

WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER

Monthly Letter #101; September, 2006 By: Teacher Clifton A. Emahiser
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830; Ph. (419)435-2836

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

TO THOSE WHOM THE COVENANT BELONGS

A NON-UNIVERSAL CULTURE AWARENESS INSTRUCTIONAL PUBLICATION

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

A MONTHLY TEACHING LETTER

This is my one hundred and first 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. Why anyone would want to be associated with such worthless scum of society is hard to imagine, yet these iniquitous slime-balls seem to gain a following among those in Israel Identity who should know better and brush their fallacious accusations aside. Since Yahshua Christ Himself praised the Ephesian assembly at Rev. 2:1-8, (except for losing their "first love"), He in effect was praising its founder, Paul! To get down to business on this subject of Paul-bashing, we will again turn to the German, William Finck:

Here again we shall continue to address Clayton Douglas' article *The Seduction: Judeo-Christianity OR Pauline Christianity? Saul of Tarsus: Paul. A different view*, which he published in the December, 2003 issue of his *Free American Newsmagazine*, and while we are approaching the end of Douglas' article there are still quite a few things to address. It seems that Douglas, like many Paul-bashers, will stop at nothing to discredit Paul, manufacturing all sorts of evidence and presenting a totally perverted and corrupted viewpoint of the Scriptures and other ancient writings in order to make something stick out of his nefarious list of charges.

In the section of his article which follows, Douglas offers a perverted interpretation of some lines from the Dead Sea Scrolls, which I shall discuss at length. While it cannot be substantiated here, Douglas seems to get these particular ideas from Joseph Jeffers and his successor Philip B. Evans, both so-called "Doctors", of an organization which they call "Yahweh's New Kingdom" based in Prescott, Arizona. Douglas is also from Arizona. Both Jeffers and Evans claim to be prophets, offer contorted versions of history, and are Paul-bashers, universalists, and inventors of tales. Their work may be addressed later in this series. For now we shall continue with Douglas' articles.

<Reference #43> Clay Douglas states: "*Perhaps most damning of all, are the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Dead Sea Scrolls were written by the Essenes (the first*

'Christians'), and are the only surviving literature of theirs. In them, they rant about a 'Liar' and a 'Spouter of Lies', that is changing and perverting their teachings for his own purposes. Researchers have shown conclusively that this 'Liar' or 'Spouter of Lies' was Saul of Tarsus (aka 'Saint Paul'), the FOUNDER of Christianity, and the main conspirator in this plot ... He was taking their little religion (which was never meant for 'other nations'), and twisting it to make it more appealing to them ... This information was so explosive that the Dead Sea Scrolls and their translations were kept under wraps for decades in fear that 'they would shake the foundations of Western religion' ..."

William Finck answers <#43>: First, there is no substantial evidence that the Dead Sea Scrolls were written by Essenes. Reading the professional archaeology journals, scholars and academics refer to the authors of the scrolls as the Qumran sect or the Dead Sea sect, and such is proper since a definite identification of these people with any of the historically known sects of Judaea cannot be made. Most of the Dead Sea Scrolls fall into one of several categories, which I would generally identify as follows: a) Copies or targums of Biblical books; b) Copies or targums of known apocryphal books; c) Sectarian commentaries on Biblical books; d) Prayers and prophecies peculiar to the sect; e) Scrolls of instruction for and governance of the members of the sect. There are some other miscellaneous documents, such as the calendrical documents, or the *Copper Scroll* which is a description of buried treasure which the sect supposedly had in various places, which don't really fit into one of these categories. Most of the scrolls are numbered in the fashion #Q#, where the first number is the cave where the scroll was said to be found, 1 through 11, and the second a serial number of the scrolls and/or fragments from each particular cave. Additionally, many of the notable scrolls also have a familiar name. For example, the *Copper Scroll* mentioned above is 3Q15.

Josephus' description of the Essenes, found at *Wars* 2.8.2-3 (2: 119-122) is very much like Luke's of some of the first Christians (Acts 2:44-45; 4:32-37), yet that does not necessarily mean that these first Christians were Essenes, or that Essenes were the first Christians. While some of the sectarian documents found at Qumran do indicate that the possessions of sect members were controlled by the sect and not by the individual, such as *4QRule of the Community*, i.e. 4Q256 Col. IX (frag. 4) and 4Q258 Col. I (frags. 1a1, 1b), so it may appear that these people were Essenes, yet such communal societies were certainly not novel and occurred elsewhere. For instance, Diodorus Siculus said of certain Greek colonists at Lipara that they "took over the cultivation of the islands which they had made the common property of the community ... their possessions also they made common property, and living according to the public mess system, they passed their lives in this communistic fashion for some time" (Loeb Library edition, 5.9.4-5). Diodorus wrote from about 50 B.C., and so it is quite possible that other groups besides the Essenes lived in a communal fashion, this way of life known among both Greeks and Hebrews.

