

WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER

Monthly Letter #126; October, 2008 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 twenty-sixth monthly teaching letter and continues my eleventh year of publication. This is another in a series on the apostle Paul. Lesson #125 was a preparatory lesson on what I am about to address in this one. In that lesson, I addressed the marriage of Yahweh to Israel, and how Israel was unfaithful to Him resulting in His divorce from her. Then I explained the true meaning of the word "gospel" (good news), and the good news was/is that Yahweh came in the flesh as Yahshua to die in order to meet the requirement of the Law so He could remarry scattered Israel as the ekklesia. With this lesson, we will follow this theme into Paul's epistle to the Romans. And as I have previously explained, the book of Romans is a book of doctrine, and we have to get the doctrine right or it will only lead to confusion. And shame on all those who would eradicate all of Paul's writings from our Bible. Inasmuch as Luke was a very close associate with Paul, if we do away with Paul's epistles, that would imply that we should also do away with the books which Luke wrote; those being Luke and Acts. After one would exclude both Paul's and Luke's writings, one would of necessity have to eliminate the book of Revelation, for at Rev. 2:1-5, Yahshua Christ Himself praised the assembly at Ephesus which Paul had founded! And in like manner as the "Reverend(?)" Jeremiah Wright said, "God damn America", the Paul bashers are in essence saying "God damn Paul"! It would appear that all of the Paul bashers should join "Reverend" Wright's church, for what's the difference between the two?

Before we go into the book of Romans, there are a few basic things we should discern. The first thing we should realize is that when Paul addressed the Romans, the Romans were by-and-large Israelites of the tribe of Zerah-Judah. Once one comprehends this fact, it brings us to the second important fact which one should distinguish: that is the difference between the Judeans of the Tribe of Judah and the bad-fig-jews who were half-breed Canaanites. In fact, one should differentiate between the two throughout the Bible. Therefore, the pure-blooded good-fig-Judaeans were not the bad-fig-Canaanite-jews, nor were the bad-fig-Canaanite-jews the same people as the pureblooded good-fig-Judaeans! The third thing we must understand is that Paul

taught the exclusiveness of Israel. In the past there had been a whole series of exclusions. At Genesis 4, Cain was excluded. Noah had distinguished Ham and Japheth from the seed of Shem. Then every family of Shem except the line from the descent of Abraham, were excluded. Of the sons of Abraham, every son except Isaac was excluded. Esau was then excluded of the two sons of Isaac. After that, it was only with Jacob-Israel that there were no further exclusions. Therefore, Paul never went to any non-Israelites! Anyone who claims otherwise is reading Paul out-of-context!

Right at the beginning of Romans 1:1-4 it says: “¹ **Paul, a servant of Yahshua Christ, called ~~to be~~ an apostle, separated unto the gospel of Yahweh,** ² (Which he had promised afore by his prophets in the holy scriptures,) ³ **Concerning his Son Yahshua Christ our Master, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh;** ⁴ **And declared ~~to be~~ the Son of Yahweh with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead.**” This being true, Paul’s calling by Yahshua Christ was predicted long before by the prophets.

Where in the Old Testament prophets does it promise anything about going to any so-called “Gentiles”, which most interpret to mean “non-jews”? Both the terms “Gentiles” and “non-jews” are improper here! Sometimes the words *ethné* in the NT and *goyim* in the OT can mean heathen, but the way Paul used *ethné* in context, it should usually be translated as “nations”. So right from the get-go, Paul excludes anyone other than Israelites, as none of the OT prophets ever prophesied anything about including any non-Israelites. William Finck, in his *Letters Of Paul*, translates this passage:

“¹ **Paul, bondman of Yahshua Christ, a called ambassador, set apart for the good message of Yahweh,** ² **which He previously announced through His prophets in the sacred writings,** ³ **concerning His Son, who came forth from the offspring of David down through the flesh,** ⁴ **who has been distinguished as a Son of Yahweh by ability in accordance with a spirit of sanctity, by a raising of the dead; Yahshua Christ our Prince ...”**

At verse 7 Paul states: “**To all that be in Rome, beloved of Yahweh, called ~~to be~~ saints: Grace to you and peace from Yahweh our Father, and the Sovereign Yahshua Christ.**”

