

CONTROVERSY OVER THE 6TH & 8TH DAY CREATION THEORY

Today within the Israel Identity movement there exists a conglomeration of confused dogmas brought from the various mainstream churches by well intended people upon their awakening to the Israel Truth. Many have not yet learned that once learning who true Israel is, one must wipe one's mind-slate entirely clean and start from the beginning all over again. Not only that, but within the movement itself, many have gone to the extreme establishing new premises which are not supported by Scripture. And after their errant conclusions have been made as a result of their faulty premises, these specious concepts are parroted endlessly by one Identity teacher after another. The 6th & 8th day creation theory falls into this category.

Because I will not deviate from anything that cannot be supported by Scripture on Genesis chapters 1 & 2, I received a copy of an E-mail from Willie Martin dated Friday, November 28, 2003, 10:59 PM. This copy of Martin's E-mail was sent to me by regular mail postmarked March 15, 2004 by Eli James, 4901 W. Oakdale, Chicago, IL 60641 evidently in an attempt to *correct* me on the subject. Martin's article was entitled "The first man was not Adam" which is too long to quote here. Those readers who are well read in Identity teachings will recognize the premises which are being addressed here. I then shared this E-mail article with William Finck who replied in a 16 paragraph letter dated 31st March 04 as follows:

Dear Mr. Emahiser, Hello! I'm sitting down this morning to address this "Willie Martin" paper you sent me earlier this month, and there are a few things I must discuss first. Willie Martin is a parrot, but certainly not the originator, of these things he wrote about. We have, and rightly so, moved quite far from the roots of our relatively young Israel Identity 'movement' (if I must), and if we go back and examine those roots, we will find many of Willie Martin's ideas scattered throughout them.

As much as I admire Wesley Swift and Bertrand Comparet, they were proponents of the errant 6th day & 8th day creation of man theory. And both Wesley and Bert also claimed that the planet was destroyed in a judgment, taking Jeremiah 4:23-28 totally out of context in order to support such a claim, while also being misled by the poor Hebrew translation which resulted in the word "replenish" appearing at Genesis 1:28 (where the LXX reads only **BSOD T**, "fill"). David Gray explained this word "replenish", which should only state "fill", very well in his draft (not publicly available) commentary. Wherever Wesley and Bert got their information – and there is much in the archaeological record which we do not understand which seems to support their theories – I do not know, but many since have followed them in these things. It took me myself (William Finck), after commenting at length upon David Gray's commentary and then with much meditation, quite an effort to realize and admit how wrong Wesley and Bert were about these things and others, regardless of the excellence of much else of their work.

While this planet obviously has a long history, and races of both men (not Adam men, but others) and beasts have come and gone, none of these things are explained in the Bible: for they are not within the scope of the Bible. Neither Genesis 1:1 nor Jeremiah 4 nor any other pericope [short passage] may be used to explain pre-Adamic history, if it must be taken out of the context of surrounding verses (an error which will always lead to larger problems), or if the underlying Hebrew or Greek doesn't truly support what is being supposed.

There are verses in the Bible which discuss glimpses of pre-Adamic history, among which are parts of Revelation 12 and Isaiah 14, and Job 38:6-7, clear in their contexts albeit sparse in explanation. But whether a global cataclysm causing mass extinction, such as the dinosaurs, happened or not one thing is certain: such an event is not specifically described anywhere in the Bible. And we can't take Jeremiah's poetic description of the Babylonian destruction of Judaea (4:23-28) out of context to twist it into anything more than it is. Ditto for sections of Isaiah, i.e. 24:19-20. Wesley Swift and Bertrand Comparet are, in some of their sermons, guilty of this very thing. It will take us a long time to cleanse Israel Identity of some of these errors, if perhaps we are ever able to do so at all.

We should never turn to an English dictionary in order to understand any word in the Bible, without first going to a Hebrew (or Greek, where appropriate) Lexicon: which is usually more than sufficient to explain the meaning of a word. The word which is translated "replenish" at Genesis 1:28 is a simple verb, a primitive root, mala' or male' (4390) meaning "to fill." This word and its Aramaic twin 4391, are the most common words in the A.V. translated fill, filled, filledst, fillest and with the related male' 4392, full, and see also fulfill and fulfilled, among others. By no means does the word mean "refill" or "replenish." Willie Martin was foolish by defining replenish, because the original Hebrew does not mean re-plenish! Yet so many others in Israel Identity have done so!

