

LIES MASQUERADING AS “THE TRUTH”, A Critical Review Of The Book, *THE TWO CREATIONS*, Part #1

Clifton A. Emahiser's Teaching Ministries
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830
Phone (419)435-2836, Fax (419)435-7571
E-mail caemahiser@sbcglobal.net

Please Feel Free To Copy, But Not To Edit

Why would anyone write a book of 147 pages in a letter size format (8.5" x 11" - equivalent to a 300 page book 5" x 7") and not sign his name to it? Instead the author of this book uses the fictitious pseudonym of "Gabriel"! While this cloak-and-dagger author does bring forth a few important truths, he offsets those truths with deceptive lies. If he were aboveboard about everything he was putting forward, why did he not openly claim authorship? What's worse, this author uses the name of "Gabriel" the archangel to legitimize his dogmas. If you will remember, it was the archangel Gabriel who was sent to Daniel to cause him to understand his vision (Dan. 8:16). It is evident that the author of *The Two Creations* is attempting to make the reader believe that his utterances are on the same high level of importance as Gabriel's were to Daniel! All of this should wave a red flag at the reader!

In this book *The Two Creations*, on page ii, the address is given as Gabriel's Enterprises, P.O. Box 513, Albert Lea, MN 56007. Now according to J. Richard Niemela, one Lloyd Palmer sells this book, which can be ordered from Gabriel's Enterprises, P.O. Box 507, Albert Lea, MN 56007. Though the P.O. box is slightly different, could Palmer be the author, or is he just a distributor of the book? Since I'm not completely sure who wrote the book (but I suspect it is Lloyd Palmer), I will simply hereinafter refer to the author simply as "alias-gabriel", as I see no need to capitalize a fictitious alias.

The book *The Two Creations* by alias-gabriel, is basically just a commentary on the book of Genesis with some appendixes added at the end. Before we get started with this critical book review, it should be pointed out the author alias-gabriel uses italics incorrectly, and this is important, especially when quoting Scripture. Italics are properly used to indicate a word that was not in the Hebrew or Greek, and by alias-gabriel changing italics to non-italics, or non-italics to italics, he is in essence adding to and subtracting from the written Word! Had alias-gabriel wanted to emphasize some words

or phrases, he should have instead used a bold or underlined font. Also, alias-gabriel uses ellipses incorrectly. Therefore, I will not follow alias-gabriel, particularly when quoting Scripture, and will use a “sic” for other writing errors. It should also be noted that Mohammed cited “Gabriel” for his false religion!

To demonstrate that alias-gabriel does not comprehend what he reads very well, I will cite a passage from his Appendix E, “Job And Satan”, on page 115:

“If we look up the word *man* in this verse [*Job 1:1*], we discover that Job was a *iyish* or son of Noah. We also know he was the third son of Issachar (Gen. 46:13). Knowing this, we can see Job had moved out of Egypt to dwell in the land of Uz.” Here alias-gabriel is attempting to make one person out of two different Jobs! To show you alias-gabriel’s error, I will quote Gen. 46:13 from both the KJV and the Septuagint:

KJV, Gen. 46:13: “**And the sons of Issachar; Tola, and Phuvah, and Job, and Shimron.**”

LXX, Gen. 46:13: “**And the sons of Issachar; Thola, and Phua, and Asum, and Sambran.**”

Notice that the KJV has “Job” while the LXX has “Asum”! Yet at Job 1:1, Brenton’s LXX reads: “**There was a certain man in the land of Ausis, whose name was Job; and that man was true, blameless, righteous, and godly, abstaining from everything evil.**” Charles Thomson’s LXX has “Allon” at Gen. 46:13 instead of the KJV’s “Job”. But in all three of these translations, (1) KJV, (2) Brenton’s LXX, and (3) Thomson’s LXX, it is in every case “Job” at Job 1:1! Had alias-gabriel checked Strong’s, he would have discovered the KJV Job at Genesis 46:13 was the Hebrew #3102, while the KJV Job at Job 1:1 is #347. And this is one of the primary passages he bases his no-Satan dogma on! And J. Richard Niemela highly recommends alias-gabriel’s book. It is not true that the Job at Gen. 46:13 is the same Job at Job 1:1, so it is a lie masquerading as the truth!

