

WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER

Monthly Letter #102; October, 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 one hundred and second monthly teaching letter and continues my ninth year of publication. Starting with *WTL* #88 we have been continuing a series defending the apostle Paul from the horrendously false charges that are being hurled at his epistles, and these accusations have their origins among the lowest moral sources one can imagine. One should be ashamed to use such satanic sources, yet the Paul-bashers take pleasure in employing them. The anti-Paulists should feel further shame inasmuch as Christ Himself praised the assembly at Ephesus, at Rev. 2:1-8, that Paul founded! It is obvious, when one considers Yahshua Christ's own words here, that when one bashes Paul, one is personally spitting on Christ in the same manner that the bad-fig "Jews" did. It is obvious that when one bashes Paul, one is bashing Yahshua Christ Himself! Are these anti-Paulists not humble enough to eat their own errant words which will be burned at the judgment? We shall now continue this subject with William Finck:

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

It seems to me that many in Israel Identity have not yet noticed the threat which Paul-bashing has become to the vulnerable of our faith. I call them "vulnerable" because, as the apostle Peter warned in his second epistle, those who contend against such scriptures do so at their own peril. A good friend of mine, whom I have been blessed to have exchanged letters with for several years now and whom I one day hope to meet, is Jeanne Snyder in Montana. Of course, Clifton has known Jeanne much longer than I. Jeanne knew both Wesley Swift and Bertrand Comparet personally, has

been involved with Israel Identity for over 40 years, and has been of great service to many over those years. Yesterday (February 1st, 2006) I received a letter from Jeanne, who read the four *Watchman's Teaching Letters* responding to H. Graber, and in it she said: "What is this about Paul bashing? He was the main one that spread the gospel to Israel. There wouldn't be much of a New Testament without his letters to the different cities where the Israelites dwelled in their new homes. How easy Israel is still led astray, I wonder what Wesley and Bert would think about what is going on today." Well, thank Yahweh for people such as Jeanne Snyder! While she may not be familiar with all of the various contentions of the Paul-bashers, she being well grounded in her faith surely isn't going to fall for such deceit! Yet in stark contrast, another woman who has been involved with Israel Identity for a long time, one Judith Nipps, purportedly vowed that she would never speak to Clifton again after he began to publish this defense of Paul, and there are many other long-time Israel Identity adherents caught up in this Paul-bashing deceit.

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

Clayton Douglas reveals several times in his articles his knowledge of Saxon-Israel Identity (for which see his comments in section <#11> of this response, *WTL #95* on p. 1) yet he loathes and denigrates Paul. Doing so, it is clear that Douglas makes himself a follower of the jews, liberals, anti-Christians and sexual deviants. And this is apparent, because it is writers of such persuasion that Douglas, and H. Graber before him, quote from time and again in their attacks on Paul. All Paul-bashers everywhere must take note of this: you are all deceived, and have made yourselves followers of the jews and all the vile scum of the earth, such as "Bishop" John S. Spong and "Rabbi" Joachim Prince. I shall now return to Douglas' article.

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

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

William Finck answers <#49A>: As we have seen, Paul certainly did not "throw out" the Laws handed down to Moses. Israel violated the Old Covenant, with which came the Levitical laws, and so the nation, the "wife", was freed from this law when Yahweh Himself, incarnated as Yahshua Christ, died on the cross, for which see section <#46> of this response in *WTL #101*. That the New Covenant is without the

Levitical law is clear, being a matter of prophecy, for which see Jeremiah 31:31-33, and which has been discussed in this response in various places, but at length in the response to H. Graber in *WTL* #90 in section <J> beginning on p. 3. These being two different aspects of the relationship of the Levitical law and the Old Testament to the New Testament, two different explanations are required. For this reason it is written, “O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of Yahweh! How unsearchable *are* His judgments, and His ways past finding out!” (Rom. 11:33).

Douglas quotes Romans 3:19-21, takes the verses out-of-context, and does a great disservice by not reading further, unto Romans 3:31: “Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, **we establish the law.**” True Christians should want to establish the laws of Yahweh, written in our hearts, but not the Old Covenant rituals nor the legalism of the Pharisees, things our own fathers failed to abide in (see Acts 15:10). The 10 Commandments, with a few other admonishments from the gospel, surely encapsulate all which is good and wholesome in the laws of Yahweh. These were the first laws given the children of Israel leaving Egypt (Exodus 20), long before the statutes and ordinances recorded in Leviticus and Deuteronomy were handed down in writing.