Jeremiah at chapter 4 (vv. 5-18) is warning the remnant of Judah of impending judgment at the hands of the Babylonians. In vv. 19-31 Jeremiah describes a vision of that judgment, lamenting the destruction to come. At verse 23 Jeremiah, using language familiar to readers of Genesis, says "I beheld the land, and lo, *it was* without form, and void; and the heavens, and they *had* no light." Yes, I wrote "land" and not "earth", for the word translated "earth" is translated "land" in over a thousand other places in the Bible. Read 4:25-28 and imagine an army, in those days typically 200,000 to 500,000 men, destroying every city, every village in their wide path, tearing up all the farms, orchards and vineyards for provisions, and burning every building they've looted: all typical of ancient warfare. The land would be void indeed! All of the beasts and fowls that could escape, would, and the sky would be blackened from the smoke of so much fire and destruction. Let no one make anything more of Jeremiah 4 than this.

The word "age" at Job 8:8 was translated (, <, V in the LXX, and not "Æ<. Brenton has here "For ask of the former generation, and search diligently among the race of *our* fathers." The Hebrew dor, 1755, does not necessarily signify the remote past or the pre-Adamic eons, except that Willie Martin would want it to. In Job 30:1-3, the writer is speaking of events in his own lifetime, but Willie Martin ignores the first two verses, to use the third as he pleases. Oh, the deceit (wittingly or unwittingly)! We can not read with understanding, reading but a single verse at a time. That would only lead to trap after trap, and we'd never emerge from the pit! The writer of Ecclesiastes is philosophizing. This book would not be out of place among the collections of the classical Athenians. Willie Martin may look to Eccl. 1:11 to support his theory, but not if his entire initial premise is flawed, as it certainly is (in his letter).

David in Psalm 18, is in poetic metaphor describing his deliverance from the hands of Saul, and thanking Yahweh. None of this has anything to do with Willie Martin's topic, except that again he would capitalize by taking certain statements out of context, and by interpreting metaphor in a literal manner.

In Isaiah 41:21-29, as at 42:9; 43:9, 18; 46:9, and 48:3, Yahweh challenges Israel by informing them that He alone is "God", because He alone can reveal the past and the future, yet in context none of this has anything to do with what Willie Martin is purporting (in his letter). In

actuality none of Isaiah's statements may be referring to anything outside of the scope of Israel's national history and written prophecy. Taken out of that context, one may pervert it to support any contention at all! Yet certainly it is not proper to do so. The "new heavens and a new earth" of Isaiah 65:17 is a prophecy for the future (see 2 Peter 3:13, Rev. 21:1-4) and has nothing at all to do with the past.

David Gray's (yet unpublished) draft commentary explains well that Rotherham's version of Genesis 1:2 "the earth had become chaotic and empty" and treatment of the verb "to be" ("was" in the A.V.), *Strong's* # 1961, is in error, and that the A.V. rendering is correct. The *LXX* does not support Rotherham either. David explained why, better than I can here. Martin on page 3 repeats his invalid argument concerning "replenish" in Genesis 1:28, and Jeremiah 4:23-28.

Whether Genesis 3:20 is an interpolation or not may be debated. The verse appears in the *LXX*, and the "oldest manuscripts" Martin refers to (and Swift and Comparet also refer to Moffat here) of the *Masoretic Text* are nowhere as old as the *LXX*. The *Samaritan Pentateuch* and the Dead Sea Scrolls I have yet to examine in reference to this verse.

Willie Martin's assertions concerning Cain's wife I will make no comment on, being aware of the content of the *Book of Adam and Eve* yet not feeling that issue is important enough to take a stand which may be errant, it is evident that Cain's descendants' spouses included non-Adamites at the earliest stages. On page 5 of his document Martin states that "The civilization of Cain was very wicked and was completely wiped out by the flood", contrary to all Scripture (i.e. Gen 3:15 and the appearance of the Kenites in Genesis 15 and elsewhere), and here Martin even diverges from Swift and Comparet probably following the lead of Jones, Weisman and their ilk instead. Question: If all of Cain's civilization "was wiped out by [Noah's] flood", who was it then that bruised Messiah's heel at His Crucifixion?

