

WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER

Monthly Letter #104; December, 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 fourth 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. Now if you are approached by a person promoting Paul-bashing, be prepared to give that person a quick and solid Scriptural answer so that he/she will never bring up the subject to you again. As 2 Tim. 4:2 instructs, "... be instant in season, out of season ..."

Refer that person expeditiously to Rev. 2:1-7, where Christ Himself commends the assembly at Ephesus for their "works", "labor", "not bearing them which are evil", "putting on trial false and lying apostles", "borne with patience and labored for Yahshua's name, fainting not." Point out posthaste that the only mark Yahshua had against them was that they had "lost their first love", which indicates that when Paul founded the assembly at Ephesus, at its inception, their love was not wanting. Thus in Christ's own (red-letter) words, He gave Paul a perfect score for his effort. Ask this would-be Paul-basher: "Could you do as well as Paul?" Maybe one ought commit Rev. 2:1-7 to memory so one might be "instant" with or without a Bible at hand. In short, the would-be Paul-basher must call Yahshua Christ a liar in order to support his/her theory. We shall now resume William Finck's narration against the anti-Paulists:

Here again we shall continue to address the second of Clayton Douglas' Paul-bashing articles, *SAUL OF TARSUS AND HIS DOCTRINE OF LAWLESSNESS*, which he published in the January, 2004 edition of his *Free American Newsmagazine*. Douglas, while attempting to discredit Paul of Tarsus, instead consistently discredits his own person by making all sorts of false accusations and inconsistent statements. And, while claiming to be a Christian, he even rejects the cardinal tenets of Christianity found throughout the prophets and confirmed by the gospels: that Yahshua Christ was the Messiah and Redeemer of our race. While in this second article Douglas often merely repackages the trash he spewed in his first article, which I hope to have already discussed sufficiently, he does add new twists and additional claims as he proceeds, and so this second article must also be addressed in its entirety.

<Reference #61A> Clayton Douglas states: “*Paul of Tarsus was an agent and spy of both the Roman state and these ultra-fundamentalist hypocrite sects (Edomite/Pharisees).*”

William Finck answers **<#61A>**: We have previously seen Douglas state that Paul was a Roman soldier assigned to spying on all of the sects in Judaea, in sections **<#12>**, **<#13>** and **<#14>** of this response in *WTL #95*, and where it was established that such a statement has no merit. Here Douglas makes Paul some sort of double-agent, working for the Romans and the Pharisees. While it is evident that Paul was a Pharisee, and in his persecution of Christians he was acting in an official capacity for the temple, here Douglas seems rather to be covering all bases by making such a blanket statement, adjusting the script to his novel so that it won't clash quite so starkly with the factual accounts. Nevertheless, Douglas could never establish with truth that Paul was a Roman soldier, agent, or held any post for the empire. Such a statement by Douglas is only a fabricated lie!

<Reference #61B> Clayton Douglas states: “*Paul was also an active conspirator in the assault on 'Stephen,' in Acts 7:58.*”

William Finck answers **<#61B>**: Yet the record at Acts 7:58 and 8:1 shows clearly that Paul was only a passive observer in Stephen's death, who merely kept the garments of the men perpetrating the acts against Stephen, and approving of their deeds. While Paul is not without guilt in the matter (i.e. Lev. 5:1, Rom. 1:32), he was no active participant. If Douglas cannot get the smallest of accounts straight, how can he be trusted with the larger?

<Reference #62> Clayton Douglas states: “*In Acts 9:22-26 it is said that Paul 'baffled' the Jews living in Damascus. 'But Paul increased more in strength, and baffled the Jews who lived at Damascus, proving that this is the Christ...'*”

“(There were no people called 'jews' during this time period. In any event, this group wasn't the only group Paul has been trifling with over the centuries. To baffle is to bewitch ... and to deceive.)”

