

# ***WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER***

Monthly Letter #98; June, 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-eighth monthly teaching letter and continues my ninth 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. For those who have been following this series defending Paul, you can now begin to see how serious all this bashing Paul really is. Again we will pick up William Finck's narrative where we left off in the last lesson:

In the last *Watchman's Teaching Letter* we 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 *WTL's #89* through 92, 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 *WTL #97* we gave a summary of Spong's academic credentials and vocational positions, condensed from the website:

[www.dioceseofnewark.org/jsspong/jssbiog.html](http://www.dioceseofnewark.org/jsspong/jssbiog.html).

At another website, [newark.rutgers.edu/~lcrew/spong\\_cv.html](http://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*; "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, *Cruce*; "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 *WTL #93*, pg. 1 col. A). 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 in *WTL #97*, p. 3, col. A, 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](http://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 are 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 Judgment!** [Back to Finck]

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 has compiled and comments upon this information from yet another website connected to him:

At the web site [www.dioceseofnewark.org/antiracistmothers.html](http://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](mailto: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! [Back to Finck]

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):

**“<sup>14</sup> Do all things apart from murmuring and disputing, <sup>15</sup> 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, <sup>16</sup> 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](http://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, that 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 how ever long it takes. *W.R.F.*

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!**