

WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER

Monthly Letter #96; April, 2006 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-sixth monthly teaching letter and ends my eighth year of publication. With this lesson we'll resume our defense of the apostle Paul. We have been continuing this topic starting with *WTL* #88 up until now, and how long it will be continued in the future has not yet been determined. Again, we will turn to William Finck with his critical review of Clayton Douglas' Paul-bashing articles in the December 2003 and January 2004 issues of his *Free American Newsmagazine*:

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!

<Reference #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.”

William Finck answers <#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 ἀλέω, “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 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 Nazirite 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 Jesus’ hometown of Nazareth” [emphasis in original].

The Nazirites 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!

<Reference #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 Iscariot, ... 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, Thessalonica, Philippi, Laodicea, Galatia, Athens, and Rome.*”

William Finck answers **<#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 Iscariot.*” 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!

<Reference #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."

William Finck answers <#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. In *WTL* #90 on page 3, in my response to the Paul-bashing H. Graber at reference <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 in *WTL* #90, 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. On page 4 of that same *WTL*, continuing that 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 reproved 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 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 can not 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 can not 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.

<Reference #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."

William Finck answers <#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 (Judaeans 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*). [End of this segment defending the apostle Paul from people such as W. G. Finlay, H. Graber and Clay Douglas by William Finck.]

It is simply amazing to me how all these people who have taken up Paul-bashing are getting all their data from "Jewish" sources. It's not from some insignificant "Jewish" source, but from higher-ups in notable Jewish organizations. It's dumb-founding to me how anyone in Israel Identity can profess and agree with Two Seedline, with a full understanding of how devious the serpent-seed are, and still adopt the enemy's lying propaganda.

Not only are those bashing Paul getting their political ammunition from "Jewish" sources, but from the higher-up leaders advocating homosexuality in superior positions within the churches, thus scraping the bottom-of-the-barrel, as we shall see in the next few lessons!