, shot up quickly in their manner of living and increased in renown" (Loeb Library edition). It may be conjectured that the Maltese, being Phoenicians, and Paul being a Hebrew speaker, could surely speak to each other in a tongue which the Greek Luke could not understand, and so Paul's denial was not recorded. But surely just because it wasn't recorded doesn't mean it wasn't made. Yet that is not all, for Douglas continues:

<Section #81B> Clayton Douglas states: "*Even when any type of special status was alluded to regarding him, Jesus abrogated it by saying 'Why do you call me god, one alone is god,' (Mark 10:18) and humbly proclaiming that even 'Greater works than these shall you do' (John 14:12)*"

In reply to section **<#81B>**: And here Douglas attempts one of the sleight-of-hand magic tricks he picked up in all of the Jewish magic books he's read! For in Mark 10:18 Yahshua Christ is recorded as saying: "Why callest thou me **good**? *there is none good but one, that is, God.*" Douglas, believing that the word processor is quicker than the eye, removed an 'o' from good in an attempt to magnify his false accusation against Paul. Surely Douglas is The Comedian! The two words are much harder to confuse in their original Greek, "god" being θεός and "good" being ἀγαθός. Elsewhere Yahshua Christ stated "Is it not written in your law, I SAID, YE ARE GODS?", a reference to the 82nd Psalm at John 10:34. The Jews thought that by calling oneself a son of God, one considered oneself as equal to God, and they considered that blasphemy in spite of the scripture at Deut. 14:1 and Psa. 82. Surely Clayton Douglas, the Man of Scoffing, shows an ignorance of this (taking the same position as the Jews did to Christ's Words). Yet Paul, a man of humility, never claimed to be a god of any sort!

Finally, we have already seen Douglas himself acknowledge that Paul was nearly blind (section [#19](#) of this response on p. 64). Paul, wanting to lend a hand in the situation on Malta following the shipwreck, lifted a bundle of sticks and placed them onto the fire. A viper, surely from that same bundle of sticks and which Paul did not see, then sprung out from that bundle and attached itself to Paul, thereby avoiding the fire. There is nothing “abnormal” about this, except that Douglas would prefer his own twisted version of the story, as we have seen Clayton twist nearly everything he discusses.

<Section #82> Clayton Douglas states: *“So who is right? Is Jesus correct when he says ‘I have not come to abolish the Law’ or is Paul right when he says that Jesus ‘destroyed the barrier ... by abolishing in his flesh the Law with its commandments and regulations?’ (Hebrews 10:19-20) Was Jesus Christ right when he said that Heaven and Earth would sooner pass away than ‘one letter of the Law,’ or should we instead follow Paul who said the anti-thesis of Christ’s words: ‘But now the Law has come to an end with Christ and everyone who has faith may be justified.’ Romans 10:14”*

In reply to section **<#82>**: The first part of Douglas’ statement here comes not from Hebrews 10, but from Ephesians 2:14. In Ephesians 2, Paul is discussing the reconciliation of the “lost” Israelites (which the Ephesians surely were a part of) to Yahweh by His sacrifice on the cross. Because Israel, the nation, was “married” to Yahweh, and Israel played the harlot, the nation was put off, divorced, by Yahweh. The Levitical law governing marital relations prevented the reconciliation of the husband, Yahweh, to Israel. This law was the “barrier”, or “middle wall” in the A.V., which Paul mentioned. Thus, Yahweh died on the cross for Israel, fulfilling the law and freeing Israel from the Old Covenant. All of this was a clear matter of prophecy discussed at length in this response in section [#50](#) on p. 108, and what Paul explains to the Ephesians is in perfect keeping with this prophecy, which Christ came to fulfill.

Douglas continues by misquoting Romans 10:4, and mislabeling it 10:14. Romans 10:4 says in the A.V.: “For Christ *is* the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.” This word “end” is the Greek word τέλος (5056), where I have “fulfillment” here in my own translation. Liddell & Scott in their Greek-English lexicon define the word “*the fulfillment or completion of anything ... i.e. its consummation, issue, result, end ...*” Yahshua Christ tells us that He came to fulfill the law, and Paul correctly tells us that Christ is the fulfillment of the law. Clayton Douglas, the Man of Scoffing, sees problems and conflicts where there certainly aren’t any!

<Section #83> Clayton Douglas states: *“Again, I ask you, did Jesus Christ not say himself that a slave cannot serve two masters?”*

“You cannot be the slave of two masters! You will like one more than the other or be more loyal to one than the other. You cannot serve both God and money.” Matthew 6:24

“So which ‘master’ do Christians now serve? Which ‘master’ do you serve?”

In reply to section **<#83>**: And for this very reason Paul of Tarsus told the Romans: “Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness? ... I speak after the manner of men because of the infirmity of your flesh: for as ye have yielded your members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto

iniquity; even so now yield your members servants to righteousness unto holiness” (Romans 6:16, 19). The word “iniquity”, twice in this passage, is the Greek word ἀνομία, Strong’s #458, literally “lawlessness”. It is apparent from this passage, contrary to Douglas, that Paul of Tarsus was certainly not promoting lawlessness! Clayton Douglas, The Comedian, has judged Paul on the basis of but a few verses taken out of context and mixed with the lies of a long list of jews, sexual deviants, and other assorted miscreants, whom he follows straight to perdition!

<Section #84> Clayton Douglas states: “*Not everyone who says to me, ‘Lord, Lord,’ will enter the kingdom of heaven, but only the one who does the will of my Father in heaven: Many will say to me on that day, ‘Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in your name? Did we not drive out demons in your name? Did we not do mighty deeds in your name?’ Then I will declare to them solemnly, ‘I never knew you. Depart from me, you workers of LAWLESSNESS (anomial).’ Matthew 7:21-23*”

In reply to section **<#84>**: We have seen over and over again in this response that Paul certainly did not promote lawlessness. Neither did Paul promote universalism. Neither did Paul support the high priests of his time, who he knew to be the enemy posing as servants of Yahweh, just as the jews do today. In his second epistle to the Thessalonians, Paul talks about the jews at Jerusalem in this manner: “**You should not be deceived by anyone, in any way, because if apostasy had not come first, and the man of lawlessness been revealed: the son of destruction, he who is opposing and exalting himself above everything said to be a god or an object of worship, and so he is seated in the temple of Yahweh, representing himself that he is a god.**” (2 Thes. 2:3-4, my own translation). Thereby Paul tells us that the actual man of lawlessness, the Edomite Canaanite jew, was revealed by Christ, evident throughout the gospels, and especially in John chapter 8. Later on, in chapter 3 verse 2, Paul prays that he and his companions are spared from these jews: “**and that we should be protected from those disgusting and wicked men, since the faith is not for all.**” (2 Thes. 3:2, my own translation), since those jews had attempted time and again to kill him. Clayton Douglas, attacking Paul, has followed the jews in so many ways, as we have seen over and over relentlessly throughout this response, and so also makes himself an aid and an abettor in all of the crimes of the jews by obscuring the true history of early Christianity and giving the jews a smokescreen of lies to hide behind! We saw in section **<#13>** of this response, at the end of Douglas’ remarks there, that he even attempts to absolve Judas Iscariot, the real traitor and betrayer of Yahshua Christ! Could this be, that Douglas is a follower of ‘bishop’ John Spong, and Spong once wrote an article entitled “Judas Iscariot - A Creation of Prejudice?” for *The Human Quest* May-June, 1994? Is Douglas merely following Spong, the lover of jews, in this? Is Douglas, following the Humanist of the Year for 1999 – John Spong, purposely attempting to undermine Israel Identity Christianity – the only true Christianity – by leading it off into Paul-bashing?