Yet others of the Qumran documents suggest that these people did not live in a truly communal manner, such as *4QInstruction*, at 4Q416 Fragment 2 and 4Q417 Fragment 1 which discuss the borrowing of necessities, and advise of the need to repay such loans as quickly as possible. These do not seem to be Essene teachings, since in a community where all things are held in common there should be no need for

borrowing, or to make repayment for what one requires. This is especially true if the Qumran sect was as wealthy as the treasures which are listed on the *Copper Scroll* purports it to be.

Some may point to a certain passage in Pliny's *Natural History*, at 5:73, which seems to support the identity of Qumran as an Essene settlement, yet there is much dispute concerning this passage, for which see *Biblical Archaeology Review*, July-August 2002, p. 18, "Searching for Essenes" for the details of this argument. Josephus testified that the Essenes "have no certain city, but many of them dwell in every city; and if any of their sect come from other places, what they have lies open for them, just as if it were their own ..." (*Wars* 2.8.4). And so there are difficulties with identifying the members of the Qumran sect as Essenes.

The *War Scroll* found in 4Q491 through 4Q497 and some other Qumran scrolls, peculiar to the Qumran sect, was written by a vain and false prophet who described a grandiose apocalyptic scenario depicting a final battle between the remnant of Israel in Palestine and the "Empire of the Kittim", which was the name that the sect gave to the Romans, also sometimes called the "Empire of Belial" (i.e. 4Q491 Fragments 8-10 Col. I). This battle was to end with the aggrandizement of the remnant of Israel, which they saw as their own sect, and the fall of Rome. The sect interpreted parts of Isaiah chapter 10 in this same manner, for which see 4Q161 Fragments 8-10. Since the Qumran sect seemed to know nothing of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans in 70 A.D., and even mentions the city on occasion, (i.e. 4Q504, Fragments 1-2, Col. IV) the *War Scroll* requires a dating for the Qumran sect somewhere between Pompey's conquest of Judaea where it was subjected to Rome, and the revolt from Rome beginning about 65 A.D. which resulted in Jerusalem's destruction in 70 A.D., a period of about 132 years. Since the scrolls lack mention of any contemporary historical figures or specific historic events, I know nothing (though others may) by which the scrolls can be dated more precisely. There was a fourth large sect in Judaea, that of Judas the Galilaian, which Josephus said was noted for their refusal to heed any authority but God, and also for inspiring revolt from Rome. Josephus describes them at *Antiquities* 18.1.6 (18:23-25). This is in such agreement with the Qumran sect's apocalyptic documents that this sect is as good a candidate for Qumran as the Essenes.

Yet one thing is certain, and that is that there is no mention of Christ or anything Christian in the Qumran scrolls, and even if the sect had heard about Christianity, they surely made no mention of it. Even if Essenes were among the first Christians, and even if the people of Qumran were Essenes, the people of Qumran were not Christian! The people of Qumran were still awaiting the Messiah, who would lead them in the destruction of the Kittim (their name for the Romans), as evident in the eschatological scroll *4QSefer ha-Milhamah*, or 4Q285 Fragment 5, and in many places elsewhere.

The Qumran sect's post-Apocalyptic *New Jerusalem* scroll (parts of which are found in 1Q32; 2Q24; 4Q232, 365a, 554, 554a, 555; 5Q15 and 11Q18) talks about Passover sacrifices and offerings (i.e. 11Q18 Fragments 16, 17 and 27), so the Christian understanding of Daniel 9:24-27 and 1 Cor. 5:7 is wanting at Qumran. Other scrolls, such as *4QRitual of Purification B* (4Q512) and *4QOrdinances* (4Q514) place an emphasis on ritual purification (baptism), which after the baptism of John we see Christ rejecting before the Pharisees (i.e. Mark 7:1-23). The Qumran sect, while anti-

Roman and separatist, surely clung to traditional Judaism. While not Pharisees, neither were they Sadducees since they believed in spirits and the continued life of the soul after the death of the body, things which the Sadducees fully rejected (*Antiquities* 18.1.4; Acts 23:8). Now it should be apparent that while the Dead Sea Scrolls may have been produced during the time of Paul of Tarsus, this is not necessarily so, and since the sect was surely not Christian, nor were they anti-Christian, having no apparent knowledge of Christ, they certainly had no reason at all to make any reference to Paul of Tarsus in their writings.

