

WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER

Monthly Letter #87; July, 2005 By: Teacher Clifton A. Emahiser
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830; Ph. (419)-435-2836

ISRAEL COVENANT TWO SEEDLINE RACIAL IDENTITY

AN ANGLO-ISAAC-SON CAUCASIAN CULTURE AWARENESS TEACHING LETTER

A MONTHLY TEACHING LETTER

This is my eighty-seventh monthly teaching letter and continues my eighth year of publication. In the last several lessons I have been defending the writings of Herodotus and Josephus; and in the last lesson I extended it to include Eusebius. Not that we find all these sources perfect in all respects, but without their histories we would have little with which to confirm our Scriptures. Not only do we need Herodotus, Josephus and Eusebius, but we can use the witness of many of the other classical and early church writers' histories. For instance, without Eusebius, we would know little about Constantine's political and religious involvement with Christianity. Under Constantine, Rome adopted a single official religion. To say "a single official religion" might be a misnomer, inasmuch as it was imperative for Constantine to unite the pagans with the Christians in order to gain the throne! And it has continued in that vein ever since, though Rome has forever fallen never to be established again. As Daniel said (2:35):

"Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshingfloors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them: and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth."

Since it was prophesied that the "iron" (and also "clay") representing the Roman Empire would be "broken to pieces together, and become like chaff of the summer threshingfloors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them", Daniel would become a liar if the Roman Empire were ever "revived" again as nearly all the mainstream "churches" so profusely proclaim. The real liars are the promoters and followers of the futurists' doctrine dreamed up by a Roman Catholic Jesuit priest. The next time someone tries to convince you of futurism, quote them this verse. It might be well to memorize it by heart! You can mark it down in your little book that Tim LaHaye, Jerry B. Jenkins, Thomas Ice, and their ilk are all liars right out of the pits of hell. When are we ever going to study our Bibles? When are we ever going to study the histories available to us which support those Scriptures such as we read at Daniel 2:35? Without our history books, we have little evidence that Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece and Rome are all past history! Again, all that is left of the Roman

Empire is “broken pieces and chaff”, just as Jerusalem and old Judaea are the “broken bottle” nation of Jeremiah 19:10; and none of these will ever be revived again – ever! When it says “**no place was found for them**”, Daniel meant exactly what he said!

EUSEBIUS GIVES EVIDENCE OF JUSTIN MARTYR

Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. 1, Introductory Note to the First Apology of Justin Martyr from the Libronix Digital Library. (In my copy of the Libronix Digital Library, Eusebius is cited 4903 times in various books):

“JUSTIN MARTYR was born in Flavia Neapolis, a city of Samaria, the modern Nablous. The date of his birth is uncertain, but may be fixed about A.D. 114. His father and grandfather were probably of Roman origin. Before his conversion to Christianity he studied in the schools of the philosophers, searching after some knowledge which should satisfy the cravings of his soul. At last he became acquainted with Christianity, being at once impressed with the extraordinary fearlessness which the Christians displayed in the presence of death, and with the grandeur, stability, and truth of the teachings of the Old Testament. From this time he acted as an evangelist, taking every opportunity to proclaim the gospel as the only safe and certain philosophy, the only way to salvation. It is probable that he traveled much. We know that he was some time in Ephesus, and he must have lived for a considerable period in Rome. Probably he settled in Rome as a Christian teacher. While he was there, the philosophers, especially the Cynics, plotted against him, and he sealed his testimony to the truth by martyrdom.

“The principal facts of Justin’s life are gathered from his own writings. There is little clue to dates. It is agreed on all hands that he lived in the reign of Antoninus Pius, **and the testimony of Eusebius** and most credible historians renders it nearly certain that he suffered martyrdom in the reign of Marcus Aurelius. The *Chronicon Paschale* gives as the date 165 A.D. [*emphasis mine*]

“The writings of Justin Martyr are among the most important that have come down to us from the second century. He was not the first that wrote an Apology in behalf of the Christians, but his Apologies are the earliest extant. They are characterized by intense Christian fervour, and they give us an insight into the relations existing between heathens and Christians in those days. His other principal writing, the Dialogue with Trypho, is the first elaborate exposition of the reasons for regarding Christ as the Messiah of the Old Testament, and the first systematic attempt to exhibit the false position of the Jews in regard to Christianity.”

I would suggest that “regarding Christ as the Messiah of the Old Testament” and “the first systematic attempt to exhibit the false position of the Jews” is quite commendable on the part of Justin Martyr! It’s a shame that today’s clergy don’t do the same! Are we supposed to disregard this testimony of Eusebius concerning the martyrdom of Justin Martyr as not worthwhile as some would proclaim?