It should be noted here that the term “saint” is #40 in Strong’s and means “... sacred (physically *pure*, morally *blameless* ... ceremonially *consecrated*)” When Abraham placed Isaac on the altar of sacrifice, that’s the description of what Isaac’s descendants became. Hence, no other people than the descendants of Isaac through Jacob can make a claim to be “saints”. Now if you listen to some preachers in judeo-churchianity they will tell you differently. And you can be sure “physically *pure*” here means to be genetically pure! Who would offer an impure sacrifice expecting Yahweh to be pleased with it? Abraham didn’t do that, and neither should we! Of course, that is what Cain did! Here we are, only seven verses into Romans, and already it is fully about race. At Rom. 7:1, Paul refers to the Romans as his “brethren” and says: “**For I speak to them that know the law.**” Paul wasn’t speaking of the bad-fig-jews here, but the Romans who were of Zerah-Judah. To read it any other way is out-of-context, but almost everyone does! At the time Paul addressed this to the Romans, all of the New

Testament had not as yet been fully developed, so that left only the Old Testament to refer to. So evidently a few of the Romans did have access to a Greek Septuagint. Thus the statement, "For I speak to them that know the law." After all, at Paul's time Greek was by-and-large a universal language, and most of the Romans were fluent in Greek. Not only that, but at many of the synagogues which Paul visited, some of the members were pureblooded Judaeans and were converted to follow Christ. Surely a few of the pureblooded Judaeans would have had a copy of the Septuagint and would have been familiar with the law. In other words, Paul was simply telling his audience, "You that have access to the Greek Septuagint, verify what I am about to say concerning the law." Then Paul proceeded to speak about the husband-wife relationship and related it to the marriage of Christ to the assembly. And this new husband-wife relationship between Christ and the assembly was nothing more than a renewal of the Old Testament where Yahweh married twelve-tribed Israel.

When we can begin to comprehend that Paul was addressing Roman Israelites concerning their heritage, we can begin to understand his message. If the Romans were not Israelites but heathen so-called "Gentiles", Paul would neither minister to them, nor expect to keep their attention, while continually speaking about foreign people! Likewise we Whites who in the past didn't understand that we were Israelites, left our Bibles to collect a lot of dust – not recognizing it to be our family history! Why? Because the churches continually taught us that the bad-fig-Canaanite-jews were "God's chosen people". We have been victims of a carefully perpetrated fraud – the "blind following the blind" – and all of that "grafted in" nonsense! Who among us would want to be grafted into a family tree with the Canaanites? We're grafted in all right; grafted back into the olive tree from which we came. If we were grafted into the Canaanite tree, I can't imagine what the olives would look or taste like! I would highly suggest that a good step in the right direction would be to stop going to the churches which teach such things! Paul never taught any such thing, nor should we support those who do!

Now that we understand that Paul was addressing Israelites about Israelites, let's now see where else in Romans he did the same thing. This is found at Romans 9:1-5: "**¹ I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Pneuma, ² That I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart. ³ For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh: ⁴ Who are Israelites; to whom *pertaineth* the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; ⁵ Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever ...**"

Here is what Paul had in common with the Romans whom he addressed at this passage: (1) the adoption, (2) the glory, (3) the covenants, (4) the giving of the law, (5) the service of Yahweh, (6) the promises, (7) the fathers, (8) kinsmen in the flesh to Christ who is over all. In other words, the Romans had all eight of these same advantages! Here Paul had introduced to the Romans who they were, and their bill of rights according to the covenants given to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. At Romans 11:1, Paul shows the Romans his own personal relationship to Israel, saying:

“¹ I say then, Hath Yahweh cast away his people? Yahweh forbid. For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin. ² Yahweh hath not cast away his people which he foreknew. Wot ye not what the scripture saith of Elias? how he maketh intercession to Yahweh against Israel, saying, ³ Yahweh, they have killed thy prophets, and digged down thine altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life. ⁴ But what saith the answer of Yahweh unto him? I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to *the image of Baal*. ⁵ Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace.” Here the remnant to whom Paul alluded were the Romans and other Israelites under his ministry, and not the Canaanite-jews who falsely claimed to be Israelites! Had Paul been an infant child in Bethlehem at the time of Christ’s birth, he would have been one of the babies that the Edomite Herod had killed! Paul was aware of this and quoted Malachi’s words, at 1:2-3, at Rom. 9:13 thusly: “**As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated.**” Don’t think even for a moment that Paul didn’t understand that the Canaanite-Edomite-jews were Israel’s mortal enemy! Therefore, the bad-fig-jews of today are God’s hated (not “chosen”) people, whom nearly every church denomination and political party mollicoddles endlessly. To them, the Canaanites can do no wrong! Paul didn’t see it that way, so neither should we. It is asinine to even suggest that Paul was akin to the bad-fig-jews! Had that been true, Paul, by writing what he did at Rom. 9:13, would have been admitting he was one of God’s hated! What’s the matter with all of these Paul bashers? Can’t they read their Bibles? The Paul bashers are nothing more than blind followers of the blind, who in turn are followers of a Canaanite-jew from New Jersey.

