

WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER

Monthly Letter #97; May, 2006 By: Teacher Clifton A. Emahiser
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830; Ph. (419)435-2836

Fax (419-435-7571); E-mail caemahiser@sbcglobal.net

TO THOSE WHOM THE COVENANT BELONGS

A NON-UNIVERSAL CULTURE AWARENESS INSTRUCTIONAL PUBLICATION

This is a non-copyrighted teaching letter.
Please feel free to make as many copies as you wish, but not to edit.

A MONTHLY TEACHING LETTER

This is my ninety-seventh monthly teaching letter and begins my ninth year of publication. With this lesson we'll resume our defense of the apostle Paul. We have been continuing this topic starting with *WTL* #88 up until now. Those who have been following intently can clearly see, it's proving to be considerably serious. But like the old expression goes: "You ain't heard nothin yet." It should be becoming quite evident that all of this Paul-bashing is coming from the bad-fig "Jews", and at the same time, aiding and abetting their agenda. And all who fall for and promote its fallacious premise have been neutralized by the "Jew" and are no longer of any benefit to Christ or to His Kingdom! Without further ado, we shall continue again with William Finck on this topic:

Here again we shall continue to address Clayton Douglas' article *The Seduction: Judeo-Christianity Or Pauline Christianity? Saul of Tarsus: Paul. A different view*, and while I do hope that in the last four of these *Watchman's Teaching Letters* where Douglas' article has been addressed, that his deceit has already been exposed, and that his lies and his fraud are fully exhibited. Yet all of Douglas' articles about Paul must be addressed, as all of H. Graber's article was addressed, as an exhibition to Paul-bashers everywhere, that their assertions are vain, and based upon nothing but lies and misunderstandings, and that Paul of Tarsus was a true and noble man, an Israelite fulfilling the tasks which were given him to do. While I have not mentioned it until now, the irony of Douglas' title to his first Paul-bashing article, published in the December 2003 issue of his *Free American Newsmagazine*, has certainly not escaped me. Douglas would on one hand criticize the jews, and on the other use jewish sources to bash Paul. Then Douglas would offer "Judeo-Christianity" as an alternative in place of Paul, as if somehow judaism and Christianity could ever be compatible with one another in the first place! And he does this even though he himself admitted "*the fact that Judeo-Christianity is almost an oxymoron*", which I've already discussed in *WTL* #93, page 1 column A. This is only further confirmation that Clayton Douglas is not a clear thinker, that his statements are full of conflicting thoughts, and his ideas consistently clash with one another. For my part, I will esteem the teachings of Paul, and reject not only "Judeo-Christianity", but all the attacks by the jews against Truth.

<Reference #20> Clay Douglas states: ***“THE LIES.*** *In Paul’s letters (and teachings), he passionately reminds people over and over again that he is NOT a liar and that he does not lie. The God and Father of the Lord Jesus, he who is blessed forever, knows that I do not lie. (II Corinthians. 11:31-33). In what I am writing to you, before God, I do not lie! (Galatians 1:15-20) For this I was appointed, a preacher and apostle (I am telling the truth, I am not lying), a teacher of the gentiles in faith and truth (1 Timothy 2:7). I am speaking the truth in Christ, I am not lying; my conscience bears witness in the Holy Spirit that I have great sorrow and unceasing anguish in my heart. For I could wish that I myself were accursed and cut off from Christ for the sake of my brethren, my kinsmen by race (Romans 9:1-3).”*

“So, is Paul lying...or not? *If it is a lie, and you accuse me of lying, I will be forced to respond with a denial because a lie cannot and will not speak for itself. The things that motivated me to lie will motivate me to deny my lie. Then, feeling the weakness of my position, I look for something more! What more can I do? I must call forth a witness, so that you have not only my testimony, but also that of another. The scripture plainly states that everything is established at the mouth of two or three witnesses. You may have me pegged for a liar, but perhaps you will believe someone else. But on whom can I call on such short notice? To be effective, I must have a witness now! Not only so, but my witness must be a person of undisputed veracity, for it will not do to call on a reputed liar. Whose testimony would you accept immediately without question? Who? Who? Who? Ah! There is only one person right for my task ... God in heaven!*