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

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

William Finck answers <#49B>: It has been shown that all sins committed by any of the children of Israel (and no one else) are forgiven by Yahweh, and that this is also a matter of prophecy, discussed here in section <#37> of this response in *WTL* #100. Yet Paul clearly taught that we must not sin more simply because our sins are forgiven, which is one of his themes in Romans chapter 3. He also taught that those who learn the truths of Christianity, and then fall away again, have no second repentance, for which see Hebrews 6:4-6; that even Israelite men, although forgiven, must answer for their sins, for which see 1 Tim. 5:24; and that there is no room in the kingdom of heaven for murderers and other sinners, for which see Rom. 1:29-32; 1 Cor. 6:9; Gal. 5:19-21; Eph. 5:1-8 and 1 Tim 1:8-11. Clayton Douglas, writing so critically about Christianity and things that he obviously does not understand, makes himself a fool. Yet in so blatantly misrepresenting the teachings of Paul and taking snippets of his writings out-of-context so as to abuse them, he makes himself a liar and a purveyor of deceit. I’d expect little else from a follower of Jews, miscreants and sexual deviants!

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

William Finck answers <#49C>: Now Douglas makes himself a linguist, and neither can he do that right. The word *blasphemy* was not derived from the word *blame*. Rather, the English word *blame* was derived from the word *blaspheme*, and this is

according to *The American Heritage College Dictionary*, and so Douglas has his etymology backwards. The English words *blaspheme* and *blasphemy* come from a group of Greek words, chief of which is the noun βλασφημία (blasphemia, Strong's #988) which is defined by Liddell & Scott: "*a profane speech ... defamation, evil-speaking, slander ... impious and irreverent speech against God, blasphemy*" and this, of course, is the word translated as *blasphemy* wherever it appears in the N.T. Clayton Douglas perverts the language, and then distorts the meaning of what is being said at Mark 3:28, and adds things to it which it does not imply. Then he concludes by quoting Matthew: "*Think not that I have come to abolish the Law and the prophets; I have come not to abolish them but to fulfill them ...*" (Matt. 5:17).

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

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

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

This ends my response to Clayton Douglas' first of two Paul-bashing articles. Since beginning this defense of Paul with Clifton's publication of my letter in response to H. Graber, at least one of Clifton's readers wrote to him and accused me of being

arrogant and haughty. While I do know that at times I can sound that way, I really try to make an effort to be humble. But I must say that I shall not offer pusillanimity in the face of lies and blasphemies. To me, my race is worth defending, so I must confront the universalists who claim to be Israel Identity. My faith and its truths are worth defending, so I must confront the Paul-bashers and those led astray with anti-Christ doctrines who are within Israel Identity.

Unlike many of the so-called theologians and academics of today, I sincerely believe that our faith represents empirical truths which are fully evident in a proper study of Scripture, history, archaeology and language, and that once learned, these truths are well worth standing up for and defending. Such is one who builds his house on a rock, and not on a foundation of shifting sand.

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

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

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

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

William Finck answers **<#51>**: I will address the poor translation of 2 Corinthians 12:16 later on where Douglas discusses it at length. Reading the accounts in Acts, whenever mayhem and disorder encompass Paul of Tarsus it is caused by the unbelieving jews, not by other Christians opposed to Paul, but by the apostate Edomite jews who were the enemies of Yahshua Christ Himself and persecutors of Christians everywhere. Clayton Douglas is their (the jews) defender, taking the blame for such violence from the jews and assigning it to Paul, just as Douglas ridiculously blames

Paul for the crucifixion of Yahshua Christ, for which see section <#13> of this response in WTL #95. Only a jew could contrive such a nefarious plot: to blame the followers of Christ for his death, diverting the blame from themselves! Thankfully we have many other witnesses who tell us differently. The only deceit in Douglas' articles is his own.

The Edomite jew propensity for rioting is evident in the pages of Josephus' *Wars*, and early bishops such as Tertullian tell us that jews were behind the persecution of early Christians (Apology 21.25), and so in early Christian writings we see the same pattern of behavior attributed to the jews that we see in the Acts, where Paul was their victim, and not an instigator. In this day and age the jews have consistently incited others to riot for them, just as they incited the pagan Greeks in Acts and even many true Judahites in first century Jerusalem. Even a casual investigation reveals that jewish activists are behind all of the social and minority unrest in America these past hundred or so years. A recent newscast, the last week of January, 2006, showed rioting by jewish settlers being forced to leave the West Bank by their own government. Just as jews incited riots against Paul of Tarsus and first century Christians, jews have incited riots continually in all Christian nations. Clayton Douglas' corrupted portrayal of history serves as a smoke-screen for the jews to hide behind.