This information was given in my *WTL* #92 for December, 2005: H. Graber was a close follower of W.G. Finlay, a Paul basher from South Africa, and on audio tape #87, Finlay identified the source of his conviction. Finlay based his tenets on the book *Popes From The Ghetto* by Dr. Joachim Prince, president of the American Jewish Congress, and chairman of the Conference Of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations. Finlay also referred to Prince as “The learned rabbi, who still serves in the Temple Beni-Abram of Newark in New Jersey.”

From *WTL* #97 for May, 2006, William Finck wrote: “Writing in *WTL* #94, where I addressed Douglas’ first quote in his article from Bishop Spong, I wondered: ‘what sort of man could Spong be?’ That was back on October 23rd of last year. Shortly thereafter I was able to obtain some information concerning Spong, and Clifton has collected more since then. How little I suspected, that Spong is a much more vile man than I could have imagined back in October! Here it is fitting to divert from our response to Clayton Douglas’ articles to discuss Bishop Spong himself, whom Douglas must have read in depth, and of whom Douglas is a disciple. Once we see – from his own mouth – that John Spong is a lover of negroes and homosexuals – that he is no true Christian but rather a full-blown member of the jewish-led liberal – Communist – deviant – minority bloc who are hell-bent upon destroying our White race and civilization, then the motives of Spong, and perhaps Douglas also, shall become fully manifest. I strongly urge all Paul-bashers everywhere to fully contemplate this review of the life and works

of John Spong, which we will begin with some comments and biographical information compiled by Clifton Emahiser:

“In an effort to find all the origins of the phenomenon known today as ‘Anti-Paulism’, it has led in many unusual directions. We first observed that Paul-bashing was nothing new, for there were many Anti-Paulists during Paul’s own time. The one common characteristic surrounding the attempted refuting of Paul’s writings, in all periods of time since Paul, is that it appears to have its origin from the bad-fig Judaeans of Rev. 2:9 & 3:9 whom we term as ‘Jews’ today. In pursuit of the ‘Jewish’ connection to this Paul-bashing, which is gaining epidemic proportions, we find that W.G. Finlay from South Africa, a venomous Paul-basher, based his flawed assumptions on a book *Popes From The Ghetto* by Dr. Joachim Prince, president of the American Jewish Congress, and chairman of the Conference Of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations. Finlay also referred to Prince as ‘The learned rabbi, who still serves in the Temple Beni-Abram of Newark in New Jersey.’” I know this last sentence is repetitive, but it’s important!

I have repeated in the previous three paragraphs the information on who is behind all of the Paul bashing that is going on today. Why should a Christian today parrot such unscrupulous people as Joachim Prince and Bishop John Spong?

Clay Douglas praised John Spong in his article *The Seduction: Judeo-Christianity Or Pauline Christianity? Saul of Tarsus: Paul. A different view:* stating: “Bishop John Spong had closely analyzed Paul’s life and writings. Spong believes Paul’s fiery manner of writing was his method of dealing with his own homosexuality. There is much, as Anglican Bishop of Newark John Spong has pointed out, which leads one to suspect Paul might have been ‘queer’ in some way. The fact he was never married, unusual for a Jew of his time, his companionship with a series of younger men, especially St. Timothy, his mention of an unnamed ‘thorn in the flesh’, and, possibly, his disdain for some types of exploitative homosexual relationships in his period, all raise questions which cannot be answered it must be admitted, about his sexuality.” Spong, a lover of homosexuals, brazenly attempts to find the same trait in Paul!

I have included this data on where all of this Paul bashing is coming from for your information, so you can be better prepared to confront any Paul basher with whom you may come into contact. Memorize every detail and write it down on a small sheet of paper and keep it in your pocket for a quick reference. Or if you wish, type up a document using both sides of one sheet of paper and pass it around to all of your friends. These people who are passing all of the propaganda around about Paul being a fraud must be addressed, and here is the ammunition you need to shoot them down. As you can clearly see, the Paul bashers are not keeping very good company. That is, unless you might consider a Canaanite-jew or a pastor who ordains homosexuals good company.

