

WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER

Monthly Letter #106; February, 2007 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 sixth 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. I had wanted to do an antithesis to the Paul-bashers for a long time, and had no idea before starting this series that we (William Finck and myself) would uncover so much festering evil at the core of this wicked and unjust doctrine. I want to thank all those who have helped gather all the information and background data to help put this rebuttal material together, exposing the anti-Paulists for what they really are.

I knew that William Finck was more familiar with Paul's epistles than I, and enlisted him to put this series together, since he has translated all of Paul's letters directly from the Greek and knows firsthand what the Greek truly says, which is in many cases entirely different than what most people think. After I had read the first few manuscripts Finck put together, I was not disappointed. We will now pick up his last presentation of this series on the subject:

Once more 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*. Here we shall finish with this series of Douglas' Paul-bashing articles, and our response to it.

<Reference #80> Clayton Douglas states: "*Speaking of pesky and deceiving, let us return once more to Paul's statement which opens up this investigative article:*

"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)

"Does Christianity accept 'taking in by deceit' as a means of 'ministering,' and propagandizing? Does Genesis 3:1 not refer to the Serpent as 'more crafty more subtle than any beast of the field?' Paul himself boasts proudly about sharing this trait with the Serpent. Like the Serpent, Paul - too - is 'subtle' and 'crafty' - not trying to deceive you with something appearing as a lie. To convince you he mixes a small portion of truth with a predominance of pagan lies. The Torah, the 'Law,' which Paul mocked and

considered a 'yoke' and 'bondage,' says: 'Do not steal. Do not lie. Do not deceive one another.' Leviticus 19:11"

William Finck answers <#80>: We have seen in section <#54> of this response, in WTL #102, that 2 Cor. 12:16 was not only poorly translated, but that Douglas takes it out-of-context, and Douglas also is aware that the translation has been challenged and refused to address that in his article. Here Douglas repackages the same argument he used there, which was proven to be false. Paul certainly was not "subtle" and "crafty", and just the opposite has been proven. Clayton Douglas alone is "subtle" and "crafty" here! And all of his accusations are unfounded! Notice also, that like a 'good' jew, he continually insists on referring to the Pentateuch as the "Torah". In the next section of his article he refers to the "Tanakh", the jewish name for the writings of the prophets, Psalms, and other books of the Old Testament. Christian writers scarcely use the word "Tanakh", and many Christians probably don't even know what it means. Such evidence of jewish influence is found throughout all of Douglas' articles.

<Reference #81A> Clayton Douglas states: "*But when Paul had gathered a bundle of sticks and laid them on the fire, a viper came out because of the heat, and fastened on his hand. When the natives saw the creature hanging from his hand, they said one to another, 'No doubt this man is a murderer, whom, though he has escaped from the sea, yet Justice has not allowed to live.'* However Paul shook off the creature into the fire, and wasn't harmed. But they expected that he would have swollen or fallen down dead suddenly, but when they watched for a long time and saw nothing bad happen to him, they changed their minds, and said that he was a god." Acts 28:3-6

"Here we are told that the natives, though receiving Paul well at first realize that it was an aberration of nature for a snake to attack someone who is in fact laying sticks on a fire. Snakes themselves are repelled by fire and it would be quite abnormal for a viper to attack a man without any provocation who is so near to the fire that he is in fact laying sticks in it. When the natives saw this they realized that Paul's ship wreck was not merely coincidence, he had in fact been subject to the wrath of God, the same as Prophet Jonah was said to have been in the Tanakh for his reluctance. Just the same as in that case the stormy sea was a sign of God's anger.

"Here Paul's Antichrist cult does not allow us any such interpretation. Nonetheless this was the first and natural understanding of the natives of Malta. Paul's devotee Luke tells us in the book of Acts that when Paul did not die from the bite of this abnormal viper, they said - that is, they uttered, not merely thought to themselves - that he was 'a god.' Nowhere in this passage does the devotee Luke tell us that the apostate Paul said one word to the contrary. Doesn't that seem a little strange for an allegedly 'god-fearing' man to not deny a claim that he is a god?

"Moreover, in the city of Lystra, Paul causes a riot by supposedly healing a man. During the riot the people shout in their native dialect that Paul and Barnabas are gods come to earth. Again, there is no denial of these claims recorded in Acts.