William Finck answers **<#62>**: Here Douglas takes the verb “baffle”, where instead in the A.V. the word συγχύνω (4797) is “confound”, and not only does he blatantly misdefine the word, but he does so after abusing its context. First, the Greek word συγχύνω (sugchuno), a form of the verb συγχέω (sugcheo, still 4797 in Strong's), means “to confound” (Liddell & Scott), and not at all does the word mean “to bewitch ... and to deceive”, as Douglas so nefariously states. And even the word “baffle” has no such meaning as Douglas claims. In *The American Heritage College Dictionary* baffle is “1. To frustrate or check (a person) by confusing or perplexing; stymie”, and “2. To impede the force or movement of”, where it has other definitions as a noun. Yet Clayton Douglas makes no citations from any dictionary, because he would rather fabricate a lie! It is clear from the account in Acts that the Judaeans of Damascus were *confounded*, or *confused*. Having been expecting Paul's arrival to harass them he rather arrived as one of them, a Christian, having been converted by Yahshua Christ Himself while enroute to the city.

It is odd that here Clayton Douglas makes a correct observation concerning the word “jews”, being so late in his articles, and having already used the word so very often himself, and quoting jews such as Marcus Ravage in his assault on Paul, where Ravage claims that both Paul and Yahshua Christ were “jews” (see *WTL #100* and

section <#40> of this response). In all of my writing, I endeavor to use the correct term, “Judaean”, when referring to the people of Judaea generally. Yet whenever the specific bad-fig Canaanites or Edomites among the Judaeans are those being referred to, those who reject Christ and His teachings, I may anachronistically use the term “jew”, because those are the people from whom today’s jews obtain their religion and identity, and from whom a great number of today’s jews have descended in part. Yet Douglas throughout his articles has used the terms “jew”, “jews” and “jewish”, capitalized or not, quite indiscriminately.

<Reference #63> Clayton Douglas states: “*Did you know that Jesus’ own Disciples were both ‘afraid of him’ and didn’t believe ‘that he was a disciple?’ Or, don’t you really care?*”

William Finck answers <#63>: Douglas’ inane argument here comes directly from the account in Acts. Of course the original disciples were initially wary of Paul, and had every right to be cautious of him because he was at the beginning a persecutor of the Christians. This is no secret, and as we have seen in section <#59> of this response in WTL #103, Paul both admitted and regretted his actions. Yet these same accounts to which Douglas refers, and gets half of his story from, tell us that in a short time all of Yahshua’s disciples did accept Paul, and accept him fully! This is readily apparent at Acts 9:23-31, where we are told that the Christians delivered Paul from the unbelieving jews, and where Paul was afterwards accepted by the disciples at Jerusalem. In Acts chapters 14 and 15 we see Paul was accepted at Antioch by the Christians there, but his teaching was challenged by certain judaizing disciples. Yet upon being heard by the elders of the disciples in Jerusalem, Paul was not only accepted but fully vindicated! Clayton Douglas, a pawn and a patsy for jews and miscreants, relates only the parts of Acts, or any of the New Testament, which can be abused in order to uphold the positions of the jews and the miscreants! Yet Douglas’ rantings get even more ridiculous.

<Reference #64> Clayton Douglas states: “... *The Dead Sea Scrolls show us that ‘Damascus’ was the name of the Qumran community of Essenes. It was on his way to visit these revolutionaries, that Paul claims to have been stopped by a ‘vision’.*”