“So, who is Paul’s witness? *(It is) understand that Paul’s denials do not constitute proof that he was lying. Many have denied in an ‘off the cuff’ manner when accused of lying, even though they were truthful. Children react this way when they accuse one another, and they frequently call on some higher authority to witness for them: ‘If you don’t believe me, ask my dad.’ They, being children, don’t think of the implications of denial, although they would understand them if they paused to reflect before responding. They may even establish a habit of denial that persists into adulthood and there continue to deny through force of habit. Perhaps we have all done it. But we are not dealing here with children or with flippant responses in face-to-face encounters. Paul was writing letters under circumstances that should have provided opportunity for reflection. I visualize him in the home of some disciple, or in prison late at night after all others have retired, sitting before the dim light of a flickering oil lamp and carefully measuring his words.”*

William Finck answers **<#20>**: Here Douglas addresses first century literature, which Paul’s letters are, and criticizes it through the distorted lens of twentieth century psychobabble. Because Paul emphatically states that he is telling the truth, or that he is not lying, then Douglas would have one believe that he must be lying. Douglas’ statements here are a classic example of Jewish “double think”, and as we shall see a little later on in Douglas’ article, of what he has the audacity here to accuse Paul, he practices himself!

Yahweh Himself is recorded as saying through the psalmist “Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me” (Psa. 89:35-36). So according to Douglas’ twisted logic, Yahweh Himself, by denying that He lied, should be considered a liar! Nay, for Paul

proclaims to us, "let Yahweh be true, but every man a liar"! If Clayton Douglas' assertions are not jewish psychobabble, then he is a mere hypocrite, for holding Paul to a higher standard than Yahweh. Here it is clear that Douglas' judgment is far from being just.

Douglas also makes much of Paul's own appeals to Yahweh, accusing Paul of childish tactics, where he attributes to Paul the attitude: "*If you don't believe me, ask my dad.*" Unlike the scoffer Douglas, there was a time when men took such public appeals to Yahweh seriously, and there are many men who still do. At one time men understood that blasphemy and impiety, along with other sins, were followed by judgment. The English word *crisis* is nothing more than a transliteration of the Greek word κρίσις (2920), which means *judgment*. There are still some men around who understand this.

We should examine the words of Paul at Galatians 1:15-20 in light of the statements of Yahshua Christ at John 5:19-38, where Yahshua asserts that He is True, and that it is Yahweh the Father who bears witness of Him. Yahshua Christ also uttered assertions that He was telling the truth in His statements, as recorded at Luke 4:25; 9:27; 12:44; 21:3; John 8:31-32, 40, 45-47; 14:6 and 18:37. Was Yahshua Christ lying? Certainly not! And neither was Paul, whom we should measure with the same standard. But since Clayton Douglas does not measure Paul with the same standard, then if he isn't employing jewish psychobabble, he's merely a hypocrite! My assertion would be that both elements are true.

Furthermore, Douglas admitted that Paul was "*in Rome nearly blind ... while under house arrest*" (see the section marked <#19> on the last page of WTL #96), yet here envisions Paul alone, writing by candlelight late at night. Yet how could this be? It is true that Paul was nearly blind, which shall soon be discussed here at length. And so Paul never wrote alone, for someone else always did the actual writing for him. Sufficient evidence of this is found at Romans 16:22; 1 Cor. 16:21; Gal. 6:11; Col. 4:18 and 2 Thess. 3:17. Can Clay Douglas get **any** of his story straight?

<Reference #21> Clay Douglas states: "*The Truth of the matter is that Paul/Saul was a Pharisee, known today as a Khazarian Zionist. From the beginning of time their philosophy and life-style has never changed. They use anyone and everyone for their purposes as set forth in the Protocols of Zion. Paul was no exception. Paul WAS persecuted, but - reportedly - not for the reasons you think. Many sources claim that Paul/Saul was a latent homosexual.*"

William Finck answers <#21>: With this short paragraph, Douglas once again openly displays his shameful lack of knowledge both of Scripture and of history. This last irrational diatribe to come from the pen of Douglas demonstrates he has not the ability to comprehend what he reads, and the reader should thus take caution when reading anything of Douglas'.