"The fact that Paul did not dispute their claims that he was a 'god' is not at all an insignificant matter. When Apollonius of Tyana was supposedly tried before the Emperor Domitian at the end of the first century, one of the charges against him was that he had supposedly allowed himself to be worshipped as a god - more or less the same charges falsely applied to Jesus Christ - despite the fact that he never claimed godhood, nor did anyone else attribute it to him."

William Finck answers <#81A>: Firstly, just because Luke didn't record any denial of Paul's in Acts 28, when the people of Malta had imagined him to be a god, doesn't mean that such a denial wasn't made, or that Paul accepted their supposition. Yet Douglas is plainly lying about the incident at Lystra, where the people imagined Paul and Barnabas to be gods (Acts 14:11-12). That upset Paul and Barnabas so that they tore their own clothing (14:14), the ancient way of exhibiting one's humility, and ran among the people denying it, admitting to be mere men (14:15). Clayton Douglas shows himself to be the Spouter of Lies.

We needn't go to Apollonius of Tyana and his trial to see the gravity of the accusations here, where one should fail to deny his elevation by the people to status as a god. There is a clear example right in the Bible, recorded by Luke at Acts chapter 12, where it is said that Herod Agrippa I was struck dead for not denying the claims of the people that he was a god. The historian Josephus, at *Antiq.* 19.8.2 (19.343), attributes this Herod's death to that very same cause. So both Luke and Paul were surely aware of the punishments for such impiety, lack of humility, and acceptance of the foolishness of the common people.

The people of Malta, called Melita in ancient times, were no uncivilized savages. The Greeks considered them barbarians only because they spoke a different language. Diodorus Siculus, in his *Library of History* at 5.12.2-3, says of Malta that it "... lies about eight hundred stades from Syracuse, and it possesses many harbors which offer exceptional advantages, and its inhabitants are blest in their possessions; for it has artisans skilled in every manner of craft ... and the dwellings on the island are worthy of note, being ambitiously constructed and finished in stucco with unusual workmanship. This island is a colony planted by the Phoenicians, who, as they extended their trade to the western ocean, found in it a place of safe retreat, since it was well supplied with harbors and lay out in the open sea; and this is the reason why the inhabitants of this island, since they received assistance in many respects through the sea-merchants, shot up quickly in their manner of living and increased in renown" (Loeb Library edition). It may be conjectured that the Maltese, being Phoenicians, and Paul being a Hebrew speaker, could surely speak to each other in a tongue which the Greek Luke could not understand, and so Paul's denial was not recorded. But surely just because it wasn't recorded doesn't mean it wasn't made. Yet that is not all, for Douglas continues:

<Reference #81B> Clayton Douglas states: "*Even when any type of special status was alluded to regarding him, Jesus abrogated it by saying 'Why do you call me god, one alone is god,' (Mark 10:18) and humbly proclaiming that even 'Greater works than these shall you do' (John 14:12)*"

William Finck answers <#81B>: And here Douglas attempts one of the sleight-of-hand magic tricks he picked up in all of the Jewish magic books he's read! For in Mark 10:18 Yahshua Christ is recorded as saying: "Why callest thou me **good**? *there is none good but one, that is, God.*" Douglas, believing that the word processor is quicker than the eye, removed an 'o' from good in an attempt to magnify his false accusation against Paul. Surely Douglas is The Comedian! The two words are much harder to confuse in their original Greek, "god" being θεός and "good" being ἀγαθός. Elsewhere Yahshua Christ stated "Is it not written in your law, I SAID, YE ARE GODS?", a reference to the 82nd Psalm at John 10:34. The Jews thought that by

calling oneself a son of God, one considered oneself as equal to God, and they considered that blasphemy in spite of the scripture at Deut. 14:1 and Psa. 82. Surely Clayton Douglas, the Man of Scoffing, shows an ignorance of this (taking the same position as the Jews did to Christ's Words). Yet Paul, a man of humility, never claimed to be a god of any sort!