Notice here that Douglas quotes Matthew 7:21-23 as the words of Yahshua Christ, which they indeed are. But earlier Douglas quoted and criticized parts of that same chapter, Matthew 7:1-6, and claimed that those words of Yahshua were a “Paulinism”! (See sections **<#77A>** and **<77C>** of this response on pp. 135 and 136.) Douglas’ hypocrisy is quite incredible, and glaringly evident!

<Section #85> Clayton Douglas states: *“A road that requires nothing of you but to ‘have faith’ is the broadest road imaginable. But, isn’t that the broad road that today’s Judeo-Christians feel they deserve?”*

In reply to section **<#85>**: In sections **<#37B>** and **<#44>** of this response, on pp. 91 and 102, we have seen that Paul’s idea of faith encompassed both good works and obedience to Yahweh. Paul certainly cannot be blamed for the state of “Judeo-Christians” today, as Paul well knew that there should be nothing “Judeo-” in Christianity! And why does Douglas use a term which he considers “almost an oxymoron” (see page 33)? In the title to his first article, Douglas offered “Judeo-Christianity” as the alternative for “Pauline Christianity.” For my part, I’d take Paul over the jews any day! All these little quirks and more, while they are relatively minor, do manifest the inconsistencies in Douglas’ thinking. And there are others which I’ve let pass by here. For instance, above in section **<#81A>** Douglas calls Luke “Paul’s devotee”, an apparent criticism considering what Douglas thinks of Paul. Yet early in his articles Douglas quotes from Luke’s gospel (section **<#8>**, p. 44, for example), and has often referred to or cited events recorded by Luke in Acts, without any prior criticism of Luke. Clayton Douglas truly is The Comedian, and surely no scholar.

<Section #86> Clayton Douglas states: *“In conclusion, Saul/ Paul of Tarsus taught deviation. Today, he’d be called an ‘Agent Provocateur’. Paul may have even been the individual that the Damascus Document identifies as ‘the Liar’ and ‘the Apostate.’ And as to why he went to the effort to found a new religion, many suggest that it was a brilliantly conceived means to defuse the political significance of Jesus and his Davidic bloodline. As an agent of the pro-Roman Sadducee establishment, Paul the Pharisee found a perfect way to deflect anti-Roman agitation into yet another Roman mystery cult. He apparently succeeded very well. The Romans may have had more reasons to throw ‘Christians’ to the lions than merely worrying that the moralistic folk might cancel their orgies and parties, especially if early Christianity were a successful anti-Roman political movement.*

“If early Christianity was really a revolutionary political movement fully within the sphere of Jesus’ teachings at the time ... whence the Christianity of today? END”

In reply to section **<#86>**: Here, finally, we reach the conclusion of Douglas’ two Paul-bashing articles, and most of the lies and misconceptions here have been addressed throughout this lengthy response, so I will not repeat them again. I must state briefly though, that I do not find any references to “the Liar” or “the Apostate” in the edition of the *Damascus Document* which I have, although appellations similar to “the Liar” appear in other Dead Sea Scrolls, specifically some of the Peshers to the prophets discussed at length in section **<#43>** beginning on p. 98. Yet we have seen throughout his articles that Douglas gets very few of his facts straight. He has instead produced little but a heap of deceptive, ignorant, confused trash.

Yet I must wonder, if Douglas is so concerned about Christianity, true, intolerant, non-politically correct Christianity, as he puts it (see section **<#77B>** on p. 135), why does he attack Paul of Tarsus based on the remarks and opinions of jews such as Sol Stein and Sigmund Freud, atheists such as Friedriche Nietzsche, and liberal theologians such as John Spong, himself an overt embracer of homosexuals, jews, and negroes as we have seen from Spong’s own websites? How is this collection of

miscreants and sexual deviants any alternative to Paul of Tarsus, and how could they possibly deal with the just and moral Paul in an objective manner? And we've already seen the Paul-bashing H. Graber was also a follower of jews and socialists, just like John Spong shows himself to be. How do such perverts and miscreants become valid discerners of Paul, of Yahshua Christ, or of anything Christian or Biblical or just or good? All Paul-bashers everywhere must take note: by unjustly attacking Paul of Tarsus, you are all mere followers and flunkies of the jews and miscreants. And all attacks on Paul shall be manifested to be unjust when measured against the gospels and the prophets! In your ignorance, you are only scattering rather than gathering the people of Yahweh. All Paul-bashers everywhere had better repent, and reconsider their anti-Christ positions!

MISCONCEPTIONS CONCERNING PAUL AND THE 'CHURCH'

So many men look at the oppressive behemoth which calls itself the Roman Catholic Church, and then foolishly place the blame for the creation of this monster and its offspring upon Paul of Tarsus, as if he ever developed such a thing. In doing so, these men are only repeating the romish church's lies by which it claims an apostolic founding, and giving them credence as if they were true, which they certainly are not!

It should be evident to nearly anybody that the apostles probably wrote many more epistles than those which we have in our Bibles, that if we possessed them, we may possibly have a more complete picture of their ideal model for the function and structure of the truly Christian community. However, not out of line with that spirit of simplicity of life which is an object of Christian teaching, it may very well be that we need none other than the scant instruction which we do have. Here we shall examine precisely what the New Testament books, and especially the letters of Paul, really do say concerning the organization and management of a Christian community.

In the apocryphal books are found some writings, in the so-called epistles of Ignatius for instance, which do attempt to clarify or enhance the instructions in our Bibles (i.e., those of 1 Timothy). These writings must be rejected, viewed with suspicion not only because they often conflict with Paul's writing, but also because they bear full support for the organized romish church structure as we know it. They are most certainly mere forgeries, and many commentaries have professed as much. All such post-apostolic writing shall be ignored here.

