

# **WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER**

Monthly Letter #91; November, 2005 By: Teacher Clifton A. Emahiser  
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830; Ph. (419)435-2836

Fax (419)-435-7571; E-mail caemahiser@sbcglobal.net

## **TO THOSE WHOM THE COVENANT BELONGS**

### **A NON-UNIVERSAL CULTURE AWARENESS INSTRUCTIONAL PUBLICATION**

This is a non-copyrighted teaching letter.  
Please feel free to make as many copies as you wish, but not to edit.

### **A MONTHLY TEACHING LETTER**

This is my ninety-first monthly teaching letter and continues my eighth year of publication. With this lesson, we'll continue with William Finck's *Open Letter Responding To H. Graber*, where Graber makes all kinds of harsh allegations against the apostle Paul. You will need lesson #'s 89 & 90 in this series, or you will not fully understand this one. Here we must review a statement which H. Graber made at **<Reference 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) ... **<Reference J-2>**"

William Finck answers **<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 Habbakuk 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!

**<Reference 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?"*

William Finck answers <K>: Romans 1:4 is a difficult verse to translate, and here in his paragraph designated <K>, 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 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.

<Reference 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.*”

William Finck answers <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?

<Reference 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.*”

William Finck answers <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?" [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 one gospel which Paul presents. And surely Graber points no finger at Isaiah for claiming a share of it (Isaiah 53:1 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!

**<Reference 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!**"

William Finck answers **<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!

**<Reference 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 infallible [sic], and the Galatians [sic] must accept it or be accursed. **IS THE GOSPEL OF PAUL THE SAME AS THE GOSPEL OF JESUS CHRIST?**"

William Finck answers **<O>**: This last paragraph of Graber's paper, page 4, 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 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!

**<Reference 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'.*"

William Finck answers **<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?

**<Reference 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?"*

William Finck answers <Q>: I will try to keep my reply to this paragraph 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!

<Reference 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 timing [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 discription [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 consumated [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 archetect [sic] of christian [sic] theology.' 'Conciously [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 C.A.E.]

William Finck answers <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" (as if his narrow selection met so wide an objective) concerning Paul of Tarsus, 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, 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! 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 <Reference 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!!!**

<Reference 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.

<Reference 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'."

William Finck answers <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 later more notably the 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! [end of this installment]

It will be necessary to continue William Finck's *Open Letter Responding To H. Graber* in the next teaching letter. A very serious question should be asked at this point: Why does H. Graber falsely condemn Paul as being a "Jew", yet, at the same time, quote from "Jewish" sources? Is not Graber guilty of a double-standard?