William Finck answers <#64>: This may be one of the most ridiculous statements I have ever seen concerning the geography of first century Palestine. It is so ludicrous, it’s an absolute pity that it requires any attention at all. Discussing the geography of Syria, Strabo says: “The city of Damascus is also a noteworthy city, having been, I might almost say, even the most famous of the cities in that part of the world in the time of the Persian empire” (*Geography*, 16.2.20). Damascus was a prominent city in Syria, which had been there for many, many centuries, even in the time of Abraham! The city is first mentioned in the Bible at Genesis 14:15, and it is still there today. Strabo wrote just before 25 A.D. In the context of Genesis chapter 14, the name Damascus appears in the Dead Sea Scrolls in the *Genesis Apocryphon*, or 1QapGen ar, Column XXII. But the name Damascus also appears several times in the document that, by reason of the city’s mention, is popularly called the *Damascus Document*. The copies of this document found at Qumran are found in the fragments designated 4Q266 through 4Q273, 5Q12 and 6Q15. Yet other copies of the *Damascus Document* were found outside of Qumran, and included in publications of the Dead Sea Scrolls because they are obviously copies of the same document. These are in the

university library at Cambridge, England, and were discovered at Cairo in Egypt. They are designated in scroll publications as CD-A and CD-B.

Using Douglas' silly logic, perhaps we should call Cairo "Damascus", and not Qumran. There is nothing in the Dead Sea Scrolls which link the scrolls to Qumran, except that they happen to have been found nearby. Going to a motel in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania and finding a Gideon Bible in the drawer, would you imagine yourself to be standing at the very place where certain events took place? I hope not! Such is the logic of Clayton Douglas: "Damascus" being found in documents at Qumran, we will relocate the name to that place. Ridiculous! Douglas is an idiot!

While the name "Damascus" appears often in the *Damascus Document*, there is nothing which would lead us to believe that Damascus was a code-word for Qumran, rather than the name of the well-known Syrian city which it so obviously was. The *Damascus Document* often refers to Israelites in the "land of Damascus" for one simple reason: it is relating the sect's perception of prophecy fulfilled, as the sect saw it, and a certain prophecy in Amos (at 5:27) warns the disobedient Israelites that they were going to be carried away "beyond Damascus."

Further indication that Paul's Damascus was the city in Syria can be found in the N.T. itself. Paul's Damascus was a large place, with streets and houses (i.e. Acts 9:11), and more than one synagogue (Acts 9:20), and walls and gates (Acts 9:24-25). Qumran was nothing of the sort! All of the archaeology of Qumran shows that the place was never more than a small compound, perhaps the size of a large Roman villa at the most. There are countless books and articles describing as much. Damascus had an ethnarch (2 Cor. 11:32) whom Paul mentions by name, something not seen anywhere in the Qumran sect's documents. Again, Qumran was in Judaea. Yet Damascus is called a "foreign" city, i.e. outside of Judaea! This is evident at Acts 26:11 (cf. 26:20). With all of this, Clayton Douglas can only be one of two things: a purposeful deceiver or a total idiot.

<Reference #65> Clayton Douglas states: *"To the mystics, Prophets and revolutionaries of that day, Paul's vision seemed as nothing more than a cop-out for why he was claiming his Romanized message to be in line with the clearly anti-Roman teachings of Jesus."*

William Finck answers <#65>: As for "mystics" and "revolutionaries" I cannot comment, except to say that Clayton Douglas is preoccupied with magic and magicians, having quoted from several of them from the very beginning of his Paul-bashing articles. And Clayton Douglas is also fascinated by revolutionaries, as he has so often in his articles put his lot with men such as Friedrich "God is dead" Nietzsche, who ended up in an insane asylum at the age of 45, and "Bishop" John S. Spong who was a revolutionary indeed, being at the vanguard of the integrationist Civil Rights movement, being the first Episcopalian Bishop to ordain homosexual ministers, and being a chorusleader for the acceptance of homosexual "marriage". These are the "revolutionaries" Clayton Douglas loves and follows!