Both the prophet Daniel (7:8, 20-26) and Yahshua Christ Himself (Rev. 13:11-18) recorded beforehand the troubles that the romish church leadership would cause for us. Once one obtains a sound knowledge of history, the meanings of these prophecies and many others become astonishingly clear. Yet this foreknowledge by Yahweh of the romish church surely is not a divine blessing of such an organization, that it may somehow be considered righteous and legitimate (note Luke 4:5-7), for the prophecies themselves put forth a declaration quite to the contrary. Rather, it must be understood that the children of Israel were to be punished for seven times for their disobedience (Lev. 26). A "time" in prophecy being 360 years, seven times is 2520 years. This period began with the Assyrian invasions and deportations of Israel, which occurred from 741 to 676 B.C. (the 65 years of Isa. 7:8). The two beasts of Rev. 13, entities which are also outlined in Daniel chapter 7, are the succession of ancient world empires (also discussed in a different way in Daniel chapter 2) ending with the Roman, followed by the popery of the romish church. Each of these beasts was to last for about 1260 years (Revelation 13:5 dates the first, Daniel 7:25 the second) which is 3-and-a-half "times" ($3.5 \times 360 = 1260$), or 42 "months" of years ($42 \times 30 = 1260$), a day being a year in prophecy (i.e. Num. 14:34; Ezek. 4:6). A study of history surely does reveal that each of these beasts did indeed endure for about 1260 years. It is certainly evident that both the succession of ancient empires and the romish church were a part of Yahweh's means of punishing the children of Israel for their disobedience. There is much more that could be said here, however it suits not the purpose of this discussion.

It is evident that the organization of the romish church was very closely patterned after the imperial Roman government, and also incorporated the major elements of pagan Roman religion. The popes were very much like the Roman emperors in many

respects, and exercised authority over the kings of Europe for many centuries. The title “pontiff”, from the Latin *pontifex*, is derived from the Latin *pontis* or “bridge”. The title was used of pagan Roman priests and implies that the holder of the title was the bridge to their god. The title “Pontifex Maximus”, which belonged to the pagan Roman religious figurehead from early times, was taken by the emperors for themselves. “Priests” and “church” edifices (temples), “nuns” (vestral virgins), and many of their ceremonies and rituals, along with the colorful costumes and other symbols, are all derived directly from the pagan religions of old Rome. The “canonized” so-called “saints” replaced the pagan Roman pantheon, which included a collection of idols taken out of the nations conquered by Rome. The idea of a “patron saint” of anything, such as a place or an occupation, comes directly from Greco-Roman paganism, where gods or demons were given those same roles throughout pagan poetry. The “college of cardinals” is a shadow of the Roman senate. The diocesan system is quite like a system of provincial government, each bishop a proconsul or procurator. The title “cleric” signifies an “allotment holder”, the word being derived from the Greek κληροῦχος meaning “one who held an allotment of land, especially to citizens in a foreign country” (Liddell & Scott, hereinafter L&S). By the very language used, the romish church lays claim to the entire world! Of course, none of this has any support in the New Testament, neither in the Gospels, nor in the letters of Paul, nor anywhere else. Studying the epistles of the apostles, a very different picture of the intended “church” life emerges.

Wherever the word “church” appears in the standard translations of the New Testament, the Greek word is ἐκκλησία (1577, *ekklesia*). Difficult to discern from those translations, and poisoned by false concepts of the word “church”, the ἐκκλησία is “an assembly of the citizens regularly summoned” (L&S), which does not in any way denote an edifice or any systemized organization with a professional hierarchy, but is rather simply the *assembly*, those of the children of Israel summoned by Yahweh (i.e. Isa. 42:16; 43:1-7; 44:6-7, 21-23; 48:12-14; 49:1-7; Joel 2:32; Matt. 15:24; John 10:3), that body of true Israelite Christians either in the world or in any particular community, depending on the scope of the context. They are called the ἐκκλησία whether or not they happen to be currently assembled together (i.e. Acts 8:3; 9:31; 1 Cor. 14:23). Many in Israel Identity would prefer to translate ἐκκλησία from its components, “the out-called” or “the called-out ones”, which should not be deemed incorrect.

Early Christians gathered not to participate in any rigid program of rituals, scripted and repetitious from week to week. Nor did they gather merely to participate in the “Lord’s supper” (i.e. 1 Cor. 11:22), which the romish church has also made into a vain ritual (see 1 Cor. 11:17-26). Yahshua set the example of communion for us – in a private home at dinner with His loved ones. We should follow His example. Paul’s one recorded example of communion is at Acts 27:33-36 (compare Luke 24:30), where praising and offering thanks to Yahweh he broke bread and shared it with his fellows, without pomp or ritual. Rather, early Christians gathered to learn. The primary teaching instrument was the Word. Since books were scarce, being very costly to produce, they had to gather in order to receive the Word (Acts 17:2, 11; Rom. 15:4; 16:26). Paul mentions the scriptures often in his letters, and the record shows that he fully expected every Christian to be able to access them. By contrast, the romish church purposely withheld the scriptures from the common people for nearly a thousand years, even

putting to death those who dared to translate them from Greek or Latin so that the common people may understand them. Paul would certainly not have approved of such behavior! Until the 1960's the romish church ceremony and ritual was always conducted entirely in 'church' Latin, which the great majority of its attendants never understood, a practice which is absolutely contrary to Paul's very own words at 1 Cor. 14:9, 19.

Matthew 16:18 notwithstanding, nowhere in the New Testament is it mentioned that there is any one head over the assembly (any particular body of Israelite Christians), except Yahshua Christ Himself, and nowhere in scripture is it mentioned that any local assembly of Christians would be subject to any other authority (i.e. Eph. 5:21 ff.). Paul himself disowned lordship over anyone's faith (2 Cor. 1:24). The popes have always claimed the title *Vicarius Filii Dei* (which sums to 666, counting the value of its letters in the Latin system), which means *Substitute for the Son of God*. In contrast, Paul wrote at Gal. 3:28 "... all you are one in Christ Yahshua", and at Eph. 5:23 "Christ is Head of the assembly ...", where the verb is in the Present tense, and not past or future. Where Paul said at Col. 1:24 "**Now, I rejoice in these sufferings on your behalf, and I substitute for those deficiencies of the afflictions of the Anointed with my flesh on behalf of the body itself, which is the assembly**", the term "Anointed" is simply another term for the children of Israel, as demonstrated in my recent pamphlet *Yahweh's Anointed: The Children of Israel*. Paul never wrote anything about Yahshua Christ needing any substitute! It should be apparent that **dead men** need successors as **substitutes**! Yahshua Christ, who lives, certainly needs no such thing! There is no support for popery anywhere in the New Testament – and especially in the letters of Paul – unless one wants to consider a small number of statements which are disjointed, misinterpreted, and taken out-of-context to be such support!

Concerning Matthew 16:18 and the changing of Simon's name to "Peter", this is mentioned in Mark 3:16, Luke 6:14 and John 1:42, however only Matthew's gospel has the statements attributed to Christ in Matt. 16:18-19. Even so, there is no indication that these statements could be an interpolation and they should not be considered as such. They must, however, be examined more closely. The A.V. translates Matt. 16:18 in part: "And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter (πέτρος), and upon this rock (πέτρα) I will build My church ...", and there is a distinction between πέτρος and πέτρα (*petros* and *petra*) which is lost in translation. Liddell & Scott define πέτρος "a stone, distinguished from πέτρα", and πέτρα "a rock, a ledge or shelf of rock ... Properly, πέτρα is a fixed rock, πέτρος a stone". Consequently, I would render this part of Matt. 16:18: "... you are a stone, yet upon this bedrock I will build My assembly ...", in order to maintain the distinction, while at the same time demonstrating the false claims of the romish church to be but vanity. Even the A.V. rendering of πέτρος at John 1:42 indicates the correct meaning of the word, "stone", where John gives the Hebrew equivalent, spelled "kephas" in English, and its Greek meaning. Certainly Peter, as he subsequently became known, is but a stone, and is not the rock upon which Yahshua Christ builds His ἐκκλησία (assembly). Even Peter saw this distinction, where in his own epistle he in turn calls his readers "living stones" and refers to Yahshua Christ as the "chief cornerstone" (1 Pet. 2:5-6). Paul describes Yahshua Christ as the foundation of His own building (1 Cor. 3:9-11). The authority given to Peter by Yahshua (Matt. 16:19) was also given to the other disciples (Matt. 18:18).