The Dead Sea Scrolls are an enigma to most people, who will never have the time or the initiative to read them. The fullest published edition of the scrolls is *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, Oxford University Press, which is 38 volumes the last time I read about it but may be even more now. Notice above that Douglas uses the phrase “*Researchers have shown conclusively*”, and makes claims without making any citations or any display of the content which those claims are based upon. In following this manner of criteria, one may say almost anything since nearly all of the intended audience will not or simply can not check the authenticity of such blanket claims: indeed since no references are given one must read the entire body of literature (sometimes several volumes) to check them! The edition of the scrolls which I am using for all of the citations here is *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* by Florentino G. Martinez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar. This edition offers a catalogue of all the scrolls which contain copies of Biblical books, listing the full contents, and also a Hebrew (or Aramaic or Greek) transcription and English translation of all the scrolls which are not merely copies of the Biblical books. So in two volumes all of the targums, apocryphae, sectarian documents and other literature of Qumran are fully reproduced. Yet where I supply the common identifiers of the scrolls to which I am referring (i.e. 4Q285), one should be able to check my citations for himself in any comprehensive scholarly edition of the scrolls, to see the text in its original context. Why hasn't Douglas done the same? Chances are, it's because he can't, for his lies would be exposed!

Douglas states that in the scrolls the writers “... rant about a ‘Liar’ and a ‘Spouter of Lies’,” and that “*Researchers have shown conclusively that this ‘Liar’ ... was Saul of Tarsus.*” Now the scrolls do mention a “Spreader of the Lie” (1QPesher to Micah or 1Q14 Frags. 8-10), a “Teacher of Lies” (4QIsaiah Pesher or 4Q163 Frags. 4-6 Col. I), a “Man of the Lie” (1QPesher to Habakkuk or 1QpHab Cols. II and V), and a “Man of Lies” (4QPsalms Pesher or 4Q171 Cols. I and IV). Also mentioned in the Pesharim (plural for Pesher) is a “Wicked Priest” (i.e. 1QpHab, Cols. I, IX, and XII). These Pesharim, or interpretations of Old Testament books, are the only places in the Dead Sea Scrolls where I have found the terms “Spreader of the Lie”, “Man of the Lie” or “Man of Lies”; hardly viable evidence identifying Paul of Tarsus! Here we shall investigate some of these instances:

- 1Q14 contains parts of an interpretation of Micah chapter 1. From fragments 8-10: “What are the high places of Judah? Is it not Jerusalem? I will reduce Samaria to a country ruin, to a plot of vines. Its interpretation concerns the **Spreader of the Lie who has misdirected the simple.**”

- 4Q171 contains parts of an interpretation of Psalm 37. From Column I: “... the arrogant ones choose ... who love slovenliness and misdirect ... wickedness at the hands of Ephraim. Be silent before YHWH and wait for him, do not be annoyed with

one who has success, with someone who hatches plots. Its interpretation concerns the **Man of Lies who misdirected many** with deceptive words ...”

So here it should be fully manifest, that the epithets “Spreader of the Lie” or “Man of Lies” as used in the Dead Sea Scrolls cannot possibly be referring to Paul of Tarsus, unless one wants to believe **that Paul was alive in the days of Micah**, having misdirected the people of Samaria! and **that Paul was alive in the days of David**, having misdirected the children of Ephraim! Yet hopefully it has been shown here again and again, that Clayton Douglas can invent and believe just about anything that suits his own purpose.

Often in these very same Pesharim this Liar is contrasted to the “Teacher of Righteousness”, such as at 1QpHab, an interpretation of the prophet Habakkuk, in Columns II and V. It is clear in other Pesharim that this “Teacher of Righteousness” is no contemporary man or sect leader, but is rather an epithet for the expected Messiah. From *4QIsaiah Pesher*, 4Q165 Fragments 1-2 which contain an interpretation of Isaiah 40:11: “The interpretation of the word concerns the Teacher of Righteousness who reveals just teachings” (cf. John 4:24-26). Since the Qumran sect had not yet met their Messiah, and knew nothing of Yahshua Christ, their Liar certainly cannot be Paul of Tarsus. Rather, it is clear from the context of the Pesharim that “Spreader of the Lie”, or “Man of Lies”, or “Man of the Lie” is another epithet for Satan, the Adversary, i.e. Genesis 3:4-5, John 8:44. In all fairness, no other identification could possibly be made within the context which the scrolls themselves provide. While in other instances the epithet “Teacher of Righteousness” indicates a much earlier prophet or leader of the people, such as in the *Damascus Document*, or CD-B, Column XX, another copy of which is *4QDamascus Document* or 4Q266, where the epithet occurs in Fragment 2, Column 1, yet since these certainly do not refer to Yahshua Christ, neither can any of the antagonists mentioned there be imagined to be Paul of Tarsus.