Another statement of Martin's on this page is un-Scriptural, and also quite repulsive: "The pure Negro stock is a servant order, as are the angels in heaven." For Martin has demoted the messengers to slaves, and elevated the "pure" (as if there were such a thing) Negro to a position he is not worthy of!

Martin, as many others do, also takes Ezekiel 31 out of context. Ezekiel uses a "garden of god" and "garden of Eden" metaphor to describe the ~~45a~~: X<O of his time. By no means was Ezekiel trying to claim that descendants of Asshur were present in Eden at the time of Adam! An impossible thing indeed!

That "Satan had been what we might call the superintendent of this planet" is an outright fabrication, contradicting Scripture in Revelation 12, Jude and elsewhere. Martin's page 6 discourse concerning Genesis 3:15 and Matthew 13 contradicts, at least partially, his own statements concerning the "civilization of Cain" on page 5, and seems to take a surprising turn at the end where he again agrees to Two-Seedline doctrine!

In closing, I don't think that Willie Martin's intent was malicious, but he did fall victim to some of the same errors which many of our predecessors have made concerning various topics, blindly following without carefully examining them for themselves ..."

William Finck

This is the end of William Finck's comments on Willie Martin's E-mail which he (Willie) evidently sent out to several thousands of people all over the world. Willie Martin died shortly after the time of the E-mailing of this letter. Willie was a phone-pal of mine, and I will miss him. Willie was in the process of falling for Buddy Johnson's effort to make our Redeemer of the tribe of Ephraim rather than Judah. I sent Willie the evidence from about 15 Bible dictionaries that the

geographic area know as Ephratah was related to Bethlehem of Judaea, and was not the Tribe of Ephraim as Buddy Johnson continually insists. Willie then was convinced that Buddy Johnson was wrong. Upon receiving that information, Willie typed it up and E-mailed that all over the country. The last I talked to Willie, he was falling for the atrocious Anti-Paul doctrine that is going around like wildfire. Willie indicated he would reconsider that topic too. Willie was very dedicated and was putting all of his energy into the Israel Identity Message as he worked on his computer from his wheelchair gasping for his next breath. But Willie parroted too many other Identity teachers rather than checking these things out for himself.

I hate to make an issue out of something like this after a man is dead, but as you can plainly see, Willie made some mistakes that the rest of us will have to address. Willie was right on a majority of things, but where he was wrong, he was really wide of the mark. But we have to remember that Willie was parroting some of the material by Wesley Swift and Bertrand Comparet. And while Swift and Comparet were the best two men for their time frame, we must press on to greater truth. There were some topics where Comparet and Swift didn't agree, in particular "the Millennium." Comparet continually spoke of a future "Millennium" while Swift evidently understood we were at 7500 years after Adam (A.M.). Swift seemingly grasped that if we were 7500 years After Man, we were presently in "the Millennium", and Swift made the statement, "If this is the Millennium, I don't want to have anything to do with it!"

Many may not be aware of it, but Willie Martin wrote a book entitled *In Search Of Isaac's Children*. This was no small book measuring 8½ x 11 x 7/8 inches containing 368 pages, and typed in a size 10 font. That makes for a lot of words on several different subjects including the great conspiracy. Most of his material is on the positive side, but there are important areas where Willie gets himself into trouble.

One such example is found on page 106 where Willie has a subheading "Moses' First Wife Was A Negro Woman But He Never Had Sexual Relations With Her." He picks up this story from *Jasher* 72:23-37, 31-37; 74:4-13. It's a story of how after Moses fled from Egypt for his life from Pharaoh and he goes to the land of Cush. Right away, Willie Martin assumes that Cush equals Negroes. Actually there were two lands of Cush (also spelled Kush), (1) Eastern Kush which stretched from Mesopotamia into Afghanistan and, (2) A land of Kush in Africa. *Jasher* doesn't indicate which land of Cush and neither does Willie. Apparently, Willie was not aware of this fact! If Willie had read Comparet, he would have known about this for Comparet covered this in his *America God's Promise To Abraham*, page 67 under the topic "Whom Did Moses Marry?" This is what Comparet said:

