

Watchman's Monthly Teaching Letter Number 93



**Clifton A.
Emahiser**

Monthly Letter Number 93 - January, 2006
By Teacher Clifton A. Emahiser

**AN ANGLO-ISAAC-SON CAUCASIAN
CULTURE
AWARENESS TEACHING LETTER**

THIS IS MY NINETY-THIRD MONTHLY TEACHING LETTER AND CONTINUES MY EIGHTH YEAR OF PUBLICATION. As I promised in Watchman's Teaching Letter #92 for December, 2005, we would continue on the subject of the apostle Paul. For this, I will turn you over again to William Finck, as I requested that he write the next segment in our defence of Paul:

This past summer while Clifton was preparing the Open Letter in Response to H. Graber for publication in the last four of these Watchman's Teaching Letters, one of his readers sent him a couple of articles found in Free American Newsmagazine, which much like the trash Graber had produced, were written to attack and discredit Paul of Tarsus.

These articles were published in the December, 2003 and January, 2004 issues, and written by Clayton R. Douglas, the magazine's publisher. For the purpose of responding to them properly, the articles shall be fully and faithfully reproduced here, and it shall take several issues of the WTL to do so. First, however, I shall respond to some of the statements made by Douglas in his December, 2003 "*Publisher's Corner*", where he prepares his readers for his subsequent Paul-bashing articles, but which I shall not fully address.

Douglas lays the foundation for his statements by criticizing the jews as a race, where surely his intentions are good, yet I don't see much point in debating any of the jews themselves on the topic, which he describes doing. It may be less frustrating and more productive to simply beat one's head against the proverbial wall. Christ set a good example for us in this

regard, for when the Edomite-Jew Herod questioned Him at length concerning many things, “He answered him nothing” (Luke 23:9). Ditto before the Edomite high priests who questioned Him (Matt. 26:62-63, Mark 14:60-61).

Why argue with the Jews concerning good and evil? How could they, being evil, say anything good (Matt. 12:34)? Douglas goes on to refer to “the fact that Judeo-Christianity is almost an oxymoron”, and he would have been correct if he had only omitted the “almost”! Ignatius, the Christian bishop who wrote circa 110 A.D. (according to Thayer) said in his Epistle to the Magnesians at 3:11 (as found in *The Lost Books of the Bible and the Forgotten Books of Eden*):-

“It is absurd to name Yahshua Christ, and to Judaize. For the Christian Religion did not embrace the Jewish, but the Jewish the Christian ...”.

Surely Ignatius understood that the Old Testament religion of our (we Saxons and Kelts and related peoples) Hebrew fathers was nothing more or less than Christianity before Christ. Judaism is a corrupted version of the Old Testament laws of Moses, adopted by pretenders and charlatans claiming to be something they aren't, as Paul explains in Romans 9 and 2 Thes. 2, chapters poorly translated by blind, Judaized exegetes.

From here Douglas goes on to attack the position assumed by many mainstream sects, that the “Bible” as we have it is infallible. Again, Douglas is pretty much on target, but as we will see later, some of his reasoning is wrong. First, basically there is nothing seriously wrong with many of the Greek mss. handed down to us through the ages. Copyists' errors have occurred in many places, yet the vast majority of them are minor and of little consequence.

In other places in some mss. synonyms were substituted, often only to replace archaic words with more common ones, or because of preferred variations in regional dialect. Nearly all of these are of no consequence. In some mss. difficult or poorly understood sentences were altered, and sometimes this presents a problem, but nowhere are the major tenets of

the true Christian faith seriously challenged when the oldest, most reliable mss. are followed. More dangerously, spurious additions were made in several places, especially in Mark and John but many smaller ones in Luke, John's epistles, and elsewhere, many of which made it into the King James Version and persist in more modern versions.

Yet because many old manuscripts do not have most of these additions, and more so because archaeologists have more recently discovered many ancient papyri dating from the second through the fifth centuries to which we can compare our copies of ancient mss., the errors and additions made in the texts can be detected, for the most part, and can be corrected or removed. The most glaring, and the lengthiest, examples of such spurious additions to the New Testament texts are found at Mark 16:9-20 and John 7:53-8:11.