Was Paul a Khazar? The Khazars were at one time an Adamic people, who dwelt north and east of the Caspian Sea (modern Kazakhstan), far removed from Paul's world both in time and place. The later Khazar monuments show an admixture with the Hittite, for which see WTL #56, p. 3, col. A, par. 4. They were converted to Judaism beginning in the seventh century A.D., centuries after Paul's death. By no means may Paul be associated with these people. Was Paul a Zionist? *The American Heritage College Dictionary* defines zionism: "A Jewish movement that arose in the late 19th century in response to growing Anti-Semitism [sic] and sought to reestablish a Jewish

homeland in Palestine and that now concerns itself with the survival and development of the state of Israel [sic].” Can Paul be blamed for these policies? Certainly not! Rather, he taught that the Edomite-jews in Judaea were the enemy, and that they were destined to be destroyed (Rom. 9:1-13, 21-23), that the enemy had taken over the temple (2 Thess. 2), and that the Romans were to participate in their destruction (Rom. 16:20), **hardly a Zionist position!** The statements in the New Testament records concerning Paul of Tarsus are consistently opposed to Clayton Douglas’ claims concerning him. One can only wonder whether Douglas ever actually sat and read the book.

Yet most vile are Douglas’ claims concerning Paul’s sexuality: *“Many sources claim that Paul/Saul was a latent homosexual.”* Note his use of the term “many sources”, as if that alone made his statement authoritative. Note also the use of the term “latent”, of which the basic definition, again from *The American Heritage College Dictionary*, is: “1. Present or potential but not evident or active.” I must say, all men have such potential! And so in reality the term is meaningless. Yet the dictionary continues: “2. *Pathology* In a dormant or hidden stage ... 4. *Psychology* Present in the unconscious mind but not consciously expressed.” In truth “latent homosexual” is a term invented by those same purveyors of psychobabble, who seek to have such behavior to be considered “normal”, and who slander all men with that and other artificial terms such as “homophobic” if one dares to speak out against such deviancy. Was Paul a “latent”, or any other type, of homosexual? Certainly not! Yet this, along with Douglas’ source for such a slanderous remark, will be discussed further below, after we finish hearing from Douglas on the issue. First, Douglas intermixes several other topics with this vile claim, and they also must be addressed.

<Reference #22> Clay Douglas states: *“Nothing good dwells in me, that is, in my flesh. I can will what is right, but I cannot do it.” - Romans 7:18 (Paul of Tarsus). While Paul’s impact on the world is clear, the issue of his sexuality is not. He was responsible for two of the three New Testament texts specifically interpreted in the modern period as condemnation of homosexuality, and for the only reference in the Bible taken to refer explicitly to lesbianism. He was an intense, passionate man filled with tremendous self-loathing. Read some of his words: ‘I pummel my body and subdue it lest after preaching to others. [sic] I myself should be disqualified.’ - I Corinthians 9:27.”*

William Finck answers <#22>: It is clear from the record: Paul taught that self-control over one’s lusts and emotions was a necessity (i.e. Acts 24:25, where ἐγκράτεια, 1466, which means “self-control”, was translated “temperance” in the A.V. The word also appears at Gal. 5:23, and twice at 2 Pet. 1:6). Anyone who’s ever read Deuteronomy should know that such self-control was necessary to practice in Old Testament times also! And not only sexual self-control, but also self-control over facets of general behavior, such as alcohol consumption and public conversation. Yet aside from the lures of drugs or alcohol, which most if not all of us have experienced to one extent or another during our lives, there is the lure of covetousness, or lust, not only for money or property but also for the opposite sex, which we are tempted with daily. The desire for security in our finances leads us to excess, reflected by the stock market bubbles of the 1920’s and 1990’s, manifestations of the evils of lust and greed. Our egos cause us to furnish our lives with all sorts of toys and unnecessary items, and the

gross consumerism of western society today leads to our downfall (cf. Ezek. 27, Rev. 18). Yet worse than these things is sexual lust, and sexual lust of any sort! We are bombarded with sexual images daily and from many directions. The same hormones which drive us to marry and have children are triggered by our minds when we succumb to these images, and can cause us to lust. Any man who denies such must be a eunuch! All of these invitations to sin which are available today were also available in the first century, although they weren't as technologically advanced, and these Paul warned about consistently. Where Paul uses himself as an example, at Romans 7:13-25 or at 1 Corinthians 9:19-27, both of which Douglas quotes from here, he is only explaining just how difficult it is even for him to control all of these lusts. We have all, without exception, experienced these lusts! How many of us have gone to the lengths which Paul did, to maintain self-control and suppress them? The issue of Paul's sexuality should not even be called into question here, and it is slanderous to do so. Paul's statements here address things which we have all experienced, once we read them in context, and have nothing at all to do with sexual deviancy, "homosexuality", as the blasphemous Douglas is suggesting, and in the next section of his article continues to suggest, enlisting the help of his icon Bishop Spong!