That the “*Dead Sea Scrolls and their translations were kept under wraps for decades in fear that ‘they would shake the foundations of Western religion’*” is a blatant lie which cannot be substantiated. The scrolls were first discovered in 1947, and they were collected and deposited in a museum in the West Bank region of Palestine, where for twenty years they were studied by western scholars, and photographs were made of all the scrolls and fragments. In 1967, during the six-day war when the Jews seized control of the West Bank, it was they who seized control of the museum that the scrolls were housed in, having restricted access to all but a select few of their own scholars. In the early 1990’s the Jews again began to grant access to the scrolls to others. This story is well known and can be found in books such as *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* by Geza Vermes, a Jew who was also denied access to the scrolls during the 25 year period in which they were restricted. It is hardly conceivable that the Jews would cut off access to the scrolls in order to protect Christianity, and books about the scrolls and their contents had already been published, such as *The Scrolls From The Dead Sea*, by Edmund Wilson in 1955. If anything, the Jews would only want to make certain that nothing could get out which exposed the lies which they tell about themselves for the frauds which they are.

<Reference #44> Clay Douglas states: “*Take heed that no man deceive you’ ... ‘Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep’s clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves.’*”

“The primary Pharisee-inspired Myth which is incorporated into Pauline Laws is the Myth/Hoax that Jesus’ death would - forevermore - cleanse us of our sins. As long as we have ‘faith’. Come on. Do you really believe this to be true? Do you believe that ‘Grace’ allows a pedophile murderer of children to enter The Kingdom at the very same time as the God-fearing man, who upheld God’s Laws and Commandments all his life? Do you really accept this to be true? As long as the Abortion Doctor ‘repents’ and gives himself to Jesus, that God will accept him into the Kingdom of Heaven? Does this really make a lick of sense to you? It does not to me.”

William Finck answers <#44>: It is absolutely evident that while all of the Paul-bashers very often cite “the law and the prophets” which Christ came to fulfill, evidently these people have read neither the law nor the prophets! Speaking of the children of Israel and of Judah (but not the jews), Yahweh says: “And I will cleanse them from all their iniquity, whereby they have sinned against me; and I will pardon all their iniquities, whereby they have sinned, and whereby they have transgressed against me.” (Jer. 33:8). “Neither shall they defile themselves any more with their idols, nor with their detestable things, nor with any of their transgressions: but I will save them out of all their dwelling places, wherein they have sinned, and will cleanse them: so shall they be my people, and I will be their God.” (Ezek. 37:23). There are no exceptions expressed in these Scriptures, and so Paul said “all Israel shall be preserved” (Rom. 11:26), teaching nothing which hadn’t been uttered by Yahweh Himself. Disputing this, Clayton Douglas again disputes with Yahweh and with the entire Bible, not merely with Paul. Of course Paul, like Yahweh, also meant no one else but the children of Israel, as he taught in nearly all of his epistles. Paul’s ideas of faith, favor (‘grace’) and salvation were discussed already, where Douglas raised the issue in section <#37> of this response, in WTL #100. There we also saw that Paul taught that sinners would not be admitted into the Kingdom of Heaven, clearly evident in his remarks at 1 Cor. 6:9-11; Gal. 5:19-21 and Eph. 5:5. Yet it should be evident that the true target of Douglas’ diatribe is not Paul, but Christianity itself, and so Douglas is willing to offer corrupt interpretations of just about anything in order to deceive his readers, and even become a follower of the jews and sexual deviants in doing so!

<Reference #45> Clay Douglas states: *“A basic Law of the Cosmos is that of Cause and Effect, which states that for every cause there is an effect, and for every effect there is a cause. Farmers know this law when they reap what they have sown. This holds true in all of creation. Why then would we not be held accountable for our own free-will choices?”*

William Finck answers <#45>: Paul knew all about cause and effect, and stated as much in his epistles. One instance is Galatians 6:7-8: “Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting.” These words are certainly not out of line with those of Yahshua Christ, such as those recorded at Matt. 6:19-21: “Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal: But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal: For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also.” The teachings of Paul were fully coherent with the teachings of Yahshua Christ.