Finally, we have already seen Douglas himself acknowledge that Paul was nearly blind (section <#19> of this response in WTL #96). Paul, wanting to lend a hand in the situation on Malta following the shipwreck, lifted a bundle of sticks and placed them onto the fire. A viper, surely from that same bundle of sticks and which Paul did not see, then sprung out from that bundle and attached itself to Paul, thereby avoiding the fire. There is nothing "abnormal" about this, except that Douglas would prefer his own twisted version of the story, as we have seen Clayton twist nearly everything he discusses.

<Reference #82> Clayton Douglas states: *"So who is right? Is Jesus correct when he says 'I have not come to abolish the Law' or is Paul right when he says that Jesus 'destroyed the barrier ... by abolishing in his flesh the Law with its commandments and regulations?' (Hebrews 10:19-20) Was Jesus Christ right when he said that Heaven and Earth would sooner pass away than 'one letter of the Law,' or should we instead follow Paul who said the anti-thesis of Christ's words: 'But now the Law has come to an end with Christ and everyone who has faith may be justified.' Romans 10:14"*

William Finck answers <#82>: The first part of Douglas' statement here comes not from Hebrews 10, but from Ephesians 2:14. In Ephesians 2, Paul is discussing the reconciliation of the "lost" Israelites (which the Ephesians surely were a part of) to Yahweh by His sacrifice on the cross. Because Israel, the nation, was "married" to Yahweh, and Israel played the harlot, the nation was put off, divorced, by Yahweh. The Levitical law governing marital relations prevented the reconciliation of the husband, Yahweh, to Israel. This law was the "barrier", or "middle wall" in the A.V., which Paul mentioned. Thus, Yahweh died on the cross for Israel, fulfilling the law and freeing Israel from the Old Covenant. All of this was a clear matter of prophecy discussed at length in this response in section <#50> of WTL #102, and what Paul explains to the Ephesians is in perfect keeping with this prophecy, which Christ came to fulfill.

Douglas continues by misquoting Romans 10:4, and mislabeling it 10:14. Romans 10:4 says in the A.V.: "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." This word "end" is the Greek word τέλος (5056), where I have "fulfillment" here in my own translation. Liddell & Scott in their Greek-English lexicon define the word *"the fulfillment or completion of anything ... i.e. its consummation, issue, result, end ..."*. Yahshua Christ tells us that He came to fulfill the law, and Paul correctly tells us that Christ is the fulfillment of the law. Clayton Douglas, the Man of Scoffing, sees problems and conflicts where there certainly aren't any!

<Reference #83> Clayton Douglas states: *"Again, I ask you, did Jesus Christ not say himself that a slave cannot serve two masters?"*

"You cannot be the slave of two masters! You will like one more than the other or be more loyal to one than the other. You cannot serve both God and money." Matthew 6:24

"So which 'master' do Christians now serve? Which 'master' do you serve?"

William Finck answers <#83>: And for this very reason Paul of Tarsus told the Romans: “**Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness? ... I speak after the manner of men because of the infirmity of your flesh: for as ye have yielded your members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto iniquity; even so now yield your members servants to righteousness unto holiness**” (Romans 6:16, 19). The word “iniquity”, twice in this passage, is the Greek word ἀνομία, Strong’s #458, literally “lawlessness”. It is apparent from this passage, contrary to Douglas, that Paul of Tarsus was certainly not promoting lawlessness! Clayton Douglas, The Comedian, has judged Paul on the basis of but a few verses taken out-of-context and mixed with the lies of a long list of jews, sexual deviants, and other assorted miscreants, whom he follows straight to perdition!

<Reference #84> Clayton Douglas states: “‘*Not everyone who says to me, ‘Lord, Lord,’ will enter the kingdom of heaven, but only the one who does the will of my Father in heaven: Many will say to me on that day, ‘Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in your name? Did we not drive out demons in your name? Did we not do mighty deeds in your name?’ Then I will declare to them solemnly, ‘I never knew you. Depart from me, you workers of LAWLESSNESS (anomial).*’ Matthew 7:21-23”