<Reference #23> Clay Douglas states: *"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 relationship in his period, all raise questions which cannot be answered it must be admitted, about his sexuality."*

William Finck answers <#23>: It is apparent that Douglas has developed many of his ideas about Paul and Christianity from Bishop John Spong. Shortly we shall examine what sort of man this John Spong is, since it is evident that Clayton Douglas is more than a casual reader of Spong's many uncouth works. I must say now, once the truly pious men amongst the Paul-bashers read what we have to present about Spong, surely they'll want to reevaluate **many** of their positions! But first the immediate issues raised here by Douglas must be dealt with.

The liberal (note Isa. 32:5) bloc in this and other western nations, which is actually a motley coalition of deviants, various minority groups, and ignorant do-goody Whites, all led by the communist jews, have long been attacking not only Christianity but all of the pillars and icons of Western civilization. One of their common tactics is to portray a corrupt and decadent portrait of one of our heroes, usually with little or no solid evidence, slandering that hero as some sort of deviant or hypocrite. In that manner, once the masses are convinced by the media, their own decadent behavior is eventually accepted and absorbed into the public perception of "normal". While this is only one method of their attacks on us, it is effective. It is more than a coincidence that the word "devil" in the N.T. in Greek is often δίαβολος (1228), which means in truth "false accuser". They did this recently with Thomas Jefferson by claiming that he fathered a child by a negress. In truth, they knew that the DNA evidence pointed to only one of several dozen possible male Jeffersons of the era as the culprit, but that didn't

stop them because they *wanted* it to be Thomas. In reality, the historical evidence points instead to his carousing brother Randolph Jefferson, but the media blitz is long over, the icon is soiled, and the masses will never hear the evidence. Thomas wasn't perfect, but he was no miscegenist. The desired result is only that once enough great White men can be shown to have been miscegenists, why should it remain taboo for the rest of us? Ditto for homosexuality and other deviant practices. This is just one tactic of the communists' culture war against our race, brought to us by deviants and jews, the so-called "intelligentsia".

These vile 'liberals' have a problem with Paul, because Paul made it absolutely, unequivocally clear that sexual deviancy and Christianity have nothing in common, thus being impossible to accept together. And if the deviants cannot be Christians, how can they then corrupt Christianity? Although they've tried for centuries, never could they destroy it from without! So in this modern age they've put forth polluted translations of Scripture, perverting and corrupting the text more and more with each new edition, in order to blur the lines of righteousness and the vision of the readers, circumventing the Truth. Then they destroy the reputation of the writers so that once the truth does come out, it isn't received with credibility in the minds of the masses! Paul, foremost defender of the gospel of Christ, is in this day the foremost target of the jews and the deviants, and all Paul-bashers are their accomplices, **wittingly** or **unwittingly**!

Here are Paul's remarks from his epistles in reference to deviant sexual behavior, which I shall take from my own translation of Paul because I believe that I have rendered the Greek as clearly as possible, which is especially important in these instances:

- Romans 1:26-32: ²⁶ **Therefore Yahweh handed them over to a state of disgrace, for both their females exchanged their natural intimacy for that contrary to nature, ²⁷ and likewise the males have given up the natural intimacy of the female, inflamed in their desires for one another, males with males perpetrating shamefulness, and their wandering necessitates the reward they are receiving among themselves. ²⁸ And just as they do not think it fit to have Yahweh in their knowledge, Yahweh handed them over to a reprobate mind, to do things not fitting; ²⁹ being filled with all injustice, fornication, greediness, wickedness; full of envy, murder, strife, treachery, malignity, slanderers, ³⁰ loud talkers, haters of Yahweh, insolent, arrogant, pretentious, contrivers of evil, disobedient to parents, ³¹ void of understanding, covenant breakers, heartless, merciless; ³² such as these who knowing the judgments of Yahweh, that they practicing such things are worthy of death, not only they who cause them, but also they approving of those committing them.** (The parallels with the apostasy and deviancy of this present time are not coincidental.)
- 1 Cor. 6:9-10: ⁹ **Or do you not know that the unjust will not inherit the kingdom of Yahweh? Do not be led astray: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor homosexuals, ¹⁰ nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor railers, nor rapacious shall inherit the kingdom of Yahweh.**
- 1 Tim. 1:9-11: ⁹ **Knowing this, that law is not laid down for righteous, but for lawless and unruly, impious and wrongful, unholy and profane, patricidal and matricidal, murderous, ¹⁰ fornicating, homosexual, kidnapping, lying, falsely swearing men, along with anything else which is contrary to sound instruction ¹¹**

according to the good message of the honor of the Blessed Yahweh, which I have been entrusted with.”

In both cases in which it appears, the word “homosexual” is from the Greek ὁμοσευκοίτης (733), used in this same manner throughout Classical writings. The 9th edition of the Liddell & Scott *Greek English Lexicon* succinctly defines the word “sodomite”. It should also be evident, that the law which Paul referred to at 1 Tim. 1:9 is certainly the Old Testament law, whereby he clearly demonstrated an obeisance to its principles.

While it shall soon be demonstrated that John Spong certainly is a member of the jewish-liberal bloc seeking to corrupt forever our race and civilization, first his remarks above concerning Paul must be addressed. Douglas states that “*Spong believes Paul’s fiery manner of writing was his method of dealing with his own homosexuality*”. This is clearly unprovable, undocumentable psychobabble contrived to be false support for further untrue accusations. It is typical jew calumny. As for Paul’s not marrying, he explains the reasons for such himself at 1 Cor. 9:1-23, not wanting to have any hindrance in the task to which he was assigned: the spreading of the gospel of Christ. How many men have sacrificed carnal desires, wife and family, for God and country and other noble pursuits? Were they all homosexuals? Certainly not! And neither was Paul! Yet I shall resort to another comparison with Yahshua Christ, for neither did He marry! Not accusing Christ, which would certainly be blasphemous, Douglas and Spong are mere hypocrites instead. “Marriage is valuable in every way” wrote Paul (Heb. 13:4), and advised Timothy that bishops and ministers must be married, and have faithful children, since if they couldn’t govern their own families well then they certainly weren’t qualified to govern the household of Yahweh (1 Tim. 3:1-13).

Again, Douglas and Spong accuse Paul of having “*companionship with a series of younger men*”, thereby throwing a blanket accusation of homosexuality over all of the associates of Paul! Calumny indeed! In the laws of Yahweh, which Paul certainly invoked, as quoted above, “If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman ... they shall surely be put to death” (Lev. 20:13, cf. Lev. 18:22; Deut. 23:17), and it is also written that “... *if the witness be a false witness, and hath testified falsely against his brother; Then ye shall do unto him, as he had thought to have done unto his brother...*”, or in other words, if one makes a false accusation for which the penalty is death, the accuser suffers the penalty instead! I pray that Yahweh grants Douglas and Spong the rewards of their labors, and quickly! Let all the followers of Douglas and Spong consider this, and beware! And again I must say that Yahshua Christ Himself chose out many young men to be His apostles. Douglas and Spong wouldn’t dare accuse Him! So instead, they are again revealed to be hypocrites!

As for Douglas and Spong’s contention concerning Paul’s “unnamed” thorn in the flesh, first we must ask, was it truly unnamed? Surely the jews and liberals would like us to think it was unnamed, so that they can use it as another false support for their attacks on Christianity. Paul mentions his “thorn in the flesh” at 2 Cor. 12:7. This again is from my own translation:

“⁷ And in order that I would not be exalted in the excellence of the revelations, a thorn in the flesh has been given to me, an adverse messenger, that it would strike me in order that I would not be exalted. ⁸ Three times I have exhorted the Prince concerning this, that it may depart from me, ⁹ and He told me,

‘My favor is enough for you; since the power is perfected in weakness’” (2 Cor. 12:7-9).