This charge against Paul by Clay Douglas is preposterous, as Paul wrote at Romans 1:25-28: “²⁵ **Who changed the truth of Yahweh into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen.** ²⁶ **For this cause Yahweh gave them up unto vile affections: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature:** ²⁷ **And likewise also**

the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompence of their error which was meet.²⁸ And even as they did not like to retain Yahweh in *their* knowledge, Yahweh gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient ...”

Does this sound like Paul was a homosexual or promoted it? Shame on Clayton Douglas!!! I know that Douglas is trying his best to be a good patriot, but he cancels out all of his patriotism with his Paul bashing. And in order to be a good patriot one must have a patriarch. Paul was a good patriot as he was not ashamed of being a descendant of Abraham and of being of the tribe of Benjamin! I’ve never seen any evidence of Clayton Douglas naming his patriarchs. If Clayton doesn’t honor his patriarchs – by faithfully rendering their relationship to the gospel and Paul – he hasn’t anything to be patriotic about! With Douglas it is one step forward and two steps backward, and he’s just spinning his wheels and going nowhere! And until he repents and asks forgiveness from the Almighty for his Paul bashing, he’s not gong to achieve a single thing!!! Thus, Clayton Douglas is weighed on the balances and found wanting.

This is only a sampling of what William Finck covered in my *Watchman’s Teaching Letter* #’s 88 through 106 in defense of Paul. Anyone who wants to know the entire story, get a copy of each one of these lessons. You will notice, with this last quotation, we are still in Paul’s epistle to the Romans, so we are right on target.

While we have covered some of the things which Paul taught, we will now consider some things which he didn’t. I have a book in my possession entitled *The Epistle to the Romans*, by W. Pascoe Goard. Now Goard is one of those British-Israel people who have as yet to understand the difference between the racially-mixed bad-fig-Canaanite-jews and the racially-pure good-fig-Judaeans. In some areas Goard does quite well, but in others, he comes short of the mark. So when Goard writes about these two completely dissimilar entities, he fails to differentiate between the two. To Goard Jew = Judah; and Judah = Jew. Then he goes on at long lengths to separate the house of Israel entirely from the house of Judah without giving any evidence that they should ever be united again. Goard is playing with only two entities where he should be playing with three: (1) Israel, (2) Judah, and (3) the bad-fig-jews. Then he makes statements such as: “The Jews have the law”. Show me a single place in the Bible where Yahweh gave the bad-fig-Canaanite-Edomite-jews His law! It can’t be done! Then Goard goes on to imply that Paul’s mission was to only the house of Israel. And Goard does well in explaining that the term “Gentile” should rather be *ethnos*, or *ethné*, meaning nation or nations of Israel. Well, if Paul went only to the house of Israel, why did he go to the Romans, as the Romans were by-and-large Zerah-Judah?

Such a position, that the house of Israel and the House of Judah are forever to be separate, is not what the Bible teaches. Ezekiel 37:16-22 says otherwise:

“¹⁶ Moreover, thou son of man, take thee one stick, and write upon it, For Judah, and for the children of Israel his companions: then take another stick, and write upon it, For Joseph, the stick of Ephraim, and for all the house of Israel his companions: ¹⁷ And join them one to another into one stick; and they shall become one in thine hand. ¹⁸ And when the children of thy people shall speak

unto thee, saying, Wilt thou not shew us what thou *meanest* by these? ¹⁹ Say unto them, Thus saith Yahweh *singular*-Elohim; Behold, I will take the stick of Joseph, which *is* in the hand of Ephraim, and the tribes of Israel his fellows, and will put them with him, *even* with the stick of Judah, and make them one stick, and they shall be one in mine hand. ²⁰ And the sticks whereon thou writest shall be in thine hand before their eyes. ²¹ And say unto them, Thus saith Yahweh *singular*-Elohim; Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land: ²² And I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all: and they shall be no more two nations, **neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all.**" (This two-sticks in one hand nation can only be America.)

About the same time that Paul was writing to the Romans, the bad-fig-jews at Jerusalem killed James.

The book of James at 1:1 states: "**James, a servant of Yahweh and of the Savior Yahshua Christ, to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad, greeting.**" Goard also seems not to comprehend that all of the twelve tribes were dispersed by the time Paul wrote Romans. Contrary to this, Goard's references to the "Jews" are to those who were in Judaea.