"There were two different countries named Cush in Bible times, one was Ethiopia, lying south of the Sudan in Africa. There was another Cush it was in eastern Mesopotamia, or what at other times was part of the Babylonian Empire. These people were not a black race at any time. This Cush flourished about 1500 B.C., during the time of Moses, the exodus from Egypt occurred in 1486 B.C. Who can we expect to find living in this Cush, on the east side of the Tigris and Euphrates rivers, from what people that lived there did Moses take his wife? Note there is absolutely nothing anywhere in the Bible which says, or even hints, that Moses was ever in Ethiopia or any place else, where he could have found a negro woman to marry. The Bible does tell us where Moses got his wife, or who she was ..."

In my *Watchman's Teaching Letter #65* for September, 2003 the following was stated: Now to turn to the Kush, or Ethiopia, of Africa. In the first eleven chapters of his third book, Diodorus draws from earlier historians (as he always did) to describe the various peoples of African Ethiopia and the various tribes contrast with one another quite starkly. The first "Ethiopi

ans” he discusses are endowed with what we may consider a well-developed form of “western civilization”, for he states *“they say that they were the first to be taught to honor the gods and to hold sacrifices and processions and festivals.”* They quote Homer in reference to themselves (Iliad 1:423-24), they recount the unsuccessful invasions into their country by Cambyses and Semiramis, and they claim that the Egyptians were originally Ethiopian colonists, led by Osiris. The two types of their writing (like Egypt) popular (demotic) and sacred (hieroglyphic), are described, and it is said that the sacred is common among these Ethiopians. Their priests were much like the Egyptian. They believed that their kings gained sovereignty by Divine Providence, their laws and punishments were from custom, and they practiced the same flight of refuge which the Greeks did, which was similar to the Hebrew Levitical cities of refuge. An Ethiopian king under Ptolemy was educated in Greece and studied Philosophy, and aside from a few odd customs there is no reason to believe that these Ethiopians, whose physical characteristics were not mentioned, were anything but civilized, and not much different than the rest of “western” society.

In stark contrast to those Ethiopians first discussed, starting at 3:8:1, Diodorus says: *“But there are also a great many other tribes of the Ethiopians, [here it is made apparent that, like “Phoenicia” and other labels, “Ethiopia” has become only a geographic designation], some of them dwelling in the land lying on both banks of the Nile and on the islands in the river, others inhabiting the neighboring country of Arabia [between the Nile and the Red Sea], and others residing in the interior of Libya [the rest of Africa — Sudan here]. The majority of them, and especially those who dwell along the river, are black in color and have flat noses and wooly hair.”* Here it is evident that Diodorus is describing the Nubians and other wandering black tribes of the region. He continues: *“As for their spirit they are entirely savage and display the nature of a wild beast ... and are as far removed as possible from human kindness to one another ... and cultivating none of the practices of civilized life ... they present a striking contrast when considered in the light of our own customs.”* (end of citation from teaching letter)

From this it should now be becoming painfully obvious that Willie Martin didn't have all his ducks in a row on the subject of Cush. Willie Martin is the guy that sent Eli James this E-mail, which in turn, James sent to me (Clifton A. Emahiser) to set me *straight* on the creation of Adam at Genesis chapters 1 & 2. In turn, I sent a copy of William Finck's appraisal of Willie Martin's E-mail to Eli James. With that copy of Finck's comments on Willie, I told Eli James that I wasn't going to change my position one little bit on the creation of Adam at Genesis 1:26-27 and 2:7! I will repeat again, Genesis 2:4-7 is the first **historical chronicle** in the Bible and the Adam at Genesis 2:7 is the same Adam as at Genesis 1:27! Eli James' position is that the Elohim (whom he designates as fallen angels) created the other races at Genesis 1:27 and that Yahweh (a different entity other than Eli James' fallen angel Elohim) formed Adam-man at Genesis 2:7. While I agree that the fallen angels are responsible for the species-mixing of angel-kind with animal-kind bringing about the other races, I don't agree that the fallen angels created anything, nor could they! The fallen angels could only bastardize that which was already created by Yahweh. Eli James also wrote a book entitled *The Great Impersonation*. This is what Eli James said on page 113:

“In general, it must be said that the myth that Adam was the first human does not hold up to archaeological evidence. Nor is it Biblically tenable either. The fact is that Genesis 1 is talking about early man and Gen. 2 is talking about Adamic man. Observe: ‘And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness... So God created man in his own image, in the image of

God created he him; male and female created he them. Vs. 26 & 27. The early man of Gen. 1, the nomadic wanderers and gatherers, was created on the sixth day.