William Finck answers <#84>: We have seen over and over again in this response that Paul certainly did not promote lawlessness. Neither did Paul promote universalism. Neither did Paul support the high priests of his time, who he knew to be the enemy posing as servants of Yahweh, just as the jews do today. In his second epistle to the Thessalonians, Paul talks about the jews at Jerusalem in this manner: “**You should not be deceived by anyone, in any way, because if apostasy had not come first, and the man of lawlessness been revealed: the son of destruction, he who is opposing and exalting himself above everything said to be a god or an object of worship, and so he is seated in the temple of Yahweh, representing himself that he is a god.**” (2 Thes. 2:3-4, my own translation). Thereby Paul tells us that the actual man of lawlessness, the Edomite Canaanite jew, was revealed by Christ, evident throughout the gospels, and especially in John chapter 8. Later on, in chapter 3 verse 2, Paul prays that he and his companions are spared from these jews: “**and that we should be protected from those disgusting and wicked men, since the faith is not for all.**” (2 Thes. 3:2, my own translation), since those jews had attempted time and again to kill him. Clayton Douglas, attacking Paul, has followed the jews in so many ways, as we have seen over and over relentlessly throughout this response, and so also makes himself an aid and an abettor in all of the crimes of the jews by obscuring the true history of early Christianity and giving the jews a smokescreen of lies to hide behind! We saw in section <#13> of this response, at the end of Douglas’ remarks there, that he even attempts to absolve Judas Iscariot, the real traitor and betrayer of Yahshua Christ! Could this be, that Douglas is a follower of ‘bishop’ John Spong, and Spong once wrote an article entitled “Judas Iscariot - A Creation of Prejudice?” for *The Human Quest* May-June, 1994? Is Douglas merely following Spong, the lover of jews, in this? Is Douglas, following the Humanist of the Year for 1999 – John Spong, purposely attempting to undermine Israel Identity Christianity – the only true Christianity – by leading it off into Paul-bashing?

Notice here that Douglas quotes Matthew 7:21-23 as the words of Yahshua Christ, which they indeed are. But earlier Douglas quoted and criticized parts of that same chapter, Matthew 7:1-6, and claimed that those words of Yahshua were a “Paulinism”! (See section <#77> of this response in WTL #105.) Douglas’ hypocrisy is quite incredible, and glaringly evident!

<Reference #85> Clayton Douglas states: “A road that requires nothing of you but to ‘have faith’ is the broadest road imaginable. But, isn’t that the broad road that today’s Judeo-Christians feel they deserve?”

William Finck answers <#85>: In sections <#37> and <#44> of this response, in WTL #s 100 and 101, we have seen that Paul’s idea of faith encompassed both good works and obedience to Yahweh. Paul certainly cannot be blamed for the state of “Judeo-Christians” today, as Paul well knew that there should be nothing “Judeo-” in Christianity! And why does Douglas use a term which he considers “almost an oxymoron” (see WTL #93, page 1 column 1)? In the title to his first article, Douglas offered “Judeo-Christianity” as the alternative for “Pauline Christianity.” For my part, I’d take Paul over the Jews any day! All these little quirks and more, while they are relatively minor, do manifest the inconsistencies in Douglas’ thinking. And there are others which I’ve let pass by here. For instance, above in section <#81> Douglas calls Luke “Paul’s devotee”, an apparent criticism considering what Douglas thinks of Paul. Yet early in his articles Douglas quotes from Luke’s gospel (section <#8>, WTL #94, for example), and has often referred to or cited events recorded by Luke in Acts, without any prior criticism of Luke. Clayton Douglas truly is The Comedian, and surely no scholar.

<Reference #86> Clayton Douglas states: “In conclusion, Saul/ Paul of Tarsus taught deviation. Today, he’d be called an ‘Agent Provocateur’. Paul may have even been the individual that the Damascus Document identifies as ‘the Liar’ and ‘the Apostate.’ And as to why he went to the effort to found a new religion, many suggest that it was a brilliantly conceived means to defuse the political significance of Jesus and his Davidic bloodline. As an agent of the pro-Roman Sadducee establishment, Paul the Pharisee found a perfect way to deflect anti-Roman agitation into yet another Roman mystery cult. He apparently succeeded very well. The Romans may have had more reasons to throw ‘Christians’ to the lions than merely worrying that the moralistic folk might cancel their orgies and parties, especially if early Christianity were a successful anti-Roman political movement.