On page 16, under the subtitle "Abraham The Heir Of The World", Goard goes especially astray saying:

"It is the old story of the *Kingdom of God on the earth*, and that in Abraham in his seed 'shall all the families of the earth be blessed.'

"The door is widely open for the heathen to come into the Kingdom by declaration of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; but the covenant is still with Abraham and his seed for ever; and this is 'the anchor sure and steadfast' of the Christian faith."

All I can say is, if a heathen can come into the Kingdom by any means, the chain of the anchor is broken and we are set adrift and Yahweh's covenant to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob isn't worth the paper it is written on! There is no record that Paul ever went to any non-Israelite heathen people. Rather than going to heathen people, Paul went to the lost sheep of both Israel and Judah. It should be pointed out again that the use of the term heathen is problematic considering its origin and use as a theological term. In many cases "Israelite" is mistranslated as "heathen", promoting confusion.

Paul picks up his theme about the Israelites at Romans 9:23-26: "²³ **And that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory,** ²⁴ **Even us, whom he hath called, not of Judah only, but also of the Israel nations.** ²⁵ **As he saith also in Osee (Hosea), I will call them my people, which were not my people; and her beloved, which was not beloved.** ²⁶ **And it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people; there shall they be called the children of the living God.**"

From Romans 9, verses 23-26, Paul speaks of Ephraim-Israel, and at verses 27-29, he shifts gears and changes his subject to Judah-Israel. Ephraim is a term often used to include all ten tribes of the northern kingdom. In fact, it would be a good idea to

draw a red line with a ball-point between verses 26 and 27. Then continuing at Romans 9, verses 27 through 29 we read:

“²⁷ Esaias (Isaiah 10:21-22) also crieth concerning [Judah] -Israel, Though the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, a remnant [of Judah]-Israel shall be saved: ²⁸ For he will finish the work, and cut *it* short in righteousness: because a short work will Yahweh make upon the earth. ²⁹ And as Esaias (Isaiah) said before, Except Yahweh of Sabaoth had left us a seed, we had been as Sodoma, and been made like unto Gomorrha.”

Here Paul had cited Hos. 1:6-11; 2:23 & Isa. 10:22. To verify that Paul indeed was speaking of Ephraim-Israel at Hos. ch. 1, we will now go to Hosea 1:6-7, 9-11: “⁶ ... And *God* said unto him, Call her name Loruhamah: for I will no more have mercy upon the house of Israel; but I will utterly take them away. ⁷ But I will have mercy upon the house of Judah, and will save them by Yahweh their *singular*-Elohim, and will not save them by bow, nor by sword, nor by battle, by horses, nor by horsemen ... ⁹ Then said *God*, Call his name Loammi: for ye *are* not my people, and I will not be your *God*. ¹⁰ Yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured nor numbered; and it shall come to pass, *that* in the place where it was said unto them, Ye *are* not my people, *there* it shall be said unto them, Ye *are* the sons of the living God. ¹¹ Then shall the children of Judah and the children of Israel be gathered together, and appoint themselves one head, and they shall come up out of the land: for great *shall be the day of Jezreel.*”

Then to verify that Paul was speaking of Judah-Israel at Romans 9:27-33, all we have to do is check the context it is written in. Verses 30-31 speaks of “the Gentiles” (meaning Ephraim-Israel) not following the law and contrasts them with Judah-Israel who did follow the law, but not in righteousness (not by faith but by works). Then verses 31-33 identify Judah-Israel as “stumbling at that stumblingstone”, and that stumblingstone was the “rock of offense” representing Yahshua-Christ. So Paul was speaking of that remnant Judah nation that returned from Babylon and gradually deteriorated into a multicultural society, though a few Judaeans did keep their racial purity. This remnant nation was “cut short” in 70 A.D., when the Romans, under Titus, destroyed it. Thus, from Romans 9:23 through 33, Paul addressed the Romans concerning all the twelve tribes of Israel! Also, Paul called the Romans his “brethren”, which is from Strong’s Greek word #80, meaning “the womb”, or brothers of the womb. In all of Paul’s epistles to the lost Israel nations, he used this same Greek word a little over a hundred times, and it was not in a spiritual sense as churchianity insists.