Yet for one who studies at length and in depth, it is fully evident that the consistency of the Word and the revelation of its prophecies are the best signs we have that – while not today found as perfect as in its original form – the books of the Bible (excluding Esther) surely were the inspired Word of Yahweh our God when they were written.

Our biggest obstacle to understanding them is translation, and that **All** of the popular and published New Testament translations have been very poorly done, or at least contain a large quantity of serious errors, is highly demonstrable. And it is not only vague and subjective matters of exegesis (interpretation) that I would contend over, but also many issues of vocabulary and grammar, things which aren't so fuzzily subjective.

To his credit, Douglas states that “While I believe that the Bible is a valuable, historically accurate document, as accurate as is possible for something done by the hand of man, it is not, for me, the end all and be all it is to mind-moulded Christians.” This, if ‘Bible’ intends the modern, published editions, certainly is true.

Yet the greater truths of the Christian faith surely can be revealed through a proper and thorough study of our ancient manuscripts together with history, prophecy, archaeology and language.

Yet Douglas fails where further on he states, “There have been numerous translations, from Aramaic to Greek to Latin to Hebrew and finally to English and back again.” The Jews of today contend that Aramaic was the primary language of Judaea, and that the NT books – at least many of them —were somehow originally written in Aramaic. Both of these contentions are false.

While it is apparent that most, if not nearly all, of the Judaeans of the Roman period were bilingual, Greek was the primary language for many, if not for the majority. The inscriptions of the period demonstrate this fully, and even the coins of Herod bore only Greek inscriptions, and even synagogues bore Greek inscriptions where corresponding Aramaic or Hebrew ones are not found (See *Biblical Archaeology Review*, July-August 2003 pp. 25 and 36).

The consistency of all early Greek mss., and the internal textual evidence show that they were all, even Matthew, John, and Paul’s epistle to the Hebrews, originally written in Greek. The provenance of the earliest Aramaic (or “Syriac”) mss. known shows that they were translated from Greek into Aramaic, contrary to the claims of today’s Jews.

For brief discussions of this see the introduction to the *Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece*, 27th edition (hereinafter simply the NA27), on pages 65-68. Aside from all of this, most of the Old Testament quotes found in the four Gospels and in Paul were taken from the Greek Old Testament, the Septuagint (LXX), and not from any Hebrew or Aramaic version.

Although some quotes do more closely resemble translations from those versions, these are but few. The bottom line is that the entire New Testament was originally written in Greek, and our most ancient manuscripts and papyri, while not perfect, must be awfully close to the original accounts.

Then Douglas fails again where he says of the Bible “It has been edited, with many books left out, those writings in Thomas and Enoch banned from the sight of the masses ...” and goes on to criticize the King James

Version. First, not all of the apocryphal or pseudepigraphal books (books which were for one reason or another omitted from the accepted canon at the Council of Nicaea in the 4th century) are worthy of equal credit. Each must be evaluated separately, and it certainly would be wise to do so before criticizing or promoting any of them! While the book commonly known as 1 Enoch contains text which is quoted at length by Jude, alluded to with certainty by Peter, and is quoted or alluded to often elsewhere in the New Testament (for which see the NA27 appendix *Loci Citati Vel Allegati*, pp. 804-805), it certainly seems that the lost Greek version (or perhaps a Hebrew version), of which some fragments still exist, should have been considered canonical. Yet I would not rely upon or promote with confidence the version from the Ethiopic which we have today, but versions of Enoch which may be more reliable were found among the Dead Sea Scrolls.

But the so-called “Gospel of Thomas”, along with certain other documents discovered at Nag Hammadi, is nothing but one of those forgeries perpetrated by the Jewish sect of the Gnostics originally based at Alexandria in order to corrupt Christianity. Failing miserably in the second and third centuries, the Gnostics have had much more success deceiving people today. And clowns such as the novelist Dan Brown have reaped millions by capitalizing on such deception, perpetuating ancient blasphemies.