<Reference #46> Clay Douglas states: “How could we expect the blood of a dead man, God’s son or otherwise, to magically remove our responsibility for our evil deeds? Why would we not be held accountable under the cosmic law of cause and effect for our own wrongful choices? Why/how could we be ‘raptured’ home?”

William Finck answers <#46>: There are several aspects to the Passion of Christ which are quite lengthy and shall not be discussed here. One has to do with the “devil”, a word which is actually often διάβολος (diabolos, 1228) and which means “False Accuser” when accompanied with an article (i.e. “the”), being used as a Substantive. This is the “accuser of our brethren” of Rev. 12:10 and has to do with the reason why certain spirits were “in prison” (1 Pet. 3:19). When the children of the devil (the jews, John 8:44, Matt. 27:25) murdered Yahweh Himself, whom Yahshua Christ was, the accusations of the Adversary against the children of Yahweh could not stand, and He was then able to free their spirits (1 Pet. 3:18-19, 4:6) once they accepted His gospel: that He let Himself be murdered by the Adversary (“Satan”) in order to redeem them. This is an important facet of the crucifixion which can’t possibly be understood unless one first understands two-seedline! Because the Romish church, and all of its daughters, do not understand this, they substitute false doctrine in its place, things which Paul certainly did not teach.

Another aspect of the crucifixion is the relationship which Yahweh had with Israel. Yahshua Christ came only for the “lost sheep” of the house of Israel (Matt. 15:24), the New Covenant was made with only Israel and Judah (Jer. 31:31-33), and Paul went only to those nations descended from the Old Testament Israelites, as discussed in the response to the Paul-basher H. Graber at section <H>, WTL #90, and in section <#7> of this Douglas response in WTL #94.

Yahweh married Himself to the nation of Israel, and as a condition Israel agreed to submit to the Old Covenant, of which the Old Testament law was a part. Exodus chapter 19 contains what may be considered the oldest prenuptial agreement on record. That Yahweh was married to Israel, and gave Israel a bill-of-divorce when Israel had wholly transgressed the law and the terms of the agreement is evident at Isaiah 50:1-2; 54:1-7; Jer. 2:32; 3:1-11; 31:31-32; Hos. 1:1-11 and 2:1-13. Yet the law of divorcement was not part of the original laws of Yahweh, nor is it mentioned in the Levitical law, but was permitted later for reasons explained by Christ at Mark 10:4-12. Reading the law of divorcement as it is at Deut. 24:1-4, once Israel became polluted by joining to the false gods of the other races, Yahweh could not take Israel back!

Yet Yahweh did promise to remarry Israel, as is evident at Isa. 49:18; 61:10; 62:5 and Hosea 2:14-20. Yahweh, as Yahshua Christ, died so that Israel could remarry another, the risen Christ, thereby fulfilling the letter of the law, and for which see Rom. 7:1-6; 2 Cor. 11:2; 1 Pet. 2:9-10 (v. 10 being a reference to Hos. 1:9-11) and Rev. 19:6-10; 21:9-12 and 22:17. The parable at Luke 16:16-18 is another assurance that Yahshua Christ accepts no one but the children of Israel, regardless of who else tries to press into the Kingdom. So once Yahweh died on the cross, Israel was released from the Old Covenant agreement made during the Exodus, to be remarried to Yahshua Christ after His resurrection upon acceptance of the New Covenant. Once this is understood, the truth of Paul’s teaching concerning sin and the law in Romans chapters 6 and 7 and elsewhere is fully apparent. Clayton Douglas and the rest of the

Paul-bashers, not understanding these things – and in part due to all of the false ‘church’ teachings on the subject – would rather scoff than study.

<Reference #47> Clay Douglas states: “(Romans 11:32) ‘For God has consigned all men to disobedience, that he may have mercy upon all.’ (Paul of Tarsus)”

William Finck answers **<#47>**: First, “men” here must be taken in context: Paul is only talking about Adamic, or Caucasian man (Romans 5:14-21), and of those only the men who were foreknown and predestinated by Yahweh (Romans 8:28-39), which as the Old Testament prophets show again and again can only be the children of Israel (i.e. Amos 3:2). So Paul is only talking about Israelite men, who were the only men under the law and expected to be obedient in the first place! Now, which Israelite – male or female – can claim to have never been disobedient in any way? I wouldn’t dare imagine one, and especially not myself, for I am no exception. James said: “For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one *point*, he is guilty of all” (2:10). How could Clayton Douglas dispute this? Does he imagine himself to be wholly obedient to all of the law? One of his own websites, www.azthunderriders.com, surely indicates otherwise.