Paul's message was certainly not "Romanized". If such were so, Paul could not have been imprisoned at Rome and executed by Nero! Why would Rome hold prisoner and kill such an ally? Why would Rome execute such a supposedly faithful agent, which Douglas claims that Paul was? Neither was Yahshua Christ "anti-Roman". If He were, how could Pontius Pilate, the Roman governor, insist on letting Him go free, finding no

fault in Him (i.e. John 19:4, 6, 12)? Clayton Douglas is a deceiver, **and** an idiot! It has previously been demonstrated, in section <#8> of this response in WTL #94, that Paul did not, and could not, teach anything concerning temporal governments that would be in defiance of the prophecies concerning temporal governments, and neither would Yahshua Christ. Clayton Douglas, scoffing at Paul, makes himself a fool because he doesn't understand the prophets. Notice again, that Douglas attributes certain "anti-Roman" teachings to Christ, but makes no citations! If Christ had taught such things, Douglas would gladly have pointed them out!

<Reference #66> Clayton Douglas states: "*Many valid and initiated Nazirenes, including Jesus's [sic] own brother did not believe Paul. The debate between James, the head of the Nazirenes after Jesus's [sic] resurrection, and Paul is depicted throughout many of the books of the 'New Testament,' as well as other historically valid writing that didn't make the Council of Nicea's 'cut' in 325 C.E.*"

William Finck answers <#66>: We have seen already in section <#56> of this response, in WTL #103, that Douglas invents a "debate" between James and Paul which never existed. There Douglas cites James 1:26 and 3:5-6 and asserts that James was referring to Paul, an assertion which is certainly proven to be false upon reading those verses in context. As far as such "debate" being "*depicted throughout many of the books of*" the N.T., this is a claim that Douglas certainly could not establish if he were challenged, for it is a lie. Notice again, that Douglas makes no citations to support his claims, and then supports his claim by further referring to unnamed Apocryphal books, making no citations there either! I can only deduce one thing from these unsubstantiated claims of Douglas': he is lying. If he weren't lying, he would have supplied citations!

Now I must say, that while there was certainly no "debate" between James and Paul, there was one apparent point of contention. Yet in our meager records and one short epistle of James', this point is not debated or discussed at length. Apparently James was convinced that those born into Judaism and their children should continue to be circumcised and keep the Mosaic law (Acts 21:20-24), yet those Christians of the nations (of Israel) not born into Judaism were not to be burdened by those things (Acts 21:25, cf. 15:1-35). If this is so, then I must assert that the Christian has to side with Paul on this issue, upon inspecting the prophets. For Jeremiah tells us that with the New Covenant both those of the house of Israel and the house of Judah would have the laws of Yahweh written into their hearts (Jer. 31:31-33, cf. Isa. 51:7). This is not ambiguous, it is a direct statement relating to both the law and the New Covenant. How could a man follow two different sets of laws? Ezekiel 37:15-28 tells us that Israel and Judah shall no longer be two nations, but shall be one and have one king and not be divided anymore. They shall be made "one stick, and they shall be one in My [Yahweh's] hand." This certainly leaves no room for them to be two different classes of people following two different sets of customs and laws, in defiance of the prophecy that they shall be one nation. For these reasons and more, such judaizers were rejected by Paul and early Christian apologists, and were rightly considered "heretics". Today Clayton Douglas, a follower of jews, sexual deviants, atheists, magicians and assorted other miscreants, makes himself a judaizer too.

<Reference #67> Clayton Douglas states: "*... In the Dead Sea Scrolls, Paul is referred to simply as 'the Liar,' for in truth he claimed that nearly every traditional facet*

of the Nazirene Way of life - those practices of the Nazirite oath in particular - were invalid. While Jesus stated that he taught the 'Spirit of the (Old Testament)' - Paul completely mocked and ridiculed the Torah time and time again. But, you still think of Paul as a 'Good Guy', correct? You are, of course, welcome to continue on with your Traditions. You can do exactly that ... even though the onus has now been placed on you."