Flawed premises lead to flawed conclusions, and alias-gabriel concluded the following in the same paragraph: “... We know the children of Israel dwelt in Egypt for 400 years. With Job listed as one of the children of Issachar who entered Egypt, it is no wonder that we don’t see any of the other Israelites mentioned as Job’s ‘Friends,’ ... By knowing this, we can deduce that Job lived out his entire life separate from his brethren in Egypt ...”

Another witness on Gen. 46:13 is the NIV which reads: “**The sons of Issachar: Tola, Puah, Jashub and Shimron.**” And a footnote on “Jashub” at the bottom of the page reads: “Samaritan Pentateuch and some Septuagint manuscripts (see also Num. 26:24 and 1 Chron. 7:1); Masoretic Text *lob*.” It is glaringly apparent that alias-gabriel didn’t do his homework! And this is only the beginning!

On page 64 alias-gabriel makes another serious blunder. He is commenting on the birth of Judah’s son born to him by the Canaanite woman, daughter of Shuah (Gen. 38), where alias-gabriel states: “The first two verses tell us that Judah took a wife of a *certain* Canaanite. His name was Shuah. At first glance it would appear Judah had done the same thing as Esau! To understand the wording – a certain Canaanite – we must look up the original Hebrew word that appears here as *certain*.”

“*Strong’s Concordance* says: ‘certain’ (Heb.) *iysh*, meaning: man, champion, good, great, of degree, worthy.

“If we cross-reference this word to *man*, we find that this word *iysh* is used to describe Adam, Cain, Noah, and Abraham. So it is now evident, because of our investigation, that this *certain* Canaanite was not a mixed breed – although he did dwell in Canaan.”

It is easy enough for anyone who has access to a *Strong’s Exhaustive Concordance* to check the Hebrew word #376 and see that alias-gabriel has picked only a few selected words from *Strong’s* definition to fit his own preconceived idea, amounting to an almost complete misrepresentation. For those who don’t have the *Strong’s* book, I will reproduce it here:

“**376.** **יִישׁ** *’iysh eesh*; contraction for 582 [or perhaps rather from an unused root meaning *to be extant*]; a *man* as an individual *or* a male person; often used as an adjunct to a more definite term (and in such cases frequently not expressed in translation):– also, another, any (man), a certain, + champion, consent, each, every (one), fellow, [foot-, husband-] man, (good-, great, mighty) man, he, high (degree), him (that is), husband, man [-kind], + none, one, people, person + steward, what (man) soever, whoso (-ever), worthy. Compare 802.”

Now compare this definition to that which alias-gabriel gave us; there’s hardly any resemblance whatsoever! What kind of a con-game is alias-gabriel promoting here anyway? The following definition is from *Strong’s Enhanced Lexicon* from the Libronix Digital Library:

“**376** **יִישׁ**, **יִישׁ** [*’iysh /eesh/*] noun masculine. Contracted for 582 [or perhaps rather from an unused root meaning *to be extant*]; 1639 occurrences; AV translates as ‘man’ 1002 times, ‘men’ 210 times, ‘one’ 188 times, ‘husband’ 69 times, ‘any’ 27 times, and translated miscellaneously 143 times. **1** man. 1A man, male (in contrast to woman, female). 1B husband. 1C human being, person (in contrast to God). 1D servant. 1E mankind. 1F champion. 1G great man. **2** whosoever. **3** each (adjective).”

From *The Theological Wordbook Of The Old Testament* (which uses a different numbering system), by R. Laird Harris, we find:

“**83** **יִישׁ** (*’yś*). Assumed root of the following.

“**83a** **יִישׁ** (*’îś*) *man, mankind, champion, great man, husband, person, whatsoever, whosoever.* (ASV, RSV similar.)

“The word *’îś* connotes primarily the concept of man as an individual and thus differs in that regard from the more general concepts inherent in the words *’ēnôś* and *’ādām* (‘mankind’).

“Two possible roots have been suggested for the word, *’nś* and *’yś* (*’wś*). If from the latter, the word *’îś* may be related to the Akkadian *ishānu* meaning ‘strong.’