This matter of Yahweh not having mercy on Israel while having mercy on Judah simply means that the ten northern tribes would never return back to Samaria, while a small remnant of Judah would return to Judaea for a period of about 500 years. This has nothing to do with a permanent separation of the house of Israel and the house of Judah as W. Pascoe Goard surmises. Even the last verse at Hosea 2:11 makes that quite clear. Again, this fits America, as we appoint (vote for) one head, a President, although he can only lawfully sign bills into law after they are passed by both the House

and Senate. Therefore, it is absurd to insist that Paul was speaking about some heathen “Gentiles” when he quoted Osee (Hosea). Nor were the Romans “Gentiles”!

Then at Romans 11:3-5, Paul cites Elijah the prophet found at 1 Kings 19:10 & 18, Elijah saying: “**3 Yahweh, they have killed thy prophets, and digged down thine altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life. 4 But what saith the answer of Yahweh unto him? I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to *the image of Baal.* 5 Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace.**” Who made up this particular Israel remnant (not to be confused with the Judah-Israel remnant) at Paul’s time other than those to whom Paul preached and believed the gospel and were converted to Christianity? And Paul’s Roman converts were part of that Israel remnant! It took a lot of courage in Paul’s day to come out against the gods of Rome and Greece, and many of the awakened Israelites and/or Christians had to die for their newfound belief, yet they considered such a death as a privilege.

Does this not settle absolutely beyond a shadow of a doubt that the *ethné* (“Gentiles”, or “nations” in the original) at Romans 9 through 11 were none other than Israelites of all twelve tribes? Some will say that it was only the ten tribes of the house of Israel who were divorced, but Scripture says that Israel’s sister Judah also played the harlot, and a major part of Judah went into Assyrian captivity, as did the ten northern tribes. And like Israel never returned to Samaria, neither did the major part of Judah ever return to Judaea. So Judah was also put away and punished in the same manner as Israel. Today, by-and-large the German people are the true tribe of Judah, and like Ephraim-Israel, are as numerous as the sand of the sea. There was a time when 49% of the population of the United States was comprised of German-Judah people. When one takes into consideration all of the people in the United States who are Irish or Scottish of Zerah-Judah, and add the 49% who are German, that made Judah the dominant progenitor of White people in our country. Not only that, but German nearly became the official language of the United States.

W. Pascoe Goard was incorrect when he obliquely intimated on page 52, that Assyria failed to take Judah captive. Correctly put, Assyria took all of Judah captive except the city of Jerusalem. And Jerusalem was populated by a lot of (but not all) non-Judaeans. That’s why it is recorded that the good-fig-Judaeans were taken captive by Nebuchadnezzar’s first deportation of Judaea. Goard isn’t playing with a full deck. In Goard’s book, he has a chapter on “The Jew”, from pages 6-11, and never once does he explain, that by-and-large, the people calling themselves “Jews” in Christ’s day were mixed with Canaanite and Edomite blood.

Paul knew the difference between a Canaanite-Edomite-jew and a true Judaeans when he declared at Romans 2:28-29: “²⁸ **For he is not a Judaeans, which is one outwardly; neither *is that* circumcision, which is outward in the flesh:** ²⁹ **But he *is* a Judaeans, which is one inwardly; and circumcision *is that* of the heart, in the spirit, *and not in the letter*; whose praise *is not of men, but of Yahweh.*” In other words, one could circumcise and baptize a Canaanite-Edomite-jew, but that would not change his half-breed degenerate genetics. And like Jeremiah said, one can buy forty gallons of strong lye soap and shower for forty days and forty nights, and he’ll still be a**

Canaanite-Edomite-jew! And Jeremiah was speaking of the Judaeans who had mixed their blood with the Canaanites! This can be found at Jeremiah 2:21-22: “²¹ **Yet I had planted thee [Judah] a noble vine, wholly a right seed [sperm]: how then art thou turned into the degenerate plant of a strange vine unto me?** ²² **For though thou wash thee with nitre, and take thee much soap, yet thine iniquity is marked before me, saith Yahweh *singular-Elohim*.**” Why didn’t W. Pascoe Goard cite this passage under his chapter entitled “The Jew”? Doesn’t he want to admit that the Germans are true Judah?

What we can observe with this lesson is that Paul was very accurate and cautious with what he stated. It’s just that the translators were at a loss to use the proper English wording for the Greek. Without study, we are also at a loss to read a passage in its proper context! I hope that this lesson has cleared up some of your uncertainties. Check all of these things out for yourself!