William Finck answers <#67>: It has been established here, and with much detail in section <#43> of this response in WTL #101, that the "Liar" of the Dead Sea Scrolls certainly could not have been Paul of Tarsus. Yet here Douglas confuses several other disparate facets of Biblical history which must be addressed. Evidently, Douglas believes that the Qumran sect, an appropriate name for whoever it was that wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls, were not only Christians, but also took the ancient Nazirite vows which are described in Numbers chapter 6. Yet it is easy to see that the Nazirite vows were not taken by the Qumran sect. For the Nazirite vows include these instructions found at Num. 6:3: "He shall separate *himself* from wine and strong drink, and shall drink no vinegar of wine, or vinegar of strong drink, neither shall he drink any liquor of grapes, nor eat moist grapes, or dried." Yet in the Dead Sea Scrolls, in *1QRule of the Congregation*, 1Q28a Column II, we read "And when they gather at the table of community or to drink the new wine, and the table of the community is prepared and the new wine is mixed for drinking, no-one should stretch out his hand to the first fruit of the bread and of the new wine before the priest, for he is the one who blesses the first-fruit of bread and of the new wine and stretches out his hand towards the bread before them." There are several other places that show that the Qumran sect indeed drank wine. The members of the Qumran sect certainly could not have taken the vows of the Nazirite! Clayton Douglas is once more found to be a liar, and a spouter of things he knows little about. Douglas only exhibits his complete incompetency in establishing a proper premise.

One does not have to look far to see that the disciples of Christ certainly drank wine (i.e. John chapter 2; Matt. 26:26-29; Mark 14:23-25; Luke 22:17-20), and so they could not have taken the vows of the Nazirite! While it is true that the early Christians were called *Nazarenes*, which is only evident in the New Testament, quite ironically, where the jews accuse Paul at Acts 24:5, this name came because they were followers of Yahshua *of Nazareth*, and the jews refused to call them Christians. This has already been discussed at the end of section <#16> of this response, in WTL #96. Whenever a jew calls a follower of Yahshua a Christian (anointed person), that jew admits that Yahshua is the Christ (Anointed One or Messiah), and so the early jews would not call them such, but used the term "Nazarene" instead. While it was a matter of prophecy that Yahshua was to be called a Nazarene (Matt. 2:23), among other things, this certainly does not mean that His disciples should take the ancient Nazirite vows, and it is fully evident that they did not! Clayton Douglas, again, is the Spouter of Lies!

Paul's position on the Levitical Law has been discussed several times throughout this response to Douglas' articles, in section <#18> of WTL #96, section <#46> of WTL #101, summarized again in sections <#49> and <#50> in WTL #102, and touched on in discussions of related topics in sections <#37> of WTL #100 and <#44> of WTL #101. It was discussed at length earlier in the response to H. Graber's Paul-bashing in section <J> of WTL #90. Here Douglas states that "*Paul completely*

mocked and ridiculed the Torah time and time again”, yet, as usual, offers nothing of substance but this vain and hollow accusation. No citations, nothing specific, no examples, just a blanket accusation. Just like the government prosecutors and Jewish false accusers who make every accusation possible hoping that something sticks, Clayton Douglas is a liar who cannot substantiate his claims! Also, notice that Douglas identifies the Pentateuch, or first five books of the Bible also known as the books of Moses, by the name which the Jews use for it, the “Torah”, which reveals his leanings.

<Reference #68> Clayton Douglas states: *“Regarding the Dead Sea Scrolls, there is - reportedly - a central character consistently referred to as ‘The Windbag’, ‘The Spouter of Lies’, ‘The Comedian’ and even ‘The Man of Scoffing.’ Who is this central character we are being warned about? Who is The Comedian?”*

William Finck answers <#68>: Now, I understand that there can be different interpretations of certain terms, and so certain appellations can appear differently in various translations of the same text. Yet I’ve read one of the better translations of the Dead Sea Scrolls, which I’ve discussed in section <#43> of this response in WTL #101, and nowhere do I recall seeing such appellations as “The Windbag”, “The Comedian”, or “The Man of Scoffing”, nor anything even similar to any of these. Notice again that Douglas makes no citations, and probably because he cannot, for he is a liar and an inventor of deceptions!