Yet good or bad, none of these books were ever “banned from the sight of the masses”! Rather, as also happened to a good many valuable history books, once interest was lost in a book, for whatever reason, scribes simply stopped copying them. Because paper decays, books that fell out of popular favour (in other words, lost commercial viability) or which the organized church was not particularly interested in, simply and gradually vanished.

While the King James Version originally contained 14 apocryphal books (not all of them deserving of merit) which were later removed and published only separately, the compilers of that version were certainly not responsible for errors made in the 4th century, at Nicaea, 1200 years beforehand.

Douglas also states: “I, personally, have never felt the need or the desire to attend church. Something about the people there struck me as hypocritical and judgmental. Nor I am [sic] a dedicated Bible scholar. I believe that a true knowledge of God is available for **Everyone**, from within, not from tangled, mangled teachings of various sects.”

Now first, for one who isn't a “dedicated Bible scholar”, and for one who obviously isn't a very good amateur historian, since he has events of the 4th century (decisions made at the Council of Nicaea) and the 17th century (publication of the King James Bible) confounded, Douglas surely goes out on a limb, because he is about to spend nearly 13 pages of his publication slamming Paul of Tarsus with all sorts of false accusations, amidst many other poorly conceived ideas and inaccurate statements.

Now what sort of man would, as Douglas clearly does, announce an ignorance of something, and something so important as the Bible, and then spend so much time tearing apart large parts of it with such strong criticisms? If your thoughts contain something like “Only an idiot!”, then they are much like my own. Of course there are many subjects and events which I would have to profess an ignorance of, or have only a surface knowledge concerning. I dare not write about any of them, and especially with scathing criticism of the parties involved.

Yet Douglas is guilty of a far greater error, for he criticizes the development of Christianity, and goes on to say that he believes “**Everyone**” (his own emphasis) has available to them a “true knowledge of God.” Is such a statement true? Certainly Not! And it shows that Douglas is no true Christian, whether or not he claims to be. A Catholic, a Baptist, a Methodist or a Hindu may make such a statement, but no true Christian can.

Why did Christ speak in parables? To exclude certain people from obtaining a “true knowledge of God”! It is also quite evident that:

1 There are people on this earth whom Christ does not know, regardless of whether or not those people claim to believe Him (i.e. Matt. 25:12, Luke 13:24-28).

2 He came only for the “lost sheep” (Ezekiel chapter 34, Jeremiah chapter 50) of the “house” (i.e., “family”, Amos 3:2) of Israel (i.e. Matt. 10:6; 15:24; Luke 1:33, 54-55, 68-80).

3 No man may know Yahweh, God the Father, unless the Son (Yahshua Christ) allows it (i.e. Matt. 11:27, Luke 10:22). Paul certainly knew this, for at Hebrews 1:6, speaking of Christ, he quoted the Septuagint version of Deut. 32:43 (which is supported over the Masoretic Text by the Dead Sea Scrolls), of which the Greek says “All the messengers of God must worship Him.” So much for the false messengers of Islam, Hinduism, Judaism, and all of the other pagan and godless cults!

4 The “sheep” are nations, as explained at Matt. 25:32 (where the word is, in plural “ethnicities”), a parable consistent with that found at Matt. 13:47-50, where the “good” kind of fish (“kind” meaning “race”,) are saved, and all the “bad” kinds destroyed. As Abraham was promised, his descendants became many nations, yet are all the same race. As Christ professes, no one may know Yahweh our God except through Him, and He admits only the sheep! See John chapters 10, 5:17-47, and 6:31-58. Those “goats” and “wolves” have no hope to see Yahweh, and face only eternal destruction.

So how can Douglas claim that **Everyone** may know God? If Douglas claims to be a Christian, and as Paul instructs us a Christian is one who consents to “wholesome words: the words of our Lord Jesus Christ” (1 Tim. 6:3 paraphrased AV), he’d better stop and consider these things. With certainty both Christ, and Paul, taught that NOT everyone could be a Christian.