The romish pope-cult claims an unbroken chain of succession from Peter and Paul through a line of bishops of Rome down to today, and claims his authority from Peter, being the “rock” upon which the romish catholic church is built. An examination of history would reveal that the first claim is a lie: the early bishops of Rome were martyred in the persecutions, and most later bishops were mere political opportunists. An examination of scripture, including Paul’s epistles, reveals that the second claim is also a lie. In reality, the romish church is built upon the bones of the saints, both figuratively (i.e. Dan 7:25; Rev. 6:9; 12:17) and literally: for the cult’s foremost temple, called “Saint Peter’s Basilica”, is built upon a large necropolis (see *Archaeology Odyssey*, March - April 2001, p. 60, “City of the Dead”)! From the edicts of Justinian, and armed with the forged so-called “Donation of Constantine”, the romish church gained dominion over all of the Christian assemblies of the οἰκουμένη (the Adamic world), and persecuted all those who refused to prostrate themselves before it, such as the Waldenses (Vaudois) and the Celtic church of the British Isles. The romish church has been but a tool for the dragon in his war against the woman, true Israel.

Paul wrote not to the popish “one true church” at Rome, but to “all those in Rome who are beloved of Yahweh, called saints” (Rom. 1:7), who were actually distributed among several different assemblies, or “churches” (i.e. Rom. 16:5), as they were in other places also (i.e. 2 Cor. 8:1; Gal. 1:2). Nowhere did Paul recognize any single leader of the Roman Christians. In the Revelation, Yahshua Christ sent messages to seven different assemblies, all independent, and not to “one true church” (Rev. 1:11), and Rome was not even considered among these seven! How could even the enemies of popery or “churchianity” possibly blame the romish catholic beast on Paul? Here it shall be endeavored to examine precisely what Paul did say regarding the organization of the assemblies to which he wrote. Hopefully then it may be realized that Paul cannot in honesty be blamed for the romish catholic church behemoth.

Paul was reckoned as an ἀπόστολος (652, *apostolos*), which is “a messenger, ambassador, envoy” (L&S). In spite of his modern critics, there is no indication that the original eleven apostles ever denied Paul this title, but rather they respected him as such (i.e. Acts 15, 2 Pet. 3:14-16). Once the “lost” nations of Israel received the gospel, there was no longer a need for such an office, and no successor “apostles” were ever appointed. Yet Paul also counted himself as a mere “servant” or “minister”, i.e. 1 Cor. 3:5; 2 Cor. 6:4; Eph. 3:7; 1 Tim. 1:12, even though his unique concern as an apostle was for all of the assemblies (2 Cor. 11:28), many of which the record shows that he himself founded. Paul had no subordinates, only colleagues: Rom. 16:3, 7, 21; 1 Cor. 3:5, 21-23; 4:1; 16:10; 2 Cor. 1:19, 24; 6:1-4; Phil. 4:3; Col. 1:7; 4:7 ff.; 1 Thess. 3:2; Ph’m. 1, 2, 24; and partners: 2 Cor. 8:23; Ph’m. 17. The Greek word συνεργός (4904, *sunergos*) is “working together, joining or helping in work, and as Substantive a fellow-workman, help-mate ...” (L&S). The A.V. rendered it “helper” at Rom. 16:3 and 2 Cor. 1:24, but more correctly “fellow laborer” at Phil. 4:3; 1 Thess. 3:2 and Ph’m. 1 and 24, since “helper” may imply subordination to some, which the Greek συνεργός does not imply. Certainly Paul did not think well of self-promotion (i.e. Phil. 2:3, 7-8), and always wrote in the spirit of the words of Yahshua Christ such as are found at Luke 13:30 and 22:26-27. Evidently, individual members of an assembly communicated with Paul directly (i.e. 1 Cor. 1:11), and his letters were written to be read to the entire assembly, not being merely summarized or interpreted by some “priest”, but read in full

(1 Thes. 5:27; 2 Thes. 2:15), and even read to other assemblies besides those who were initially addressed (i.e. Col. 4:16), which surely also encouraged the copying and distribution of those letters. Paul probably wrote many more epistles than those which we now possess, and the ones which we have themselves indicate that others are missing, i.e. 1 Cor. 5:9 and Col. 4:16.

While Paul in his ministry had allocated resources both human (i.e. 1 Cor. 4:17) and monetary (Rom. 15:31; 2 Cor. 8 and 9), he coerced no one (i.e. 1 Cor. 16:12). His “service to the saints” at Jerusalem must be understood in the context of the social climate there at the time, and it does not provide a reason or excuse to beg support for “missionary” work in foreign lands to alien peoples as so often witnessed in this age. The example Paul set for himself was to work for his wages in order to support himself (i.e. Acts 18:3; 1 Cor. 4:12), which he also recommended others to do (1 Thess. 4:11; 2 Thess. 3:9-12; 1 Tim. 5:8). Paul left no model for a professional priesthood which lived off the fat of the community like parasites (Matt. 23:14; Mark 12:40; Luke 20:47), which we see in the romish church and all of its offspring. There is not even a mention of any word meaning “priest” in connection with a New Covenant assembly in any of Paul’s writings! Only the most ignorant and unjust men could blame Paul for that monster which the romish church became, or for modern judeo-churchianity, things certainly not found in any of Paul’s instructions.

Here we have mentioned some of the various assemblies (ἐκκλησίαι) which Paul wrote to. Paul founded Christian assemblies throughout the cities of the Greco-Roman world, as the records in Acts and his epistles attest. Note that Paul did not found the assemblies at Rome, which he wrote to before ever visiting. That the assemblies which Paul founded in Anatolia were valid Christian assemblies is verified both by Peter who wrote to them (1 Pet. 1:1), and also by Yahshua Christ Himself (Rev. 1:11; 2:1 - 3:22) who addressed and even commended some of them. So anyone who questions the validity of Paul’s work also questions the validity of 1 Peter, of 2 Peter (3:14-16) and of the Revelation. Only a **fool** could do such a thing. Hence, all Paul-bashers, of their own volition, make themselves **fools**!