“If early Christianity was really a revolutionary political movement fully within the sphere of Jesus’ teachings at the time ... whence the Christianity of today? END”

William Finck answers <#86>: Here, finally, we reach the conclusion of Douglas’ two Paul-bashing articles, and most of the lies and misconceptions here have been addressed throughout this lengthy response, so I will not repeat them again. I must state briefly though, that I do not find any references to “the Liar” or “the Apostate” in the edition of the *Damascus Document* which I have, although appellations similar to “the Liar” appear in other Dead Sea Scrolls, specifically some of the Peshers to the prophets discussed at length in section <#43> in WTL #101. Yet we have seen throughout his articles that Douglas gets very few of his facts straight. He has instead produced little but a heap of deceptive, ignorant, confused trash.

Yet I must wonder, if Douglas is so concerned about Christianity, true, intolerant, non-politically correct Christianity, as he puts it (see section <#77> in *WTL* #105), why does he attack Paul of Tarsus based on the remarks and opinions of jews such as Sol Stein and Sigmund Freud, atheists such as Friedriche Nietzsche, and liberal theologians such as John Spong, himself an overt embracer of homosexuals, jews, and negroes as we have seen from Spong's own websites? How is this collection of miscreants and sexual deviants any alternative to Paul of Tarsus, and how could they possibly deal with the just and moral Paul in an objective manner? And we've already seen the Paul-bashing H. Graber was also a follower of jews and socialists, just like John Spong shows himself to be. How do such perverts and miscreants become valid discerners of Paul, of Yahshua Christ, or of anything Christian or Biblical or just or good? All Paul-bashers everywhere must take note: by unjustly attacking Paul of Tarsus, you are all mere followers and flunkies of the jews and miscreants. And all attacks on Paul shall be manifested to be unjust when measured against the gospels and the prophets! In your ignorance, you are only scattering rather than gathering the people of Yahweh. All Paul-bashers everywhere had better repent, and reconsider their anti-Christ positions! *W.R.F.*

At this point, it becomes the reader's responsibility to check out everything presented in this series taking the Paul-bashers to task! Either the facts, which have been presented in this series, are true or they are not true! This series may not bring a cessation of Paul-bashing, but it may make it much more difficult for those promoting Paul's demise than they ever deemed it might be, as now their audience may demand documented proof of their allegations.

And not only that, but we have presented the truth to the matters which Clayton Douglas has raised to the best of our ability, and now the consequences rest squarely upon the reader's shoulders to check out. The Paul-bashers needn't ever say at the White Throne Judgment that no one ever warned them that they were in error, and that their reward might fall into the "hay, wood and stubble" category only to be destroyed by fire. Though they themselves, while they will suffer great loss, will nevertheless be saved if they are genetically Adamites.

Hopefully, now that this series of defending the apostle Paul has been completed, a discussion of some of the more difficult-to-understand teachings of Paul will be undertaken. Just where this new direction will lead has not yet been fully determined. Like this series defending the apostle Paul, this next sequence of study may take some time to cover. I don't plan a verse-by-verse commentary, but rather shall concentrate on addressing the more difficult passages. Maybe if the harder-to-understand passages are developed, the rest will fall into their proper place. I warn you in advance, we'll definitely get on some thought-provoking subjects.

One thing that must be kept in mind is the fact that during the life of Yahshua Christ, it would have been premature for Him to reveal the mysteries which Paul was shown by the Spirit. The reason for this is because certain things couldn't be unveiled until after Christ's death. That is why Paul's ministry is so important! What Paul did was simply build on top of the ministry of Yahshua. In other words, Christ could not present the gospel of Redemption until He sacrificed Himself on the cross. Once that was in place, the Gospel was ready to be taken to the nations which were the twelve lost tribes of Israel. And James was correct when he spoke of "the twelve tribes which

are scattered abroad". What is important to notice is that James was martyred before the bad-fig "Jews" were dispersed from Jerusalem in 70 A.D., thus James in his epistle was not including them among the twelve tribes as judeo-churchianity tries to falsely declare today.