In weakness, not in sodomy! Paul didn’t necessarily have to tell the Corinthians what his “thorn in the flesh was”, for they probably already knew. Paul had spent some time in Corinth (Acts 18) and had written them not only once before (1 Cor.), but at least twice (see 1 Cor. 5:9, 2 Cor. 7:8), and at least one of his letters to them is lost. Yet we must examine something Paul wrote to the Galatians after he had visited them:

“¹³ Now you know that in sickness of the flesh I had announced the good message to you earlier, ¹⁴ and of my trial in my flesh you did not despise or loathe, but as a messenger of Yahweh you accepted me, like Yahshua Christ. ¹⁵ Then what is your blessing? I testify to you that, if possible, your eyes being extracted you would have given them to me.” (Gal. 4:13-15).

Now any honest man, or even a child, can see that Paul’s “thorn in the flesh” was nothing more than his failed eyesight! To make anything more of it is not only dishonest, but purposely slanderous! Spong and his disciple, Clayton Douglas, are both guilty of such deceit!

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 ravenous 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.”**

As we shall see, this is not the only connection associated with Paul-bashing and Newark, New Jersey. Not that that should be a bad reflection in any way upon any of the good citizens of Adamic-culture from that state. Clayton Douglas’ Paul-bashing articles in the December 2003 and January 2004 issues of his *Free American News-*

magazine state: “*Bishop John S. Spong (Episcopal Bishop of Newark): ‘Paul’s words are not the Words of God. They are the words of Paul - a vast difference!’*” Thus, we have one Paul-basher in the person of Clayton Douglas quoting another Paul-basher in the person of “Bishop John S. Spong”. It is paramount, therefore, to investigate the tenets of this “Bishop John S. Spong” from Newark, New Jersey, which we will now examine. To fully investigate this “Bishop” Spong will be no short task. Anyone who would like to verify what is about to be revealed here can go to the web site:

www.dioceseofnewark.org/jsspong/jssbiog.html

At this web site one will find a biography of John Shelby Spong, and from that biography one can decide if it is advisable and proper to be associated with such an evil person. One will find at this web site that John Shelby Spong is a member of the “House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church in the United States.” No insignificant position, and a vast realm of influence!

Spong was born 1931 at Charlotte, NC; where he also attended public school; graduated from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1952, and received his Master of Divinity from the Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary in Virginia in 1955, which later conferred on him, along with St. Paul’s College, “honorary Doctor of Divinity” degrees. He then served as rector of St. Joseph’s Church in Durham, NC, 1955-1957; rector of Calvary Parish, Tarboro, NC, 1957-1965; rector of St. John’s Church at Lynchburg, VA, 1965-1969; rector of St. Paul’s Church, Richmond, VA, 1969-1976; consecrated bishop June 12, 1976. Spong’s influence has touched a wide variety of official authority serving on committees and commissions. He was editor of *The North Carolina Churchman*; president of the Standing Committee; three times deputy to the General Convention; he has been president of the New Jersey Council of Churches; consultant, Episcopal Radio & Television Foundation; consultant, Standing Liturgical Commission; member, Overseas Review Committee of the national church; elected 1973 to six-year term Executive Council, next highest governing body under the General Convention; appointed by Presiding Bishop Edmond Browning to serve on the Standing Commission on Human Affairs and Health; serves on the House of Bishop’s Theology Committee; elected Quatercentenary Scholar, Emmanuel College, Cambridge University, 1991; guest lecturer, Oxford University, United Kingdom, 1993. Also, Spong takes an active interest in sports, including play-by-play radio announcer for stations in Tarboro, NC and Lynchburg, VA for the three major sports; also serving as sports editor for the *Daily Southerner* at Tarboro.

In addition to the above web site, one might also check the web sites:

www.dioceseofnewark.org/jsspong/reform.html
www.dioceseofnewark.org/antiracistmothers.html
newark.rutgers.edu/~lcrew/spong_cv.html
www.dioceseofnewark.org/jsspong/profile.html

More on John Spong and his evil intrigues in the next lesson. This should start to reveal from what kind of a malignant atmosphere Paul-bashing has its origin, which should be shunned at all costs.