Paul left no successors [unlike romish pope succession], and warned the assemblies that they were on their own after his final departure, clearly illustrated at Acts 20:17-38. Here Paul tells the leaders of the assemblies gathered to him that they themselves are overseers (ἐπίσκοπος, 1985, *episkopos*, the word from which “bishop” comes) of the “church of God” (the assembly of Yahweh), and no one else! Anyone who reads this account in Acts and then blames Paul for popery and the romish church beast is terribly **foolish**! Since Paul himself would not rule over the assemblies of Christ (2 Cor. 1:24), surely neither would he recommend that anyone else do so, except Yahshua Christ Himself, for whom there is no substitute (i.e. 1 Cor. 11:3; Eph. 1:22; 4:15; 5:23; Col. 1:18)! So it is evident that Paul left behind him a collection of independent, autonomous Christian assemblies, which both Peter and Yahshua Christ also recognized and acknowledged. Now the internal structure of the local assembly, from the epistles of Paul and elsewhere in the New Testament, shall be examined, beginning with a compilation of the terms used to describe governance within the assembly, or Christian community. The usage of these terms outlined here may be verified with a Strong’s Concordance.

ἐπίσκοπος (1985, *episkopos*) is a noun, and the very word from which the English word *bishop* is derived, by way of the Vulgar Latin *ebiscopus* and Medieval English *bisceope*. ἐπίσκοπος appears five times in the N.T. and in the A.V. it was translated only once, at Acts 20:28, as “overseers” in the plural. Otherwise it appears as the borrowed “church” word *bishop* at Phil. 1:1; 1 Tim. 3:2; Titus 1:7 and 1 Pet. 2:25. An ἐπίσκοπος is properly “one who watches over, an overseer, guardian ... a public officer, intendant ...” (L&S). The related noun ἐπισκοπή (1984, *episkopê*) is “a watching over, visitation ... the office of ἐπίσκοπος ... generally, an office ...” (L&S). In the A.V. ἐπισκοπή is “the office of a bishop” at 1 Tim. 3:1, “bishopruck” at Acts 1:20 (compare Psa. 109:8), and “visitation” at Luke 19:44 and 1 Pet. 2:12.

Verbs related to ἐπίσκοπος are ἐπισκοπέω (1983, *episkopeō*), and ἐπισκέπτομαι (1980, *episkeptomai*). The verb ἐπισκοπέω is in the A.V. the “looking diligently” of Heb. 12:15 and “taking the oversight” of 1 Pet. 5:2. ἐπισκέπτομαι is in the A.V. to “look out” at Acts 6:3, and to “visit” on ten other occasions.

My own translations have rendered the word ἐπίσκοπος either *overseer* or *supervisor*. The word ἐπισκοπή is either *office* or more fully *office of supervisor*. The transliteration “bishop”, which is not a translation but is instead a borrowed word interjected into the language for devious “church” purposes, I have cautiously avoided.

πρεσβύτερος (4245, *presbuteros*) is the comparative form of πρέσβυς which is “an old man ... Comparative πρεσβύτερος ... elder ...” (L&S), and appears over 60 times in the N.T. as a noun, an *elder(s)*, as it usually is in the A.V. The related noun πρεσβυτέριον (4244, *presbuterion*) is “a council of elders” (L&S). The A.V. renders πρεσβυτέριον as “elders” at Luke 22:66, and “estate of the elders” at Acts 22:5. However at 1 Tim. 4:14 the A.V. merely transliterates the word, using another “church” word merely borrowed from Greek: “presbytery”.

διάκονος (1249, *diakonos*), a noun, is “a servant, waiting-man, Latin minister ...” (L&S) and appears 30 times in the N.T. In transliteration, it is the source of the borrowed “church” word *deacon*, Old English *diacon* and Late Latin *diaconus*. διάκονος is in the A.V. “minister(s)” 20 times, and “servant(s)” 7 times, and either of these translations are acceptable, so long as the term *minister* is understood to mean *servant* and not taken as some position of authority, which the Greek meaning of the word surely does not bear. On 3 occasions the A.V. renders this word as “deacon(s)”, at Phil. 1:1 and 1 Tim. 3:8 and 12, which is not acceptable since those renderings manipulate the word so as to somehow support the artificial structure of the organized “church”. διάκονος in those passages should not be distinguished from the other 27 passages in which the word appears.

The related noun διακονία (1248, *diakonia*) is “the office of a διάκονος, service ... 2. attendance on a duty, ministration ...” (L&S) and appears 34 times in the N.T. The A.V. has rendered the word “administration(s)” twice, “to minister” once, “ministering” three times, “ministry” or “ministration” 22 times, “relief” once, “service” three times, “serving” once and “office” once.

The verb διακονέω (1247, *diakoneō*), is “to minister, serve, do service ... II. to furnish, supply ...” (L&S) and appears in the A.V. 37 times. The A.V. has rendered the word twice *to administer*, ten times *to serve* and 23 times *to minister*, and all of these are acceptable, as long as one understands the word *minister* as a verb in the sense of

performing a service to the assembly, or for the assembly, and not ruling over it, a perception which the Greek meaning of διακονέω does not support nor convey. Yet like διάκονος, the A.V. rendered διακονέω as “to be a deacon” twice, at 1 Tim. 3:10 and 13, which following the “church” Liddell & Scott also mentions, but which is omitted from the definition given above. Of course, διακονέω may mean *to be a διάκονος*, but “deacon” is a “church” word borrowed from Greek for artificial “church” purposes, and not an English word.

In my own translations, διάκονος is usually *servant*, but nearly as often *minister*. διακονέω is usually *to serve*, but nearly as often *to minister*. διακονία is most often a *service*, but also in various contexts an *administration, attendance, ministering, ministry, office, or supply*.

It must be mentioned, that in the A.V. a diverse group of 12 other Greek words have on a total of 28 occasions been rendered “(to) minister (-eth, -ing, -s, -try)”, none of which should be taken to imply the holding of any office or position within the assembly, and so they shall not be discussed here.

Now that the basic terms describing offices within an organized Christian assembly have been defined, and the manner in which the A.V. has treated those words has been observed, their application in the New Testament may be discussed, once the meaning of one more Greek word has been examined.

χειροτονέω (5500, *cheirotoneō*) only appears twice in the N.T., however it is a very important word. Its interpretation determines whether a Christian assembly should select its own leaders, and thereby remain autonomous, or whether some outside, **supposed** authority selects those leaders, where the assembly then becomes subject to that **supposed** authority.

Liddell & Scott define χειροτονέω “*to stretch out the hand, for the purpose of voting ... II ... to vote for, elect, properly by show of hands ... Passive to be elected ... χειροτονηθῆναι, election, was opposed to λαχεῖν, appointment by lot ...*” and this is the natural meaning of the word, since its components, χεῖρ and τόνος, are *a hand* and *a stretching* respectively. This definition was derived from the 7th edition of the Liddell & Scott *Greek-English Lexicon*. The 9th edition of Liddell & Scott does add “*appoint*” to the word’s definition, yet it is obviously following the “church” since it cites both N.T. passages where the word appears, but no secular authority in order to show that the word was ever actually used in such a manner.