Judeo-churchianity has not yet learned that the house of Israel is not the house of Judah, and that the house of Judah is not the house of Israel. Neither have they learned that the good-figs of Judah are not the bad-figs of Judah nor are the bad-figs of Judah the good-figs of Judah. Neither have they learned that the house of David is only one family line within the house of Judah. Neither have they learned that there were two kingly lines descended from within the house of Judah: one from the house of Pharez-Judah and one from the house of Zerah-Judah.

If one listens to so-called "Christian television" long enough, one will be left with the impression that there are only two tribes of people: "Jews" and "Gentiles". Almost every wannabee television preacher will use the words "Jews" and "Israelites" synonymously, as if they were the same group of people, surely making the identification of the various Israelite tribes more confusing. On the other hand, the apostle Paul never used the term "Gentile" in any of his writings, ever! Latin may have been one of the languages Paul was fluent in, but he never used the Latin word *gentilis* in his Greek writings, ever! It implores us, then, to understand the proper Greek word which Paul did use where the translators substituted the Latin word *gentilis*. The fact that Paul was fluent in many languages highly qualified him to take the Gospel to the lost nations of Israel. We read nowhere that Paul needed an interpreter to converse with people where he traveled. In fact at 1 Corinthians 14:18, Paul indicates he spoke in many languages "more than ye all". If so, Paul would have understood Latin and would have understood the Latin term *gentilis*, but never chose to use it in place of the Greek term *ethnos*, meaning nation. Hopefully, these are examples of subjects we can address in our studies of Paul's letters.

Paul quoted many times from the Old Testament. We need to determine in what context Paul was doing so. Unless we can ascertain the Greek words which Paul used, and their meanings, much of his message will be lost or poorly grasped. We want to comprehend thoroughly everything Paul did say, while not reading anything into it which he didn't say or mean.

There are two general ways in which the reader can interpret their Bibles, (1) with a closed mind interpreting what they read determined by some of their preconceived ideas, and (2) with an open mind attempting to determine exactly what is being said related to the context in which it is written and taking into account the idioms of the language at the time it was written. It is simply amazing the various fanciful concepts some well-meaning people have developed from reading into various Scriptures ideas which are really not expressed. As we get into Paul's epistles, we will undertake to explore various difficult passages that have, in the past, been so misconstrued and twisted entirely out-of-shape that today they are but an enigma to many.

We must remember that Paul of Tarsus was of the tribe of Benjamin, and the tribe of Benjamin was appointed to be a light-bearing tribe to the tribe of Judah, especially to David. This seems to be an important fact overlooked by most commentaries. We must understand that Yahshua Christ was of the tribe of Judah, and

his disciples were His light-bearers to the *ethnê* (plural of *ethnos*), or the lost sheep of the house of Israel! Witness to this fact can be found at 1 Kings 11:36: “**And unto his son will I give one tribe, that David my servant may have a light always before me in Jerusalem, the city which I have chosen me to put my name there.**”

Surely the fact that Paul was a Benjamite should be a signal to everyone that he was a man chosen to bear the light of Yahshua Christ to the *ethnê* (nations). What other tribe would we expect Yahshua to pick a man from to do such a job? We should be suspicious had Christ chosen a man of any other tribe! Thus, Christ’s choice of Paul is in context with the Old Testament! You can see from this that once we get all the pieces of the puzzle in their proper places, it proves the veracity of the Bible! When are we ever going to start studying the Bible rather than just skimming over the surface?

In addition to this, we must remember that there was to be a “fishing” period and a “hunting” period (Jer. 16:16), thus Christ called his disciples “fishers of men”. For anyone who wants to examine this situation, Paul was the greatest “fisherman” of all the apostles, yet the humble Paul said (1 Cor. 15:9) “For I am the least of the apostles ...” Yahshua Christ only picked twelve disciples, and one was a genetic devil. After Judas killed himself, the eleven took it upon themselves to appoint a replacement, and there is no record he ever fulfilled such an office. But Yahshua Himself chose Paul, and we have much recorded of his ministry. Inasmuch as Paul said “For I am the least of the apostles ...”, shows beyond all doubt that he was counted among the twelve, and we have no record where any of the other eleven disputed Paul’s claim, but much to support it.

We will now start a new series on Paul’s teachings. How long it will take or just where it will lead is not yet determined. It will be a large undertaking, and must be done correctly.