Yet if Douglas would purport not to be a Christian, then he’s at fault to a greater degree, attacking something that he not only lacks expertise in, but denies having any part of!

It is universalistic thinking such as Douglas' that has allowed our Saxon nations to be infiltrated by jews and overrun with heathen aliens in the first place.

Douglas should consider this also, and perhaps spend more of his time studying something that Paul of Tarsus very well knew: that the identity of the "sheep" nations descended from Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, wrongly called "Gentiles" by all modern Judaized theologians and Bible translators, is certainly none but the true white Saxon, Keltic and related peoples of today!

This error alone, meaning Douglas' universalism, should be enough to demonstrate that Douglas is not qualified to say much of anything concerning either the ancient history of our "Caucasian" race, or of Christianity and the Bible.

Yet I shall complete a full critique of Douglas' remarks concerning Paul of Tarsus, not merely because Douglas made them, but because like Graber, Douglas' remarks represent a great part of the trash "scholarship" and blatant misconception being used in an attempt to further soil Christianity today, and little of it is new, but has now been echoed by jews and Christ-haters for over 1900 years! And like Graber, it may also be evident that the primary sources for the trash Douglas spews here are indeed jewish.

Anti-Paulism is a jewish conception. And if they succeed in getting Christians to disregard Paul, then Luke and Mark shall follow immediately, and then they'll set their sights on John! Certain jews have already begun campaigning against John. In the same manner, jewish Gnostics in the second century took Matthew's gospel and shredded it, called it the "gospel of the Hebrews", and disregarded the rest of what we call the New Testament. To that they began to add their forgeries and fairy tales, such as "Thomas" and "Mary Magdalene." Graber and Douglas follow in their footsteps!

Douglas' "Publisher's Corner" goes on to make many blanket criticisms of Paul, calling him "forerunner to the Zionists we deal with today",

which is an absolute lie, and connecting him to the Catholic “church”, another lie. These and other fallacies shall be addressed later on when Douglas’ articles are addressed. But first, one last thing here I shall discuss. Douglas quotes a lengthy criticism of Friedrich Nietzsche concerning, and criticizing, Paul of Tarsus.

Now it is likely that Nietzsche was a man of some intelligence, but he was also a critic of Christianity in general. He was also a critic of nationalism. I consider nationalism, true nationalism which is based upon ethnic (not geographic) identity, to be the political expression of one of those laws which Yahshua our God has written on our hearts: that we were to be a separate people, and not commit adultery.

Yet his most famous and well-remembered quote is this bit of blasphemy: “God is dead.” No wonder the anti-Paulist jews love him. Jews too, are enemies of Christ, of Yahweh, of Paul, and of Nationalism! No wonder too, that Nietzsche ended up in an insane asylum in 1889, at the age of 45.

I would not consider such a man to be a valid authority on Christianity at all. Where he claims that Paul was “the first Christian”, he denies not only Christ, but all of the prophets! These are the sorts of men whom the anti-Paulists always seem to follow. And how many they manage to deceive! What follows shall be a reproduction and criticism of Douglas’ articles written against Paul of Tarsus. To avoid confusion, all of Douglas’ original text shall appear in italics, and all of the responses in normal type.

Reference 1 Clay Douglas states: “The Seduction: Judeo-Christianity OR Pauline Christianity? Saul of Tarsus: Paul. A different view. ‘A magical effect is like a seduction. Both are built through careful details planted in the mind of the subject.’ Sol Stein

““You will know them by their fruits. Grapes are not gathered from thorn bushes, nor figs from thistles, are they? Even so, every good tree bears good fruit; but the bad tree bears bad fruit. A good tree cannot produce bad fruit, nor can a bad tree produce good fruit, Every tree that does not

bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire. So then, you will know them by their fruits.' (Esu Immanuel)"

William Finck answers 1: It is fitting that Douglas opens this diatribe against Paul with a quote about deception from one who should know: a Jew! Paul himself warned us against the Jew deceivers (i.e. Acts 13:10; 20:29 et al.), yet the Anti-Paulists embrace the Jews and their writings! This has already been demonstrated in these pages concerning H. Graber, and shall also be concerning Clay Douglas. Douglas quotes Matt. 7:16-20 here, and the name he attributes the statement to, "Esu Immanuel", shall be treated shortly.