The A.V. rendering of Acts 14:23, “And when they had ordained them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they believed”, contains **several errors** which shall not be reviewed at length here, but which are discussed in the notes for this passage in my own translation of Acts, part of my forthcoming edition of *The Records of Luke*. My own translation of Acts 14:23 reads thusly: “And elders being **elected** by them in each assembly, praying with fasting they presented them in whom they had confidence with the authority.” The important issue to note here is that χειροτονέω is rendered “**elected**” (appearing here in the past tense), **and NOT “ordained”**.

The second occurrence of χειροτονέω in the N.T. is at 2 Cor. 8:19, a verse rendered in part by the A.V.: “And not *that* only, but who was also chosen of the churches to travel with us in this grace ...”, language which is quite **ambiguous**. From my own edition of Paul’s epistles, this same pericope reads: “and not only, but our

fellow traveler has also been handpicked by the assemblies to be endued with this favor...”, and “**handpicked**” may just have well been “**elected**”. The assemblies chose who was going to represent them by traveling to Jerusalem with Paul to present their gift to the needy there; Paul himself did not make the choice. This is even more evident reading the previous verse, 8:18, which I have read: “And we have sent along with him that brother of whom there is approval in the good message throughout all of the assemblies”.

There are many Greek words which may be rendered *appointed*, *chosen*, or *ordained* in English. The use of χειροτονέω by Luke and Paul in these two passages very clearly shows in both context and definition that the leaders and servants of a Christian assembly should be **elected** by that assembly. The assembly chooses its own leaders. No one sets leaders over them, as so-called “churches” do today, and there is no other passage in the New Testament which gives credence to such an idea. The romish church built its authority upon the decrees of Justinian and its own false claims, and the ignorant masses were led to believe them, just as so many still do today. Only the most foolish of men could blame this on Paul of Tarsus.

In the definitions of the words used in the N.T. given previously, we have seen what appear to be two positions of authority within the Christian assembly. These are ἐπίσκοπος (*overseer* or *supervisor*) and πρεσβύτερος (*elder*). That these are legitimate positions within the assembly is found not only because Paul uses the terms in such a context, but Peter, James and John do likewise, and their so doing verifies many of Paul’s statements for us (i.e. 1 Peter 5:1, 2; James 5:14; Rev. 4:4, 10 et al.). That these two offices are actually one and the same is fully evident from the discourse in Acts chapter 20, at vv. 17 and 28, and at Titus 1:5-7 and 1 Pet. 5:1-2. Where the A.V. has “ordain” at Titus 1:5, the Greek word is καθίστημι (2525, *kathistâmî*) which may mean “to ordain, appoint” but also “to establish” (L&S). While the meaning of this one word here may be argued, we have already seen the manner by which elders were to be selected, by election of the assembly at Acts 14:23 and 2 Cor. 8:19 (though the election there was for a different purpose), so here I must read καθίστημι as *establish*.

Peter discusses the role of an elder at 1 Pet. 5:1 ff., where he states that they should lead by example, and not lord (*become a dictator*) over the assembly. Likewise, Paul discusses the role of supervisor (“bishop” in the A.V.) at 1 Tim 3:1-7. That “elder” and “supervisor” are one and the same role, Joseph Thayer discusses at length in his *Greek-English Lexicon Of The New Testament* under πρεσβύτερος (4245): “That they [οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, elders] did not differ at all from the (ἐπίσκοποι) bishops or overseers (as is acknowledged also by Jerome on Tit. i. 5 ...) is evident from the fact that the two words are used indiscriminately, Acts xx. 17, 28; Tit. i. 5, 7, and that the duty of presbyters is described by the terms ἐπισκοπεῖν, 1 Pet. v. 1. sq., and ἐπισκοπή, Clem. Rom. 1 Cor. 44, 1; accordingly only two ecclesiastical officers, οἱ ἐπίσκοποι and οἱ διάκονοι [overseers or supervisors and ministers or servants] and are distinguished in Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 1, 8. The title ἐπίσκοπος denotes the function, πρεσβύτερος the dignity; the former was borrowed from Greek institutions, the latter from the [Judaeans]” [brackets mine, but not parentheses]. James also mentioned elders in his epistle (5:4), and they are discussed again by Paul at 1 Tim. 5:17 ff.

So we see that overseer or supervisor (A.V. "bishop") and elder are one and the same office, and we have seen that the men of the assembly are elected to this office by the assembly, as previously discussed referring to Acts 14:23 and the verb χειροτονέω. From the instructions given by Paul at 1 Tim. 3:1-7 and 5:17-24 and elsewhere, it is also evident that an assembly may have more than one elder at any given time. It is also evident that the assembly should consider men who have at one time or another served in the capacity of a teacher of scripture (a function performed by a minister) when filling a position of elder, as Paul instructs at 1 Tim. 3:2. The elder is a leader of and an example to the assembly, but not its lord or ruler (1 Pet. 5:3). Yahshua Christ is the one and only Head over one and all in every Christian assembly: 1 Cor. 11:3; Eph. 1:22; 4:15; 5:23; Col. 1:18 et al. There is no prescription for popery in the New Testament, and especially in the letters of Paul. In the temporary absence of Yahshua Christ, scripture is the only valid authority: Acts 17:2, 11; 18:24, 28; Rom. 15:4; 1 Cor. 11:2; 14:37 (v. 2 Pet. 3:15-16); Gal. 2:5; 6:6; Col. 3:16; 1 Tim. 6:3; 2 Tim. 2:15; 3:15-17; 4:2 et al.

As we have also seen Thayer agree, the only other office in the Christian assembly is διάκονος, minister or servant (sometimes "deacon" in the A.V.). From the definition of διάκονος discussed previously, we have seen that minister, servant and deacon are all one and the same. Paul discusses the qualifications of ministers at 1 Tim. 3:8-13. Note that in 1 Tim. 3, Paul's instructions disqualify every single romish catholic cardinal, bishop and priest, along with many of the ministers of other denominations, from being legitimate servants of the assembly of Yahweh.

Any person at any time may serve as a minister to an assembly, and even voluntarily (1 Cor. 16:15), although it is clear from 1 Tim. 3:8-13, in conjunction with other statements of Paul, that minister may also be an office in the assembly to which one or more persons may be elected, each performing some specified function for an extended period of time. These may be teachers, or messengers, or caretakers of the elderly, or any other capacity which the community of Christians may require or even desire. Eph. 4:11-12 lists some of the functions which a minister may be chosen to perform, and other functions are evident elsewhere, such as at Acts 6:1-7; Rom. 16:1; 2 Tim. 2:2 and 1 Pet. 4:10-11. So a minister is one who serves the assembly in a certain task, or even multiple tasks, depending upon his or her abilities. A minister is a servant, not an authority figure, and surely his work must be monitored by the overseers. Various gifts beneficial to the assembly are discussed in Romans 12 and 1 Corinthians 12. At Rom. 12:7 διακονία, *ministering* or *administration* is listed as one of these gifts, for which note also 1 Cor. 12:5. Yet 1 Cor. 14:26 ff. reinforces the notion that any member of the assembly, and not just a selected minister, may share his gifts, insights or abilities with the assembly.