There are some cases where forged writings have been thrust upon us using the names of Early Christian writers. This became a standard practice of the Roman Catholic Church under the papacy later on. We find the following information at *Ante-*

Nicene Fathers, vol. 1, Introductory Note to the Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians (from the Libronix Digital Library):

“ There are, in all, fifteen Epistles which bear the name of Ignatius. These are the following: One to the Virgin Mary, two to the Apostle John, one to Mary of Cassobelae, one to the Tarsians, one to the Antiochians, one to Hero, a deacon of Antioch, one to the Philippians; one to the Ephesians, one to the Magnesians, one to the Trallians, one to the Romans, one to the Philadelphians, one to the Smyrnaeans, and one to Polycarp. The first three exist only in Latin: all the rest are extant also in Greek.

“ It is now the universal opinion of critics, that the first eight of these professedly Ignatian letters are spurious. They bear in themselves indubitable proofs of being the production of a later age than that in which Ignatius lived. Neither Eusebius nor Jerome makes the least reference to them; and they are now by common consent set aside as forgeries, which were at various dates, and to serve special purposes, put forth under the name of the celebrated Bishop of Antioch.”

With this, it should be quite apparent that what Eusebius didn't say can be as important as what he did. But there is another famous forgery by the Roman Catholic Church we should mention here:

ROMAN CATHOLICISM SITS ON A FALLACIOUS FOUNDATION

For information pertaining to “ The Donation Of Constantine ” I will quote from *The Horizon History Of Christianity*, by Roland H. Bainton, pages 243-244:

“ We do find skepticism of a sort in the form of historical criticism used to expose the spuriousness of famous forgeries and to examine sacred documents critically. Historical criticism was a by-product of studies by the Humanists, whose profound interest in the antique encouraged a pure Latin style. Through their comparison of classical and medieval Latin, there arose an awareness of philological (study in literature and linguistic) development. ‘ The Donation of Constantine ’, upon which the papacy long based its claims to dominion, was exposed as a forgery by Lorenzo Valla. The language, he pointed out, was not that of the age of Constantine. In the document there were references to the iconoclastic controversy of the eighth century. Documents of the period of Constantine never once mentioned the Donation, and at no time during that emperor's reign did the popes actually exercise the authority Constantine was supposed to have bestowed upon them. Valla disproved also the common assumption that the Apostles' Creed was the work of the twelve apostles. More daring was his application of historical, critical methods to the study of the Bible, even though he came up with no startling conclusions. As far as the Church was concerned, Valla's demonstrations were not especially disturbing. She could survive the exposure of forgery.” (See also, *The Story Of Civilization*; Part IV, “ The Age Of Faith ”, by Will Durant, pages 525-526, along with footnote.)

But according to some, “ It's only history; and we should read only the Bible.” And as we have seen, many who proclaim this, and other silly notions, can't even read Daniel 2:35 correctly! Why don't they just be honest and own up to the fact that they are simply too lazy to study history? There is no place in Israel Identity for such an attitude!

EUSEBIUS TESTIFIES TO WRITERS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

Eusebius gives us data concerning the writing of the books of our New Testament. Interestingly, he speaks of Paul, Mark and Peter. *Eusebius: Church History* tells us this at chapter 8, paragraph 3, on page 222 (Eusebius' *Church History* is found under *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* Second Series Vol. 1 in the Libronix Digital Library, also in book form from Hendrickson publishing and others.):

“3 After their departure Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, also transmitted to us in writing those things which Peter had preached; and Luke, the attendant of Paul, recorded in a book the Gospel which Paul had declared.”

We pick up again at Eusebius chapter 21, speaking of the Egyptian, who is mentioned also in the Acts of the Apostles:

“3 Josephus relates these events in the second book of his History. But it is worthwhile comparing the account of the Egyptian given here with that contained in the Acts of the Apostles. In the time of Felix it was said to Paul by the centurion in Jerusalem, when the multitude of the Jews raised a disturbance against the apostle, ‘Art not thou he who before these days made an uproar, and led out into the wilderness four thousand men that were murderers?’ These are the events which took place in the time of Felix.”

