

WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER

Monthly Letter #99; July, 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-ninth 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 it is paramount that we continue the subject to its end. We must remember there was no Redemption until Christ's death and that things continued under the Old Testament sacrifices up until that time. Though Yahshua Christ forgave many of their sins before his death, never once did he offer any man Redemption before that time. Therefore, Paul was the "chosen vessel" to preach Redemption and resurrection through the cross. Had Christ preached Paul's message, it would have been premature and highly out-of-place, and Christ, who is "the fulness of the Godhead bodily" (Father, Son & Holy Spirit all wrapped up into one, Col. 2:9), never does anything out of its proper order! We'll now again return to William Finck for a continuation of his narrative defending the apostle Paul:

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

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

William Finck answers <#24>: Douglas' ignorance of history and the contradictions of his own remarks should be really evident here. First he grouses that Paul placed "*women lower than men*", which is not true at all because both the Hebrew and Greek societies had placed women in a position subservient to men long before Paul came along. Then he complains that Paul advocated "*a complete destruction of prevailing social codes*", and neither is that true because Douglas is taking Paul's remarks out-of-context. Yet surely he is accusing Paul at least in part because Paul

said, as he quotes further on and as we shall address shortly: “there is neither male nor female ...”

As we have already discussed in the short article “Paul Was Not A Misogynist!” on pages 3 & 4 of *WTL* #92 in December, 2005, Paul did not despise women, nor did he consign to them any role which was not already their expected role in Greek society. The role which many women have anointed themselves with in our society today is rebellion against not man, but Yahweh, as can be fully demonstrated in the Old Testament, the “law and the prophets” which Christ came to fulfill. However in the ancient world there were certainly far worse alternatives: “women enjoyed greater personal and property rights in Roman societies than among the Germans, who regarded them as legally subject to their menfolk from birth to the grave” (*The Oxford History of Medieval Europe*, p. 47).

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

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

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

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

Greeks (not those of today, for most of today's are by-and-large racially Turks and Arabs), or Judaeans (not the impostor jews), all of whom descended from Israelites, and Paul knew and taught as much!

- “There is neither bond nor free.” Anyone who professes in the law, such as Mr. Douglas, should know that there is no permanent, forced slavery in Israel. Slaves were to be released in the seventh year of their servitude, and freely, unless the slave himself desired to remain (Deut. 15:12-18). Yet even Paul respected the property rights of the slave-owners, for which see the epistle to Philemon, and also Eph. 6:5; Col. 3:22; 1 Tim. 6:1; Titus 2:9, and compare 1 Peter 2:18. Then see the words attributed to Yahshua Christ at Matt. 10:24-25; 23:1-12, and the parable at Luke 17:7-10. All Israelites, whether bondmen or freemen, are brethren and have but one Master: Yahweh, Yahshua Christ in the flesh, whom Paul clearly follows. Clayton Douglas, just like the jews, pretends to know Scripture, yet knows it not!
- “There is neither male nor female.” For this I will go only to one place: the challenge made to Yahshua by the Sadducees recorded at Matt. 22:23-33; Mark 12:18-27; and Luke 20:27-40, which I suggest one should now read. Part of Christ's response, which surely concerns the position of men and women in the age to come, as recorded at Matt. 22:30 is: “For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of Yahweh in heaven”, which Paul surely follows here. Clayton Douglas follows jews and liberals instead! The modern day Sadducees!

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

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

William Finck answers **<#26>**: If Romans 7:14-15, quoted here, confuses Douglas it is likely due to his own failure to read the verses in context and undertake the modicum of self-reflection necessary to understand what Paul is saying. These verses, along with others which Douglas has previously quoted where Paul taught about temptation and the need for self-control, were discussed in *WTL #97* in section **<#22>** of this response. At Romans 7:13-25, Paul discussed the struggle between the two natures of Adam Man: The carnal and the spiritual. While the law imposes a code of behavioral ethics upon us, which in spirit we should desire to follow, the very brain chemicals which enable our bodies to function properly also compel us to sin – to desire things we ought not! Being strong we seek to overpower those desires, yet sometimes being weak we succumb to them. The non-Adamic races, and especially the negroes, seek immediate personal gratification and fulfillment of their lusts without even a thought of abstinence or self-control, and today many Adamic people follow in that same manner, having rejected the controlling moral authority of the Spirit and the

necessity to seek to follow that instead. Clayton Douglas, not understanding this but criticizing Paul, rather puts his lot with the scoffers, and sexual deviants such as John Spong.

<Reference #27> Clay Douglas states: “*For though I am free from all men, I have made myself a slave to all, that I might win the more. To the Jews I became as a Jew, in order to win Jews; to those under the law I became as one under the law - though not being myself under the law - that I might win those under the law. To those outside the law I became as one outside the law - not being without law toward God but under the law of Christ - that I might win those outside the law. To the weak I became weak, that I might win the weak. I have become all things to all men....*’ (1 Corinthians 9:19-25).