Reference 2 Clay Douglas cites Paul: "'Let every person render obedience to the governing authorities; for there is no authority except from God, and those in authority are divinely constituted...' (Paul) (Romans 13, 1)."

William Finck answers 2: Any serious student of Daniel and the Revelation should realize that Paul is entirely correct in his statements at Romans chapter 13. This too will be discussed shortly, for first Douglas' comments on the topic shall be presented.

Reference 3 Clay Douglas states: "Jesus Christ (real name: Immanuel or Esu; it was Saul who changed Immanuel's name) did not found Christianity. Paul did."

William Finck answers 3: Anyone who has read my pamphlet Yahshua to Jesus: Evolution of a Name has seen all of the linguistic evidence presented showing the various forms of Christ's given name, Yahshua (Yashu, Ἰησοῦς, Iesus, Yesu), in the Hebrew, Greek, Latin and English languages.

Yet I can't imagine from which of the pits of hell Douglas retrieved the corruption "Esu", and so can't even comment on it since I've never seen it in any manuscript, lexicon or ancient document. Someone, probably some Jew, must have tricked Douglas into using it, because it surely is a farce!

The title “Immanuel” however, has somewhat more credibility. Matthew 1:23, quoting from Isaiah 7:14, states: “Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Immanuel, which being interpreted is, God is with us.” But at Matt. 1:21 the messenger had commanded to Joseph: “thou shalt call His name Yahshua (Ἰησοῦς).” At Luke 1:31 we see that His mother, Mary, received the same instruction, where she was told that she “shalt call His name Yahshua (Ἰησοῦς).”

Now a discerning mind may see one difference here immediately. For the messenger told His parents: “You shall call His name Yahshua”, and so Yahshua was His given name. Then the messenger said “They shall call his name Immanuel”, stating a prophecy, that the people at some later point would call him such. Immanuel is Hebrew (Strong’s #6005) for “with us is God”, which is exactly what the people did later say of Him, Paul included!

But that doesn’t mean that His name was not Yahshua! Simon was called Peter by Christ, and so later he was Simon, Peter, Kephas (the Hebrew equivalent of Peter), or Simon Peter, and by his own pen! Being called Peter doesn’t mean that he somehow lost the name Simon. The same for “Joses, who by the apostles was surnamed Barnabas” (Acts 4:36), or James and John, whom Christ “surnamed them Boanerges” (Mark 3:17), and there are yet other examples of this, but already it should be explained sufficiently.

Yet Douglas insists: “it was Saul who changed Immanuel’s name”! Did Paul of Tarsus write Matthew 1:21? Mark 1:1 states: “The beginning of the gospel of Yahshua Christ ...”, did Paul write that? Did Paul write Luke 1:31? Okay, Douglas may retort that Luke was Paul’s cohort. But what about John? What does John’s gospel call Him? This is a ridiculous exercise, but necessary!

The name Ἰησοῦς appears in John’s gospel alone, referring to Christ, over 240 times. The Revelation, written over 30 years after Paul of Tarsus was killed, written by John, opens: “The Revelation of Yahshua (Ἰησοῦς) Christ ...”! What does all this add up to? One thing: Clay Douglas is an

idiot! For Douglas errantly states, as it shall be quoted below: "Paul ... wrote almost two-thirds of the New Testament." Tell me Mr. Douglas, which one-third do you believe Paul did not write, and I'll wager that we find the name "Ἰησοῦς Χριστός", Yahshua Christ, mentioned quite often there also as He is the central figure.

And since we have discovered through archaeology several papyri containing portions of both Matthew and John which are with certainty dated to the second century A.D. (see the Introduction to the NA27, page 58 comparing the dates from the appendix at pp. 684-688 for the papyri cited), it could not be that some later "church" could have changed all these names in our New Testament books!