At chapter 22, page 124 we read again about Paul, Luke and Paul's epistle to Timothy. Paul having been sent bound from Judaea to Rome, made his defense, and was acquitted of every charge:

“1 FESTUS was sent by Nero to be Felix's successor. Under him Paul, having made his defense, was sent bound to Rome. Aristarchus was with him, whom he also somewhere in his epistles quite naturally calls his fellow-prisoner. And Luke, who wrote the Acts of the Apostles, brought his history to a close at this point, after stating that Paul spent two whole years at Rome as a prisoner at large, and preached the word of God without restraint.

“2 Thus after he had made his defense it is said that the apostle was sent again upon the ministry of preaching, and that upon coming to the same city a second time he suffered martyrdom. In this imprisonment he wrote his second epistle to Timothy, in which he mentions his first defense and his impending death.

“3 But hear his testimony on these matters: ‘At my first answer,’ he says, ‘no man stood with me, but all men forsook me: I pray God that it may not be laid to their charge. Notwithstanding the Lord stood with me, and strengthened me; that by me the preaching might be fully known, and that all the Gentiles [sic. nations] might hear: and I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion.’

“4 He plainly indicates in these words that on the former occasion, in order that the preaching might be fulfilled by him, he was rescued from the mouth of the lion, referring, in this expression, to Nero, as is probable on account of the latter's cruelty. He did not therefore afterward add the similar statement, ‘He will rescue me from the mouth of the lion’; for he saw in the spirit that his end would not be long delayed.

“5 Wherefore he adds to the words, ‘And he delivered me from the mouth of the lion,’ this sentence: ‘The Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom,’ indicating his speedy martyrdom; which he also

foretells still more clearly in the same epistle, when he writes, ' For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand.'

" 6 In his second epistle to Timothy, moreover, he indicates that Luke was with him when he wrote, but at his first defense not even he. Whence it is probable that Luke wrote the Acts of the Apostles at that time, continuing his history down to the period when he was with Paul.

" 7 But these things have been adduced by us to show that Paul's martyrdom did not take place at the time of that Roman sojourn which Luke records.

" 8 It is probable indeed that as Nero was more disposed to mildness in the beginning, Paul's defense of his doctrine was more easily received; but that when he had advanced to the commission of lawless deeds of daring, he made the apostles as well as others the subjects of his attacks."

At chapter 6, page 220 we read in Eusebius about a catalogue of the Bishops of Rome:

" 1 THE blessed apostles (namely, Peter and Paul; but neither of them founded the Roman church. See Bk. 2. chap. 25, note 17) having founded and established the church, entrusted the office of the episcopate to Linus. Paul speaks of this Linus in his Epistles to Timothy."

In my *Watchman's Teaching Letter* #13, May 1999, I spoke of Linus several times:

These names (Claudia, and Rufus Pudens) just mentioned should be familiar to you as they are mentioned in 2 Timothy 4:21. I am sure that millions of people over the years have read this passage and had no idea who the people mentioned were, or that they had a direct connection with the first permanently organized church, the British Church. Let's read it again with a new light on it:

"Do thy diligence to come before winter. Eubulus greeteth thee, and Pudens, and Linus, and Claudia, and all the brethren."

This not only proves that Paul had a direct connection with the church in Britain, but proves that Paul was a genuine apostle of Yahshua. It proves that his calling was true. There is a doctrine going around that Paul was not genuine, but an impostor and a deceiver. I will give you a short history of this "Anti-Paulism" which was published in pamphlet form by Destiny Publishers, Merrimac, Mass. I will only quote the first three paragraphs:

" There is a movement on foot to discredit the writings of the Apostle Paul in the Bible, declaring they are a perversion of the truth. The conclusion is that Paul's Epistles should be expunged from the New Testament.

" This is the objective of a book entitled *Who Was Paul of Tarsus?* by Isabel Upton Van Etten. In this book, a premise is established, based upon ' ifs ', ' surmises ' and ' assumptions ' which enable the author to conclude that Paul was in opposition to the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ and was completely out of step with the teachings of the disciples of Jesus.

" It is a faithful axiom that, once a premise is established and accepted, the deductions drawn naturally follow. After reading this little book, we are reminded of another book, also by a woman author, whose name was Mary Baker Eddy [founder of

so-called Christian Science]. She also established a premise and won the acceptance of a substantial following in support of her conclusions. We pose the question: Will many succumb to the propaganda that Paul was subversive and that his writings are unacceptable and should be deleted from the New Testament?"

Obviously, Isabel Upton Van Etten overlooked 2 Timothy 4:21 (above), and 2 Peter 3:15 where Peter said in his epistle, *our beloved brother Paul*. I presume, because of this remark, might we have to delete all of Peter's Epistles also? Either Paul was a "chosen vessel", or he was not a "chosen vessel", and we might advisedly tread very lightly in condemning his **commissioned ministry** to be unfit, as Paul commissioned Linus, first Bishop of Rome.