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

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

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

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

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

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

William Finck answers <#52>: So we see that Clayton Douglas encourages “*dialogue on this important topic*”, but evidently hasn’t had any replies as of yet which he feels are worthy. At the end of his first article Douglas did print one short response, from a teenager, which we did not reproduce here. Douglas’ attacks on Paul in his first article were quite broad, and simply cannot be answered properly in a limited talk-radio call-in format, or on an Internet message board. Neither can Douglas’ sweeping accusations be answered by a neophyte, or by anyone who is only a casual reader of Scripture. Here we have spent nearly 54,000 words already (to the end of this lesson), reproducing Douglas’ arguments and answering them, and not a little research has gone into those answers! We may be two years late here, but once this response to Douglas’ Paul-bashing articles is fully prepared we shall certainly make it available on the Internet, and Clayton Douglas will be sent a copy of it in its entirety. We can only wonder: will he dare share it with his own subscribers, before whom he has so unjustly defamed not only Paul of Tarsus but Christianity and even Yahshua Christ Himself? We adjure him to do so!

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

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

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

William Finck answers <#53A>: Here Douglas further develops the plot to his novel, and this part of it was already addressed in section <#14> of this response, in WTL #95, and also in section <#39> in WTL #100. Paul’s initial persecution of Christians, before he himself “saw the light” and was converted, is discussed in the Bible at Acts 8:1-4; 9:1-4, 13-14, 21, 26; 22:4-5; 26:9-11 and Gal. 1:13 and 1:23. These Biblical accounts make no mention of children being bound or gagged, no mention of burning houses, ransacking and pillaging, or any other brutal injustices. Clayton Douglas sounds just like a Jewish storyteller, make a little Zyklon B to kill the lice and suddenly you’re blamed for gassing 6 million people to death! Like the Jews, Douglas is quite adept at rewriting and embellishing history to fit his own agenda. Yet also like the

jews, Douglas cannot substantiate any of his claims here with solid evidence. Douglas continues his novel:

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

William Finck answers **<#53B>**: Now I wonder if Douglas has ever read any of the New Testament for himself, because none of these accusations can be substantiated. Rather, everything here is either a misrepresentation of Scripture or something that Douglas made up! We have seen in section **<#39>** of this response, in WTL #100, that Paul is no murderer. Nowhere did Paul brag, as Douglas said he did. Nowhere did Paul enrich himself by stealing the property of others, as Douglas claims. Why doesn’t Douglas make citations? Because novelists don’t need such things! Douglas makes himself a liar as well as a patsy for the jews and miscreants.

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

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

The A.V. rendering of 2 Cor. 12:16: “But be it so, I did not burden you: nevertheless, being crafty, I caught you with guile”, and neither is this a good translation of the verse. The word “nevertheless” is an adverb. Here it was translated from the Greek word ἀλλά (235, for which one may check *Strong’s Concordance*). ἀλλά (alla) is, according to Liddell & Scott’s Greek-English Lexicon, a “Conjunction ... otherwise, but ... I. to oppose single clauses, but ... the preceding clause being negative”. When I did my own translation of 2 Corinthians, in early 2001, I translated

this verse: “ **But it is that I have not imposed on you, otherwise being villainous I have taken you with guile.**” Today, as I look at the Greek of the NA27, I stand by that translation as a perfectly literal, word-for-word rendering of the Greek. In context (that means reading from the beginning of the paragraph, and interpreting that against all that precedes in Paul’s relationship with the Corinthians) Paul is telling the Corinthians that he never imposed on them for anything (read 2 Corinthians 11!), and **if** he had done so, **then** he would have been as a villain, taking the Corinthians with guile. Paul is not, as Douglas suggests, inferring that he has deceived anyone, nor was he predacious in any way: he is stating just the opposite! Douglas continues:

Clay Douglas states: “*Paul claims that HE, not Christ had ‘begotten you.’ He ‘beseeches you’ to be HIS followers, HIS imitators.*”

William Finck answers: Yet neither is there any fault with Paul in this statement, for Douglas leaves out half of what Paul said! “Become imitators of me, just as also I am of Christ” (1 Cor. 11:1, my translation). Paul lived piously and justly among the Corinthians, being there to act as an example, where Yahshua Christ was not there personally. The only predator here who would corrupt Christians with “guile” is Clayton Douglas. Attempting to slander Paul, he will stop at nothing, and is willing to pervert everything. Yet all of his wicked deeds shall be proven to be vanity. *W.R.F.*

Some may complain that to contend with the likes of Clayton Douglas is unChristian, but not doing so would be a sin of omission which is greater by far than a sin of commission. I highly suggest that anyone holding such a position should reread Titus 1:7-14! It is every Christian’s duty to defend the apostle Paul and his writings! Paul was the founder of the Assembly at Ephesus, and it would be advisable to reread Revelation 2:1-8 where our Messiah praises very highly that assembly for its merits, except for losing its *initial benevolent affection*. Surely, when Paul first founded the Assembly at Ephesus, no fault could be found, or Christ’s Words here are vain. How can anyone condemn Paul, inasmuch as Yahshua Christ put His “good housekeeping seal of approval” on Paul’s work? But condemn Paul they do! *C.A.E.*

Stick with us, for you ain’t heard nothin yet!