The name Yahshua Christ appears at James 1:1, 1 Peter 1:1, 2 Peter 1:1, 1 John 1:3, 2 John 3 and Jude 1. Was this Paul's doing also, Mr. Douglas? Only one people have endeavoured to destroy the name of Yahshua Christ from the beginning, Mr. Douglas: the Canaanite-Edomite jews. And you are their proselyte!

Douglas states that Paul, not Yahshua Christ, founded Christianity. The historian Josephus, writing not long after 70 A.D. at Antiquities 18:3:3, tells us the style=at "... Jesus (Ἰησοῦς, Yahshua), a wise man ... was [the] Christ ... and the tribe of Christians, so named from him, are not extinct at this day." Josephus never mentioned Paul, and was a follower of those who persecuted Paul (those of Acts chapters 21-26). Did Paul write this also, Mr. Douglas?

In order for the Old Testament prophecies concerning the repentance of (genetic) Israel (who are not the jews) to be fulfilled, and the return of (genetic) Israel (not the jews) to Yahweh, which the Book of Hosea and most of Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel are all about, the gospel of Yahshua Christ had to succeed in Europe.

Peter went to Babylon (1 Peter 5:13, it is only a conjecture that he meant "Rome" metaphorically), and his first epistle was addressed only to those Israelites of Anatolia (Asia Minor). James remained in Jerusalem, and John made it to Ephesus (and was exiled at Patmos for a time, an island

off the coast of Anatolia), a Greek city of Anatolia, only late in his life. Surely there were Israelites of many tribes: Greeks, Kelts, Romans, Parthians and others, in these areas. Yet the bulk of "lost" Israel were in Europe, or soon to be there (i.e. during the mass migrations of the 4th and 5th centuries).

While we have stories of apostles in Ireland and Spain at an early time, we have no substantial and contemporary (i.e. 1st or 2nd century) writings from the Irish or the Spanish to prove so. But with surety we know that Paul brought the gospel to Europe, initiating the fulfilment of the prophecies.

And the Irish Celtic Church, which developed independently of the Romish Church and was never under Rome's authority until the English sold it out to Rome in the 12th century, "cherished a deep love of the Bible, and from the Epistles of St. Paul developed their theology." (The Celtic Church In Britain, Leslie Hardinge). That Douglas does not understand these things is not Paul's fault. Perhaps it shall soon be evident that there is much more which Douglas does not understand!

Reference # Clay Douglas states: "Paul crafted Christianity as we know it today. In reality, we learn little about Immanuel's actual life on earth, his experiences and his teachings from the Scriptures. Astonishingly, Jesus did not really create the basis for Christianity. As a matter of fact, Immanuel/Jesus warned his followers **Not** to organize a formal church network from His teachings; but - rather - encouraged them to pray in .small informal groups. Most of the New Testament doesn't even concern the historical Jesus, while the main influence **and** focus is the Apostle Paul.

It was Paul of Tarsus who renamed Immanuel 'Jesus Christ' (although Immanuel had consistently cautioned all of His followers not to be fooled by those who would falsify His name and call Him 'Jesus the **Messiah**' - that He was not the 'Messiah' come to save anyone!"

William Finck answers 4: So few words, yet so many lies! I'm beginning to wonder whether someone swapped Clay Douglas' Bible with a

copy of the Talmud, and he hasn't yet noticed it! Where else could Douglas get these statements from, and why doesn't he make citations? Likely because he **Can't** make citations, and is inventing his own philosophy!

And under the slightest scrutiny it shall disintegrate, just like fragile Clay (pun intended). Where did Christ "warn his followers **Not** to organize a formal church network"? Not that I'm advocating one, but I only want to know where the warning is, along with His encouragement only "to pray in small informal groups."

The schematic for Christian community proposed by Paul is nothing like what the catholic "church" became. Paul proposed no formal megachurch with popes, bishops, nuns, and the like. This was the work of later oppressors. The catholic "church" as we know it didn't begin to take shape until the 6th century AD, and can't be blamed on Paul!