<Reference #48> Clay Douglas states: “In stark contrast to Paul’s teaching of salvation by faith *APART FROM* behavioral manifestations, Jesus (in Matt. 7:21-27), state [sic] unequivocally that the mere profession of accepting him is not enough, but that such a profession *MUST BE* backed up by deeds. So, why in the world do Christians everywhere make the absurd claim that entry to Heaven is absolutely guaranteed by anyone, and I mean anyone, just verbalizing that they’ve accepted Jesus as their Savior? How could Paul - or anyone - convince us of this blasphemous humanistic nonsense? This question is a moot point. After all, the bottomline is everyone *HAS - INDEED - ACCEPTED THIS SLEIGHT-OF-HAND SORCERY. Correct?*”

William Finck answers **<#48>**: It has already been elucidated here, in section **<#37>** of this response in *WTL #100*, that Paul deemed one’s behavior as an integral part of one’s faith. Douglas is absolutely misrepresenting Paul’s teachings in this respect, as he has done in so many others. All of the words of Yahshua Christ were to Paul a most important part of that faith (1 Tim. 6:3-6). Paul certainly did not teach that “... anyone, just verbalizing that they’ve accepted Jesus” can gain “entry to Heaven.” Rather, it is wholly evident that Israel was favored solely for genetic reasons, and everyone else is excluded, and such has been shown from Paul’s writing, the gospels, and the Old Testament prophets again and again throughout both this response and the earlier response to the Paul-bashing H. Graber. The “*SLEIGHT-OF-HAND SORCERY*” is the fault of organized religion, the Romish catholic church and her daughters, which Paul certainly cannot be blamed for. It would be much more productive an endeavor if the Paul-bashers studied Paul instead, and learning the truths of the matters placed the blame where it belongs: on the modern judaized churches and seminaries which have produced devoted humanists such as John Spong.

I had hoped to finish my response to Douglas’ first article here, but there remain a few paragraphs which demand critical attention, and I would be remiss in my Christian duty if I did otherwise! In the next *Watchman’s Teaching Letter* we shall finish with this

article and begin responding to the second of Douglas' Paul-bashing articles, which although shorter may even be more deceitful than his first.

All of the devices of the Paul-bashers fail upon an honest investigation of the facts. That the Paul-bashers' real issue is with Christianity itself, and not with Paul, should be fully evident throughout these responses. And this should be no surprise, since we have seen that both Graber and Douglas rely upon a host of Jewish, anti-Christ, and Socialist sources (as did W. G. Finlay) in order to make their cases. Anti-Paulism is only a stepping-stone for these Paul-bashers. They truly desire to dissuade as many of us as possible in what is really just another attempt by the Jews to divide and conquer the last remnants of true Christendom. Oh, how the Jews must rejoice with glee when they observe us snagging onto their bait, and swallowing it hook, line and sinker! These arguments would never have gone anywhere until recently, for until recently, most people had more sense than to listen to a Jew ranting about anything Christian! If H. Graber and Clayton Douglas aren't themselves Jews, they surely have become their followers and their tools, just like W. G. Finlay, Joseph Jeffers, Philip Evans, and the whole lot of these rash and obstinate fools! *W.R.F.*

Some may condemn such rhetoric as unessential and unproductive in building the Kingdom, but Scripture testifies otherwise! Even the Nigerian-lover and complete imbecile Ted R. Weiland in his *Eve, Did She Or Didn't She?*, on page 1, said: "Spiritual leaders are admonished by the Scriptures to address false doctrine, especially doctrine injurious to the gospel of Yahshua the Christ – Titus 1:7-14."

This passage says: "⁷ For a bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God; not selfwilled, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre; ⁸ But a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate; ⁹ Holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers. ¹⁰ For there are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision: ¹¹ Whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake. ¹² One of themselves, *even* a prophet of their own, said, The Cretians *are* always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies. ¹³ This witness is true. Wherefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith; ¹⁴ Not giving heed to Jewish fables, and commandments of men, that turn from the truth." I ask you, Shall we keep quiet or speak out?!