Douglas’ contentions concerning the Dead Sea Scrolls and Paul of Tarsus hold up only if one is led to believe that the Qumran sect members were Christians. It has already been demonstrated here that the sect was positively not Christian, and made no indication in their writing that they knew anything of Christianity (section <#43>, WTL #101). Here I shall quote one more Dead Sea Scrolls passage which fully supports my contention, and which should remove any lingering doubts which anyone may have. From 4Q271, Fragment 5, Column I, a portion of the *Damascus Document*: “No-one should help an animal give birth on the sabbath day. And if it has fallen into a well or a pit, he should not take it out on the sabbath ... And any living man who falls into a place of water or a well, no-one should take him out with a ladder or a rope or a utensil.” In the Christian mind, this should immediately evoke the words of Yahshua Christ recorded at Matt. 12:9-13 and Luke 14:1-6, for He would surely want us to help the animal, and especially the man, immediately on the Sabbath! The writers of the Dead Sea Scrolls were **NOT** Christians. Neither is Clayton Douglas!

<Reference #69> Clayton Douglas states: *“However, it takes more for a matter to be ‘true’ than to have a charismatic ‘man’ traveling around getting paid big money to say that lawlessness justified by ‘faith’ is truth. How convenient a message to literally ‘sell’ to the lawless Roman pagans, literally ‘Goyim’. Are you still happy to be ‘Stupid Cattle?’”*

William Finck answers <#69>: We have already discussed Paul’s position on the law and faith at great length in this response, and an index is given above, at the end of section <#67>. Paul was not teaching or promoting any “lawlessness”, rather Clayton Douglas is a liar! Notice Douglas’ use and definition of the term “Goyim”. This word is a Hebrew word, the plural of *goy*, Strong’s Hebrew dictionary #1471, which means *nation*. Abraham was told that his descendants would be “a great nation” (*goy*), “a great and mighty nation” (*goy*), and Jacob was told that “a nation and a company of nations” (*goy, goyim*) would be from him (see Genesis 17:20, 18:18 and 35:11). Yet

Douglas' definition of goyim comes from the colloquy of the Jews and their Talmud, their true religious book. The terms that a man uses, and the manner in which he uses them, reflect the materials he chooses to read, how he has acquired his opinions, and the company he keeps. As he uses the terms "Torah", "goyim", "Esu Immanuel Sananda", etc., Clayton Douglas is a follower of Jews and miscreants.

<Reference #70A> Clayton Douglas states: "*THE NEW PAULINE DOCTRINE OF LAWLESSNESS ... Paul has a lot to say but little or no Scripture to back it up. Likewise, he seems to either have been ignorant of, or blatantly hiding the words, contradictory to his own, that Jesus spoke. He claims to preach 'the Gospel' and even 'the new Gospel' yet he speaks little or nothing at all about the actual life, ministry and teachings of Jesus Christ. Instead he writes about his new doctrine of Lawlessness, and spends most of the rest of his 'Epistles' defending his violation of the Torah. This should be a great warning to us!*"

William Finck answers <#70A>: It should be readily apparent to anyone who ever read Paul's letters, that Clayton Douglas is the Spouter of Lies. Clayton Douglas is the Comedian! A quick perusal of the A.V. reveals that there are roughly 60 direct quotes of the Old Testament in Paul's letter to the Romans alone, not counting the many allusions and indirect references, such as those found at Rom. 1:32, 7:1-6, 9:20-23 and 16:20. Additionally, several chapters in Romans are all about the Old Testament, including chapters 4 and 9. Clayton Douglas speaks not the truth!