In the yearbook of *DESTINY* magazine (a monthly publication), June, 1946 published by Destiny Publishers, Haverhill, Massachusetts, there is an article, *Druidism in Britain*, by Rev. L. G. A. Roberts, pages 203-208. On page 207 of this article, we find the following information under the subtitle "Christianity in the Isles":

"It was in A.D. 52 that the conflict took place between the Romans and British under Caractacus, who so nearly held back the Roman legions from conquering Britain, but he was cruelly betrayed by Cartismandua and taken prisoner to Rome. With him, as hostages, Bran, his father, his three sons, and daughters, were also taken captive. The struggles of this brave people for their liberty filled the streets of Rome with their daring prowess, and about A.D. 59 St. Paul was himself a prisoner at Rome, but in his own hired house. Whilst here he met with Pudens and Linus and Claudia, and evidently also Eubulus, i.e., Aristobulus. Timothy was also with St. Paul, and in the 2d Epistle of St. Paul to Timothy, written a few years after (chap. 4:21), he says, 'Eubulus greeteth thee and Pudens and Linus and Claudia.' **Every one of these we find intimately connected with Britain.** The prefix *Eu* in Eubulus being of the same meaning in Greek as *aretos*, the two names (Rom. 16:10; II Tim. 4:21), Aristobulus and Eubulus, have been considered to mean the same person. Of this man we read in the 'Greek Menologies' that St. Paul ordained him as a bishop to the country of the Britons. Another account says that this man died at Glastonbury in A.D. 99." ...

You will notice it is a bit hard to follow names here. For instance, let's take the name of Caradoc. As long as he was not king, his name was Caradoc, but once he took the throne, he was called "King Arviragus" (being the same person as Caradoc). When he went to Rome, they Latinized his name to Caractacus (still being the same person), so whether he is called Caradoc, King Arviragus or Caractacus, it is the same person (see *Celt, Druid and Culdee* by Isabel Hill Elder, page 38, paragraph 4). Caractacus is the next person I am going to talk about, and for that I will quote from, *The Origin and Early History of Christianity In Britain*, by Andrew Gray, D.D., pages 14-16:

"CARACTACUS

"From those valuable historical documents, the Welsh Triads — written originally in the British dialect — it appears that Caradoc (Caractacus) was betrayed and delivered up to the Roman Commander by Arègwedd, about A.D. 51, and taken to Rome. Brân (Brennus) his father, Llyn (Linus) his son, Eurgan a daughter, and Gladys

(Claudia) a second daughter, were all taken to Rome likewise, and there detained seven years as hostages for Caractacus.

“Tacitus furnishes an account of the battle which terminated the career of Caradoc in field. Caradoc seeing that the Romans were victorious, and that his own wife and daughter had fallen into the hands of the conquerors, took refuge himself, at her repeated solicitations, at Caer Evroc (York), with Arègwedd, Queen of the Brigantes, and grand-niece of the infamous traitor in the Julian war, Mandubratius of Avarwy. Here by her orders, —with hereditary treachery, he was seized while asleep in her palace, loaded with fetters, and delivered to Ostorius Scapula. On receiving intelligence of the event, Claudius ordered him and all the captive family to be sent to Rome. The approach and arrival of Caradoc at Rome are finely described by the ancient historians — ‘Roma catenatum tremuit spectare Britannum’ —Rome trembled when she saw the Briton, though fast in chains.

“The Senate was convened and the trial of Caradoc began. With an unaltered countenance, the hero of forty battles, great in arms, greater in chains, took his position before the Emperor and defended himself in the following utterances:

“‘Had my government in Britain been directed solely with a view to the preservation of my hereditary domains or the aggrandizement of my own family, I might long since have entered this city an ally, not a prisoner; nor would you have disdained for a friend a king descended from illustrious ancestors and the director of many nations. My present condition, stript of its former majesty, is as adverse to myself as it is a cause of triumph to you. What then? I was lord of men, horses, arms, wealth: what wonder if at your dictation I refused to resign them? Does it follow, that because the Romans aspire to universal domination, every nation is to accept the vassalage they would impose? I am now in your power —betrayed, not conquered. Had I, like others, yielded without resistance, where would have been the name of Caradoc? Where [is] your glory? Oblivion would have buried both in the same tomb. Bid me live, I shall survive for ever in history one example at least of Roman clemency’.”