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

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

William Finck answers **<#27>**: We have seen H. Graber criticize Paul for these same remarks in 1 Corinthians, which were addressed in *WTL* #92, page 1, in the section designated “**<T>**”. As I have also explained in section **<#7>** of this response to Douglas, in *WTL* #94, Paul was an individual uniquely qualified to take the gospel to the “lost” nations of Israel; and indeed he fulfilled that task. Paul, being born in Tarsus and educated in the Classics as well as in Judaism, was qualified to explain the meaning of the gospel and Old Testament Scripture to pagans (“those outside the law” here) as well as to Judaeans (“those under the law” here). All the other apostles, not having any such education as Paul’s, had not the tools necessary to do what was required, for the “lost” Israelites (not the Judaeans only, nor the jews) to receive the gospel. Paul also explains, as I have discussed before, that he means to speak to people on their own terms, and not with the pretense of superiority and authority that the jew rabbis, and so many of today’s clerics, employ with abandon.

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

<Reference #28> Clay Douglas states: “*Another good example of the Talmudic flavoring Paul added to the New Testament, remains the Communion. Paul’s ritual, which is the ‘drinking of the blood and the eating of the body of Jesus Christ’ is nothing*

more than Satanic cult worship. This is vampirism and cannibalism at best! Shall we dare to be open and honest about it? Or, is it easier to remain deaf, blind and dumb?"

William Finck answers <#28>: As demonstrated throughout this response to Douglas' Paul-bashing articles, Douglas while rejecting Paul also rejects much of the rest of the New Testament, along with much of the Old Testament, and thereby has been shown to have adopted all the positions of the jews themselves. See for instance section <#4> of this response in WTL #93, where it is fully manifest that Douglas is little but a jew, at least from a religious perspective.

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

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

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

William Finck answers <#29>: I can only wonder how anyone may possibly imagine that Paul had anything to do with Easter! And Douglas' own ignorance is readily manifest here. How can one do so much writing on a topic, with so little studying? Sure, the word "Easter" does appear once in the Bible, at Acts 12:4, but only in its English translation. The Greek word there is $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\alpha$ (Strong's #3957), which is the

Greek form of the Hebrew *pesach* (Strong's Hebrew #6453), "Passover" everywhere else in the Bible in Greek or English. It's not Paul's fault that the "lost" tribes of Israel adopted the pagan Easter festival, and the Old Testament explains that they adopted such pagan ways again and again. Neither is it Paul's fault that centuries after his death the Romish church adopted the pagan festival rather than correcting our ancestors. Another thing which Paul can not be blamed for is the Romish church's acceptance of swine eaters, and the common consumption of pork among Christians today. Paul never advocated eating swine, because once his words are examined in their historical context it becomes evident that the Greeks also considered swine to be unclean! (i.e. Strabo 12.8.9). This I hope to address at length later on, where Douglas again raises the topic.

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

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

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

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

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

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

William Finck answers **<#32>**: Here Douglas continues the novel he began writing earlier in his article, for which see the section designated **<#13>** in *WTL #95*. Apparently Douglas attempts here to clarify some of the ambiguities in the plot to his novel, but that still doesn’t make it real. Paul of Tarsus was described by Luke as a νεανίας (neanias, 3494) which Liddell & Scott define primarily as “a young man, youth”, which he must have been since he was still quite robust when he was sent off to Rome nearly 30 years later (Acts 27:1; the Roman procurator Festus who sent Paul to Rome held that office in Judaea from 59 to 62 A.D.). In a society such as Judaea, which was governed by elders who were always given deference, Paul could not have had the position or authority which Douglas claims for him.

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

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

<Reference #33> Clay Douglas states: *“After having more or less left Peter in charge of his disciples, Jesus disappeared, his message being rather confusedly understood by the humans of his time (after all, His writings had simply disappeared).”*

Peter had the official responsibility of taking over, in so far as there was a take-over, as Jesus never tried to set up any hierarchy or sect around himself, a fact to be remembered (Jesus warned us about ‘churches’), but another disciple was soon to emerge and transform the influence of Jesus’ life on the world. Dark blue velvet curtains open. Spotlights come on. Enter Saul.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

Remember the testimony concerning the assembly of Ephesus, which has been discussed here in section <#18> of this response in WTL #96. Douglas admits in the section marked <#17>, in that same WTL, that Paul of Tarsus founded the ‘church’ at Ephesus, where Paul had spent two years (Acts 19:10). It is clear from the account in Acts 19 that Paul did indeed found this assembly, bringing the Holy Spirit and the gospel of the Kingdom of Yahweh to the Ephesians (Acts 19:1-8). John wrote the Revelation 30 years after Paul’s death, a fact which can certainly be established in history, and which Clifton Emahiser has elucidated elsewhere. In the message to the assembly at Ephesus, Yahshua Christ scolds the Ephesians because the assembly “left thy first love”, which **demands** it was the gospel and teachings brought to them by Paul, because he founded the assembly! Therefore Yahshua Christ Himself, testifying to the **good work of Paul**, makes Clayton Douglas and all of the Paul-bashers nothing more than gainsayers and hypocrites, found to be fighting against that which they claim to be defending! When one begins to spew false doctrine, such as these Paul-bashers, Scripture will make a liar out of them every time! Here Christ Himself testified against the likes of Clayton Douglas at Rev. 2:1-8, laying wide open his appalling error! Therefore, think twice before falling for the Anti-Paulists’ suppositions!