As I discussed in section <O> of my response to the Paul-bashing H. Graber, in WTL #91, Paul's letters are not his gospel. Surely the gospel which Paul preached, which he often referred to as the gospel of the kingdom (which Luke also did, i.e. Acts 28:31), is that gospel which is found with Luke. Paul's epistles illustrate an application of the gospel for the Christians of his time, as well as an application of the law. Anyone who thinks not should go back and read Romans chapter 2 or 1 Corinthians chapter 5 over again. These chapters clearly demonstrate that Paul upheld lawfulness, and that both good and wicked deeds are rewarded in kind by Yahweh. Clayton Douglas is a liar, the Man of Scoffing, who probably hasn't even read Paul's letters in their entirety, let alone studied them! Time and again, Douglas shows his utter incompetency in developing good judgment.

Reading Paul's epistles, we must bear in mind that we surely do not have all of them. It is certain that a letter to the Corinthians prior to 1 Cor. existed and is now missing (see 1 Cor. 5:9), and perhaps there was one more of these, but 2 Cor. 7:8 may only be referring to the 1 Cor. which we have. There was also an epistle to the Laodiceans, mentioned at Col. 4:16, which is lost. Yet it would seem that since Paul's ministry lasted for close to 30 years, we may expect that he wrote more than 16 or 17 epistles.

<Reference #70B> Clayton Douglas states: "*Strangely, this man, who was only shortly before murdering Jesus' disciples, now expected everyone to believe him to be infallible and above any criticism. Considering his Satanic track record, it should be expected that Paul would have to prove himself through works or 'fruit' if he was to be accepted. However, not only are there no works except for preaching for money, but this Satan never even publicly repents nor seeks forgiveness for his oppression.*"

William Finck answers <#70B>: We have seen here that Paul murdered no one, in sections <#39> (WTL #100) and <#59> (WTL #103) of this response, where it was

also demonstrated that Paul did indeed apologize for his early persecution of Christians. Recycling the same false accusations time and again, Clayton Douglas only magnifies his own lies. Neither did Paul preach for money, but as an honest reading of 2 Corinthians chapter 12 demonstrates, just the opposite is true. Such is also evident at Acts 20:33-35. This was discussed in part in section <#54> of this response in WTL #102. Clayton Douglas is rather the Comedian.

Paul did not consider himself infallible, but he did consider both the Old Testament scriptures and the gospel of Yahshua Christ to be infallible, and rightly so. In WTL #91, in section <O> of my response to H. Graber, I said that “An honest study of Paul’s letters reveal no fault on Paul’s part when compared with the four gospels, though in places Paul’s mere humanness is surely revealed, and as Paul at times himself admits.” Those admissions are found at places such as Romans 3:5 or 6:19, where Paul admits speaking “as a man” or “after the manner of men”, and not from scripture, meaning that he was indeed not considering his words to be infallible. At 1 Cor. 7:12-40 Paul admits that his advice there was his own, for which see both 7:12 (“I speak, not the Lord”) and 7:40 (“after my judgment”), obviously because he had no scriptural or gospel example to draw from by which to answer the question at hand. Paul wrote his advice here concerning marriage in a time when Christians were undergoing a harsh and violent persecution, the weakly translated “present distress” of 7:26, and because of that he advised against marriage for that time. Otherwise, of course, Paul esteemed marriage as a very important necessity (i.e. Heb. 13:4; 1 Tim. 3:2, 5, 12). So we see several examples where Paul warned that his teaching was his own when it could not be based upon Scripture, and by no means did he claim that such teachings were infallible. Clayton Douglas, the Man of Scoffing, has surely not studied what is necessary in order to discern these things.

The records in Acts demonstrate that Paul surely did “*prove himself through works*” (Acts 14:3; 19:6, 11; 28:8), and Peter accepted Paul (Acts 15) and testified concerning Paul’s legitimacy and wisdom (2 Pet. 3:15-16). Douglas, the Comedian, Spouter of Lies, spouts accusations which are untrue concerning things which he has neither studied nor understands! Clayton Douglas, Christian? ... or Patriot? Hardly! To qualify as either, one must erase from his mind all his errant concepts and start all over again from the beginning! *W.R.F*