Paul only proposed that each individual community govern itself, with the elders appointing an overseer (supervisor or "bishop") who would answer to them and manage the day to day affairs of widows, ministers (be they teachers or doing other services) and the like. Evidently Douglas hasn't read Paul very closely, as these things are evident throughout his epistles.

Neither does Douglas know history! For even Eusebius in his church history complained of how certain 4th century bishops of Rome were attempting to usurp authority over the other bishops, of churches Paul helped found, and they resisted any such thing! Only an ignoramus would blame Paul for the overbearing church organizations of the later centuries.

Douglas complains that from the scripture "we learn little about Immanuel's actual life on earth." Was this Paul's fault? What does Douglas want? "Jesus: the miniseriess"? "Jesus goes to high school"? "The Jesus diet"? That's in Leviticus 11 and Deuteronomy 14! Matthew, Mark, Luke and John wrote exactly what they thought necessary for us to have. Certain first and second century jews had a complaint similar to Douglas', and began to manufacture fairy tales to substitute for what they

thought was lacking! Some of these are found in The Lost Books of the Bible and the Forgotten Books of Eden. Should Paul answer to Douglas for not founding a first century version of People Magazine? More is known about the life of Christ than about most men of the first century, yet I believe that whatever Douglas had, he would not be satisfied with – for he hasn't even read what he does have! This is readily evident!

Douglas also complained that “we learn little about ... his teachings from the Scriptures” and then goes on to say that Christ did not accept that He was “Jesus the Messiah”, and that “He was not the ‘Messiah’ come to save anyone!” Incredible! Here it is, and it can't be any plainer. Clayton Douglas is no better than a Jew by his own admission: for he denies not only Paul but the entire New Testament, and has adopted fully the position of the Jews!!!

First there is Daniel 9 and the vision of the 70 weeks. If we understand the chronology of Ezra and Nehemiah, 483 years may be counted from the rebuilding of Jerusalem, and we would arrive at 28 A.D., the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar and the beginning of Christ's ministry: the coming of “Messiah the Prince” of Daniel 9:25, who was Yahshua Christ, who was “cut off” 3 ½ years later at Passover, in the middle of the 70th week ($483 = 69 \times 7$, a day being a year in prophecy). So Douglas denies Daniel.

Then there is John. At John 1:41 the apostle puts these words down, as having come from the mouth of Andrew: “We have found the Messiah”, and says: “which is, being interpreted, the Christ.” At John 4:25-26 the apostle records the following exchange between a woman of Samaria and Yahshua Christ: “The woman saith unto him, I know that Messiah cometh, which is called Christ: when he is come, he will tell us all things. Yahshua saith unto her, I that speak unto thee am he.” And so, Douglas denies John!

Then there is Matthew 1:21: “And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Yahshua (which means ‘Yahweh, Savior’): for he shall save his people from their sins.” While Douglas professes Matt. 1:23 out of one side of his mouth, he denies Matthew 1:21 out of the other

side of his mouth! Now either Douglas is a purposeful deceiver, or a blithering idiot: take your pick! Unless, of course, you would choose to believe that Paul wrote Daniel, John and Matthew too. **W.R.F. To be continued.**



Steven Books

**League Enterprises
Suite 3, 3rd. Floor
148 Cambridge Heath Road
London
E1 5QJ**

For books by identity authors –
Kenneth McKilliam, Ria Splinter
and Richard Porter plus many
other subjects and difficult to
obtain books.

<http://www.stevenbooks.co.uk/category/341/Religion>

Contact us for details of audio tapes and articles by:-

Dr. Wesley A. Swift

Rev. Dr. Bertrand Comparet

Rev. William Gale

Captain K. R. McKilliam

Pastor Don Campbell



**THE NEW CHRISTIAN CRUSADE
CHURCH**

CALLING THE PEOPLE OF BRITAIN

At last the bible makes sense!

At last we know its meaning.

Its the book of the RACE