While women may serve the assembly in certain capacities, and were even counted by Paul as colleagues (Rom. 16:1, 3; 1 Cor. 16:19; Phil. 4:3), they are forbidden to speak in the assembly (1 Cor. 14:34), and forbidden from teaching or being chosen as elders or having any position of authority over men (1 Tim. 2:12). So while women may hold positions as ministers, there are certain limitations which by necessity must be imposed.

All men of age (20 years: Num. 1:3 et al.) in a Christian community are equals (i.e. 1 Cor. 12:12-26; James 2:1 ff.), with a certain amount of deference given to those

who are older than us who are upright members of the community (1 Pet. 5:5). As we have seen, an elder or overseer is not a lord or boss, but a leader who teaches by example. The verb rendered *to rule* in the A.V. at Rom. 12:8 and 1 Tim 3:4, 5 and 5:17 is προϊστημι (4291, *proistâmi*) and means merely *to lead, govern, preside, direct, manage*, etc. It is most literally *to stand before* and not “rule” (for which there are many other Greek terms) as the organized ‘church’ would have it of their appointed “bishops”, something Paul would certainly not recommend. We have also seen that a minister is not an authority figure, but is a servant. A minister is not a “preacher” but may be a teacher, or a proclaimer of the Word, or an administrator of some other task. Yahshua Christ, and by extension His Word in scripture (New Testament and Old), is the only authority. All matters should be brought before the assembly and judged by the Word, which shall be discussed at greater length below. One important difference from the Old Testament judges-era model is explained in 1 Cor. 5: those who have erred terribly should at the most be excluded from the community, rather than condemned (stoned), and Yahweh will see that they are judged.

Surely the above advice given by Paul at 2 Thess. 3:14, 1 Tim 6:3 and Tit. 3:10 must be applied to every and any member of the assembly, including ministers and elders, and therefore 1 Tim. 5:19 allows for an impeachment process of those officers who go astray. This must necessarily be conducted before the assembly, which would decide the issue. Officers elected by the assembly must therefore be answerable only to the assembly. My own translation of 1 Tim. 5:19 reads thusly: “An accusation against an elder you must not receive publicly, except ‘by two or three witnesses’,” and the main difference with the A.V. is in reading the Greek word ἐκτός (1622, *ektos*), which is discussed at length in the notes to my edition of Paul’s letters. Of course Paul’s admonishment here, where he cites Deut. 19:15, should stand for both elders and any other member of the assembly.

The Christian assembly, being autonomous and answering to no other authority except the Word, must therefore assume responsibility for itself and not turn to secular authorities to fulfill its needs. Those who look to the governments of man to solve their problems invite the government to become involved in every facet of their lives. The government becomes their god. One may deny the veracity of such a broad statement, yet this is the very dilemma which we in America suffer today. The Christian assembly provides for its own members and resolves its own social problems. Such is clear in the examples given at Acts 2:44-46; 4:32-37 and 6:1-7. Note also in chapter 6 of Acts, when the apostles recommended that men be selected to serve the assembly by managing a particular necessity, that the people chose the men, and not the apostles. This example, and those given here previously, show again that the people of the assembly choose their own leaders and ministers. Not even Peter, James or John would dictate by appointing these men over the assembly. Why should any organized ‘church’ (at the time of the apostles or since, or even in the Identity assemblies of today) assume that they have a right to do otherwise? Certainly Paul wouldn’t have, as we have already observed here. These examples of Christian social life set forth in Acts are also evident in Paul’s epistles, for example at 1 Tim. 5:1-16.

The Christian assembly providing duties of community to its own members, the members must look only to the assembly for those services. This is explained by Paul concerning matters of justice at 1 Cor. 5 and 6, (chapters poorly translated in the A.V.).

Since the secular authorities disdain the laws of Yahweh, they cannot judge righteously, nor provide for a community righteously, and should therefore be avoided by Christians. My own translation of 1 Cor. 5:12-13 reads thusly: “¹² **What is it to me to judge those outside? Not at all should you judge those within you.** ¹³ **But those outside Yahweh judges; ‘you will expel the wicked from amongst yourselves’.**” The Christian assembly must expel wrongdoers, and not “judge” (i.e. condemn) them, trusting that Yahweh Himself will see to it that they are treated in accordance with their deeds. Again, my own translation of 1 Cor. 6:1-11 reads thusly: “¹ **Dare any of you, having a matter against another, have it decided before the unrighteous, and not before the saints?** ² **Do you not know that the saints will judge the cosmos? And if by you the cosmos is judged, are you unworthy of the smallest trials?** ³ **Do you not know that we will judge Messengers, let alone the things of this life?** ⁴ **So then if you should have trial of things pertaining to this life, those who esteem themselves least in the assembly, those will be set to judge.** ⁵ **I speak from respect to you. So is there among you not even one wise, who would be able to decide among his brethren?** ⁶ **But brother is brought to trial by brother, and this before those not believing!** ⁷ **So then already there is altogether discomfiture among you, seeing that you have matters for judgment among yourselves. Why would you not still more be wronged? Why would you not still more be defrauded?** ⁸ **You would rather do wrong and defraud, and this of a brother?** ⁹ **Or do you not know that the unjust will not inherit the kingdom of Yahweh? Do not be led astray: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor homosexuals,** ¹⁰ **nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor railers, nor rapacious shall inherit the kingdom of Yahweh.** ¹¹ **And these things some of you may have been, but you have cleansed yourselves; moreover you have been sanctified, moreover you have been deemed fit, in the name of Prince Yahshua Christ, and in the Spirit of our God.”**

In 1 Cor. 6:1 Paul tells the assembly not to sue for justice before “the unrighteous”, or non-Christian, secular authorities. In 6:2-3 Paul tells the assembly that “the saints”, Israelites who have accepted the gospel and have returned to Yahweh, separating themselves from the evils of the “world” and from the unrighteous, shall judge the “cosmos” or “world” (Adamic society), and so they certainly should be able to settle their own matters among themselves. In 6:4 Paul advises that they select “those who esteem themselves least”, i.e. men who are of a humble disposition, in order to judge such matters. In 6:5-6 Paul expresses his own shock and disbelief that no one among the assembly would be able to judge such matters, and that one Christian would venture to sue another before a non-believer. In 6:7-8 he continues to admonish them for having such problems among themselves at all, and also warns them that they would probably only be wronged even further by the secular authorities. Just think of all the jews, mamzers, and other assorted heathens who sit as judges in America today! And not one of them could ever be righteous before Yahweh!

The local ἐκκλησία, assembly or Christian community, answers to no authority except the Word. There is no basis for a single one-world command structure such as the romish catholic “church” is organized. Paul certainly never recommended such a thing! For this reason, and much of what follows is of my own opinion, I believe that much latitude is given to the local assembly, to organize and regulate itself based upon

its own custom and economic status. I would think that the number of elders (supervisors) elected, the number of ministers (servants), whether or not compensation is granted for time spent in service, or if any of these positions are “full-time” or “part-time”, are all dependent upon the size, economic status, and desire of each particular assembly. The assembly itself should decide the authority of its elders, powers delegated to them, functions of ministers, and any other manner of government. Because the children of Israel have not yet been fully restored from their state of punishment, secular authorities should be obeyed (Rom. 13; 1 Pet. 2:11-17; Matt. 22:21 [Mark 12:17; Luke 20:25]; John 19:11), but not placed before Yahweh (Acts 5:29). Surely it may sound as if the function of the Christian assembly is “democratic”, but this is certainly not the case since the governing authority (or constitution) is the Word, and therefore the will of the masses is restricted. The assembly has no authority to disobey or circumvent the Word for any reason!