“The word is used variously in the OT. Most commonly it denotes any individual male. Less frequently it has the more specific connotation of ‘male,’ emphasizing the male sex, as distinct from the female sex (Ex 35:29; Lev 13:29; II Chr 15:13) or man in his sexual role (‘to know a man,’ Gen 19:8, etc.). Characteristically this is *zākār*.

“ It is used in many technical expressions such as ‘ man of the earth ’ (Gen 9:20) meaning ‘ farmer,’ ‘ man of the field,’ connoting a hunter (Gen 25:27) and ‘ man of God,’ referring to a prophet (Deut 33:1, etc.).

“ Frequently the word functions as an individualizing element connoting the concept ‘ each ’ as in ‘ each person ’ (Gen 10:5). It also functions in a broadly inclusive sense meaning ‘ whoever ’ (Lev 15:5).

“ One of the most common usages of *ʾiṣ* is in the sense of ‘ husband.’ The word begins to achieve significance in this sense first in Gen 2:23–24 where the origin of woman is described. While the derivation of *ʾiṣṣā* from *ʾiṣ* suggested by this passage is difficult philologically (there may be no more than a word play), there is no question that the words ‘ This ... is bone of my bones ... She shall be called woman because she was taken out of man ’ (v. 23), communicate a close and intimate relationship that Adam could not find apart from one who shared his own station and nature; indeed, his own life. It reflects God’s desire to provide man with a companion who would be his intellectual and physical counterpart. The permanency intended in the relationship is expressed in the assertion that man should leave his parents and cleave to his wife.

“ A husband could divorce his wife under certain conditions (Deut 24:1–4) but divorce was not encouraged (Mal 2:16; Jer 3:1).

“ The relationship of husband to wife is used as a metaphor of God’s relationship to his people. This relationship is the basis of assurance for the people of God in the book of Hosea where the marriage relationship forms a central motif (see Hos 2:16).

“ Man possesses great individual worth in the OT, for anyone who murders a man is himself to be put to death (Lev 24:17). God observes the ways of men (Job 34:21; Prov 5:21) and the invitation of wisdom goes out to all men (Prov 8:4) demonstrating God’s concern for the individual.

“ As with *ʾēnôṣ* a distinction obtains between God and man. Balaam observed that God was not man that he should lie (Num 23:19).”

While all of these explanations may not be 100% perfect, they are a lot better than what alias-gabriel offered! What it all boils down to is, *iysh* is simply man as opposed to woman. It simply means a male of the species. As Gesenius’ *Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament* points out, #376 is used even for brute beasts such as found at Gen. 7:2 where it says: “ **And of the clean cattle take in to thee sevens, male and female, and of the unclean cattle pairs male and female.**” Both times here “ male ” is #376! Contrary to alias-gabriel, even a half-breed such as Cain can be an *iysh*. Sure, Adam, Cain, Noah, and Abraham all fall into the category of *iysh*, as they were all male in gender. Even one’s pet dog or cat would also be an *iysh*, if they were the male of their species! Therefore to place the half-breed Cain in the same pure racial category with Adam, Noah, and Abraham, as alias-gabriel did, is ridiculous. Here again with alias-gabriel we have another example of lies masquerading as the truth!

If you consider all of this to be outrageous, you ain’t heard nothin yet! We will next go to page 10 of his diatribe, and it gets even more ridiculous. By citing the temptation in the garden of Eden shortly after the fall, alias-gabriel develops various flawed premises leading to several faulty conclusions thusly:

“Now on with Genesis 3:7. Adam and his wife, now with full knowledge of what they had done, realized their nakedness. They then sewed fig leaf aprons for themselves, and hid from the Lord. Yahovah [sic Yahweh] God soon discovered that Adam was hiding in the garden and called out to him. Adam gave the reason for hiding as his nakedness, which, of course, tipped his hand to the transgression. Then Adam shows his carnality by blaming the woman. The woman in turn blamed the serpent. But the serpent had no one to blame, because it was now a dumb creature, and always was! And because the serpent had received the blame as the conduit for the ‘fall,’ (the scapegoat) it received the least punishment, that is, to the extent that it should go on its belly and eat dust from then on. And the Lord God decreed that enmity would exist between the woman’s seed and the serpent’s seed. In other words, white women would be afraid of snakes and vice versa. But there was a prophetic meaning also in this. The prophecy was that two different spiritual seed lines would flow from this enmity. One would follow the lie and carnal lusts. And the other would seek after righteousness. The last part of the prophecy was: ‘it shall bruise thy head, and thou shall bruise his heel.’ This means that the serpent was to be ‘symbolic’ of the lie that persuaded the woman to introduce death to mortal mankind. In other words, symbolically speaking, throughout the rest of the Bible, the serpent would represent the lie that introduced sin, the wages of that sin being death and the grave (Romans 6:23). This is also the first promise of the Savior, who as we know, ‘bruised the head of death and the grave,’ (the symbolic serpent), by his [sic His] resurrection. The ‘serpent,’ on the other hand, did bruise Christ’s heel on the cross. Of course, we know it was a short-lived victory for death and the grave, i.e., the ‘serpent.’”