This is part of what I wrote in *Watchman's Teaching Letter #13*. I am bringing this again to your attention, as with this present lesson we can clearly see a direct connection between the Celtic Church in Britain and Paul, though Eusebius failed to identify the origin of Linus, Claudia and Pudens. This evidence of Paul's direct connection with the Christians from Britain proves beyond all doubt that he was a true Apostle chosen by Yahshua Christ to the nations [not the silly term Gentiles]! The people who today are still bashing Paul would do well to take this history presented here into consideration!

If Paul were this terrible, evil person that several people in Israel Identity are proclaiming, why didn't his contemporary coworkers and the very apostles chosen by Yahshua Christ Himself identify Paul as such? Inasmuch as Eusebius was evidently the best qualified to put together a church history during his tenure (for no one else ever did), why didn't he warn us against this erroneously-so-called (by many), “Jew.” Paul was not a “Jew”, but a Benjaminite, as were all the other twelve disciples Yahshua chose, except Judas Iscariot the Canaanite. The Book of Acts, at 1:23-26, records that a certain Matthias was chosen by the apostles to take the place of Judas, but Yahshua

Himself chose Paul, and surely this is correct for we never again hear anything mentioned concerning Matthias. The deafening silence on Matthias speaks volumes, though no doubt he was otherwise a man of great esteem.

Let us now return to *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* Second Series, vol. 1. Eusebius' *Church History*, chapter 4 page 163:

“7 But Luke, who was of Antiochian parentage and a physician by profession, and who was especially intimate with Paul and well acquainted with the rest of the apostles, has left us, in two inspired books, proofs of that spiritual healing art which he learned from them. One of these books is the Gospel, which he testifies that he wrote as [of] those who were from the beginning eye witnesses and ministers of the word delivered unto him, all of whom, as he says, he followed accurately from the first. The other book is the Acts of the Apostles which he composed not from the accounts of others, but from what he had seen himself:

“8 And they say that Paul meant to refer to Luke's Gospel wherever, as if speaking of some gospel of his own, he used the words, 'according to my Gospel.'

“9 As to the rest of his followers, Paul testifies that Crescens was sent to Gaul; but Linus, whom he mentions in the Second Epistle to Timothy as his companion at Rome, was Peter's successor in the episcopate of the church there, as has already been shown.

“10 Clement also, who was appointed third bishop of the church at Rome, was, as Paul testifies, his co-laborer and fellow-soldier.

“11 Besides these, that Areopagite, named Dionysius, who was the first to believe after Paul's address to the Athenians in the Areopagus (as recorded by Luke in the Acts) is mentioned by another Dionysius, an ancient writer and pastor of the parish in Corinth, as the first bishop of the church at Athens.”

TWO DIFFERENT PAULS

Eusebius mentions two different Pauls in his history: (1) the Apostle Paul and (2) Paul of Samosata, and we shouldn't confuse one with the other. This Paul of Samosata, (bishop of Antioch c. 260-272) is mentioned at chapter 30, and a footnote makes this explanation:

“It is plain from this passage that the case of Paul of Samosata had been discussed in at least two Antiochian synods before the one which deposed him, and not only in one as has been claimed. The passage shows, too, the way in which Paul escaped condemnation so long. Not merely on account of his influential position, as some have said, but also because he promised that he would give up his heresy and conform his teaching to the orthodox faith. The language would seem to imply that Firmilian had presided at the synod or synods, which are referred to here; and this is assumed by most writers. On Firmilian, see Bk. VI. chap. 26, note 3.”

At chapter 30 under the subtitle “The Epistle of the Bishops Against Paul [of Samosata]”:

“The pastors who had assembled about this matter, prepared by common consent an epistle addressed to Dionysius, bishop of Rome, and Maximus of Alexandria, and sent it to all the provinces. In this they make manifest to all their own

zeal and the perverse error of Paul, and the arguments and discussions which they had with him, and show the entire life and conduct of the man. It may be well to put on record at the present time the following extracts from their writing:

“‘ Whereas he has departed from the rule of faith, and has turned aside after base and spurious teachings, it is not necessary, – since he is without, – that we should pass judgment upon his practices: as for instance in that although formerly destitute and poor, and having received no wealth from his fathers, nor made anything by trade or business, he now possesses abundant wealth through his iniquities and sacrilegious acts, and through those things which he extorts from the brethren, depriving the injured of their rights and promising to assist them for reward, yet deceiving them, and plundering those who in their trouble are ready to give that they may obtain reconciliation with their oppressors ’ ...” **Paul of Samosata was hardly a tent maker!**