Are elder, or overseer, and minister, or servant, full-time positions? Should these officers receive compensation from the assembly, living off the good will of the assembly? Although such need not be encouraged, it is not unlawful, i.e. Rom. 15:27 and 1 Cor. 9:1-18 (where Paul also explains why he did not marry, and that he need not have lived in poverty – both contrary to romish church dogma). The example which Paul made was to preach the gospel without burdening the assembly, without cost to the hearers, i.e. 1 Cor. 9:18; 10:33; 2 Cor. 11:7; 12:13; 2 Thess. 3:8; and also to work at labor in order to support himself: Acts 18:3; 1 Cor. 4:12. He recommended to his followers that they follow his example: 1 Thess. 4:11; 2 Thess. 3:9-12; 1 Tim 5:8.

While Paul explains in 1 Cor. 9:1-18 why he and Barnabas chose not to marry, he instructs that elders and ministers of the Christian assembly not only **should** be married, but they **must** be married. This is not hypocritical on Paul’s part. It has been previously explained here that the office of apostle was quite unique, and required much travel from those who held it, who also endured much hardship. All of the apostles were very young when they were selected, including Paul (Acts 7:58), and evidently at least several of them put their mission ahead of the prospects of marriage. Traveling with a family would impose a great burden and expense on a man. Paul traveled for nearly 30 years! Neither could a mere laborer afford both to travel and support a family with a home. To properly conduct the office of apostle in a simple Christian lifestyle, having a family along would be greatly inhibitive.

The A.V. usually translated the imperative form of Greek verbs as “let...”, rather than “must...”. My own translation of 1 Tim. 3:1-13 reads as follows: “¹ **Trustworthy is this saying. If anyone strives for an office of supervisor, he is desirous of good work.** ² **Therefore it is necessary for that supervisor to be irreproachable, a husband of one wife, sober, discreet, orderly, hospitable, inclined to teach,** ³ **not a drunkard, not a brawler but reasonable, not contentious, not loving money,** ⁴ **governing his own house well, having children in subjection with all reverence,** ⁵ **(now if one does not know to govern his own house, how would he care for an assembly of Yahweh?)** ⁶ **Not a neophyte, lest blinded with pride he would fall into condemnation of the False Accuser.** ⁷ **Now it is necessary also to have a good accreditation from those outside, lest he fall into a reproach and a trap of the False Accuser.** ⁸ **In like manner reverent ministers, not double-tongued, not addicted to much wine, not shamefully desirous of gain,** ⁹ **holding the mystery of**

the faith with a clean conscience. ¹⁰ But even they must be scrutinized first, then being void of offense they must minister. ¹¹ Likewise reverent wives, not slanderous, sober, trustworthy in all. ¹² Ministers must be husbands of one wife, governing their children and their own houses well. ¹³ For they that are ministering well obtain for themselves a good degree and much liberty in faith which is in Christ Yahshua.” Again it must be mentioned, these remarks by Paul alone disqualify nearly, if not every, romish catholic pope, cardinal, bishop or priest from service to the true assemblies of Yahweh, and disqualify many of those belonging to the protestant sects as well. Only an ignorant, blasphemous, self-serving man could possibly blame Paul for these organized religious sects, since Paul himself refutes them at every turn!

There is no prescription in Paul’s letters for popes, cardinals, or priests. All references to priests in Paul’s letters are in the context of the Old Covenant, where the performance of prescribed rituals at precise times, along with other duties necessitated a professional priesthood. Romish sacramentalism and their priesthood are vestiges of Babylonian paganism readily adopted by the later romish “church” and adapted to their perverted interpretations of the New Testament in order to satisfy their desire for control over the people. None of this can be blamed on Paul, who consistently states in his epistles that the rituals, “works of the law” in the A.V., have been done away with in the New Covenant (i.e. Rom. 3:20, 27, 28; 4:2, 6; 9:11, 32; 11:6; Gal. 2:16; 3:2, 5, 10; Heb. 6:1; 9:14). Even the Melchizedek priesthood mentioned by Paul at Hebrews 5:6, 10; 6:20 and 7:1-21, after Psalm 110:4, is said to belong to none other than Yahshua Christ. Again, any man who blames Paul for romish churchianity and its offspring is profusely ignorant.

I must also add, that not only many of the early so-called “church fathers”, but many commentators unto this very day have looked to earthly models, drawn from our own historical experience, as the basis for “church” structure. They have not realized that there is no proper model in our recorded experience which demonstrates how an assembly of the children of Yahweh should operate, except in His only guidance: the scant instructions which we have in the epistles of the New Testament, and what we see in the gospels and Acts. This model offered by the apostles remains outside of our experience, since it has never been tried to any significant extent, and since those who have tried it have been persecuted, suppressed, or even destroyed by the romish church or various governments, much of what we do know of those groups which have tried to live a true Christian life is mere propaganda! Today there are a few groups in America which have come close to a true Christian model of community living, such as the Amish or the Mennonites, yet even they rely upon the larger outside community (i.e. tourist dollars) for a good part of their sustenance. So many commentators have accepted the structure adopted by the romish church, a blending of old Rome’s paganism and its model of imperial government, as if such a model were based on scripture, which it certainly IS NOT! Yet others look to the Judaeon “sanhedrin” as a proper model, which it is not since it was sectarian and oligarchical. Many other alternative models are based on greed and a desire to concentrate power, while appearing on the surface to be righteous. Mormonism is one example of these. We have seen here that the authority of assembly elders should not transcend the

immediate community, each which should elect its own elders. Any more than that is not Scriptural.

There is not one legitimate religious authority with U.S. Government tax-exempt status (IRS 501c3). Such status is a reward by the government granted only if the organization holding it agrees to follow certain guidelines. True Christianity, an exclusive, racist, discriminating doctrine, cannot possibly be found operating within those guidelines! That true Christianity is racist can be found as quickly as one can examine the language of Matt. 13:47-48 or 25:31-46, which by themselves should be enough to support the statements offered here, although many more scriptures follow suit. Yet this is only one issue – albeit a major one – where tax-exempt “churches” capitulate to government guidelines. Bob Jones’ University in South Carolina did this very thing in recent years, being one prominent and public example. Yet as Yahweh raised judges and leaders for the children of Israel as He deemed it necessary, so even now will He raise true ministers and elders for His people. As the children of Israel awaken, and get out of Babylon (which includes all of those tax-exempt phony “churches”), even though we must continue to render unto Caesar what is Caesar’s, then as we render to Yahweh what is His, Babylon will crumble under its own weight: for not enough of the people of Yahweh shall be left to support it any longer.