“Adam and Eve, however, were created after the seventh day. Early man did not farm or cultivate the earth in a civilized manner, so He went about creating one who does. Gen. 2:7 says, *‘And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.’*

“That we are confronted with two types of man is confirmed by the fact that in Hebrew there are two different words for the English word ‘Adam’: #119, adam, pronounced *aw-dam* and #120, adam, pronounced *aw-dawm*. The meaning of adam, #119 is ‘to show blood in the face.’ This, of course, can only mean the white race of Adamites. No other race shows blood in the face. The meaning of adam, #120 is ‘a human being’ with the connotation of being ‘mean’ or ‘of low degree.’ But this matter of higher and lower degree only applied to Adam (the individual) before he fell. After the fall, Adamic man became as mortal as all other men. So, we have two reasons, two witnesses for saying that *awdawm* and *awdam* are not the same. *Awdawm* was created on the sixth day and *Awdam* was created after the seventh day.”

Contrariwise, if one will check *Strong’s Concordance* with the Hebrew dictionary, he will find that the man at Genesis 1:26-27 and Genesis 2:7 is the same #120, so Eli James has not done his homework. Ditto with *The Interlinear Hebrew-Aramaic Old Testament* by Jay P. Green, Sr. ... Ditto with *The Complete Word Study Old Testament* by Zodhiates. It is absolutely untrue that the man (Adam) at Genesis 2:7 is different from the man (120) at Genesis 1:26-27! Again, if one will check #120 in the *Strong’s* Hebrew dictionary it says “from 119”, so both numbers are closely related! Why doesn’t Eli name his source(s) for such a statement? Because Eli James’ imagination is working overtime on this one! Again, I will repeat, Scripture does not record any creation after the sixth day, let alone the “seventh”! You will notice how Eli avoids saying “the eighth day” by stating “after the seventh day.” This shows that Eli knows down deep that Genesis 2:1-2 says: “Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and the hosts of them. And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made.”

To show you the absurdity of Eli James’ assertion that *Strong’s* #119 is the proper Hebrew word for Adam, #119 translates as “dyed red” five times, “red” four times, and “ruddy” once while #120 translates as “man” 408 times, “men” 121 times, “Adam” 13 times, “person(s)” eight times, “common” once, and “hypocrite” once. In addition to #s119 & 120 is 121 translated as “Adam” nine times (all this taken from the *Enhanced Strong’s Lexicon*). All one need do is check the following passages where #119 is found in the Old Testament: Exo. 25:5; 26:14; 35:7, 23; 36:19; 39:34; Pro. 23:31; Isa. 1:18; Lam. 4:7 & Nah. 2:3. If one will inspect these, he will find that #119 has more to do with color than man. One can only conclude that #119 does in no way represent Adam other than his color when blushing, which is Adam’s trademark so to speak. #119 is not translated “Adam” anyplace in scripture, but #119 is an essential part of both #s 120 & 121. Actually, #s 119, 120, 121 & 122 were the same exact word indistinguishable in Palaeo Hebrew until the scribes chose to use a slightly different vowel marking to separate the word according to each of the parts of speech. Properly, 119 is a verb, 120 a noun, (121 a proper noun) & 122 an adjective, according to *Strong’s* own definitions. These four numbers should be treated as a group.

What a terribly baseless statement for Eli James to have made! You have just observed two examples in Willie Martin and Eli James showing a lack of scholarship. While both of these men are commendable in their general stand, they fall short in some of the more critical

areas of Scripture. On the positive side, both of these men are Two Seedline, and strongly against race-mixing! Since Willie is no longer among the living, we will miss him!

Clifton A. Emahiser's Teaching Ministries
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830
Phone (419)435-2836

Please Feel Free To Copy, Or Order:
10 for 2.00; 25 for 3.00; 50 for 5.00 or 8.00 per 100