First, alias-gabriel is attempting to add yet another pronunciation for the Almighty by calling Him “Yahovah” rather than Yahweh. This version of the Name is even worse than the corrupted form “Jehovah”! You will also notice that he uses the term “Lord”, equivalent to Baal, which the Canaanite-jews used as a substitute for Yahweh throughout the Bible! Does alias-gabriel not know that at Hosea 2:16, the prophet declared: “... **thou shalt call me Ishi; and call me no more Baali**”? Then alias-gabriel states in part: “Then Adam shows his carnality ...” Now I’ve spent my share of time in the judeo-churches, and I’ve heard the term “carnality” batted around for years on end. The term “carnally” is used twice in the Old Testament (Lev. 18:20 & Num. 5:13), and both cases is has to do with sex, so unwittingly alias-gabriel is admitting that that was the nature Adam and Eve’s deeds! Then alias-gabriel states: “But the serpent had no one to blame, because it was now a dumb creature, and always was! ... In other words, white women would be afraid of snakes and vice versa.” Here alias-gabriel actually believes that Eve was deceived by a talking snake! Can you believe that? That’s ridiculous! Why doesn’t alias-gabriel identify what species of snake that it was; a rattlesnake, a cobra, a python, etc. Yet alias-gabriel claims to be an expert on Biblical idioms! Then alias-gabriel makes the statement, “The prophecy was that two different spiritual seed lines would flow from this enmity.” Inasmuch as “seed” means sperm, alias-gabriel would have us to believe that there is such a thing as “spiritual sperm”. Who ever heard of such a thing? As alias-gabriel goes along, his logic continues to deteriorate! And as one can observe, it is plunging to an all-time low! One of the many

seeds of the woman was Christ! Is alias-gabriel intimating that Christ came not in the flesh? It would appear that alias-gabriel is moving dangerously close to becoming an antichrist with his designation of “spiritual seed”! Additionally, alias-gabriel admitted that Christ was one of the seeds of Genesis 3:15, and since He came in the flesh, how can He be “spiritual seed”? Here alias-gabriel attempts to have it both ways, showing a lack of consistency. In other words, he is highly unstable, and as dangerous as a loose cannon! The truth of the matter is: if Christ was fleshly seed, so were the seed of the serpent, and the serpent wasn’t of the snake species (Rev. 12:9).

Previously on page 6, alias-gabriel commented on his snake theory thusly: “Now if the Lord (Yahovah) [sic Yahweh] God created the snake, is it not also true that the Lord God gave the snake the ability to speak? I believe that I can prove to you that it was completely within the providence of Yahovah [sic Yahweh] God that the snake was used to *test* the woman to see if she would obey or not. To confirm this, let’s jump ahead in the Bible and cite some other examples of how the Lord *tested* others as to their obedience.” Then alias-gabriel goes on to cite Gen. 22 and (1) how Yahweh tested Abraham in offering his son Isaac as a sacrificial offering, (2) how Yahweh tested Israel under Moses’ leadership at Exod. 16:4, concerning the matter of manna, and (3) the matter of driving out the Canaanites at Judges 2:21-22. The problem with alias-gabriel’s snake theory is that there is no place where it indicates that Yahweh “tested” Eve; rather it was a temptation by the serpent! The idea of a “test” comes only from the distorted mind of alias-gabriel! It was not a matter of “testing” but a matter of breaking Yahweh’s commandment “thou shalt not eat”! (cf. Prov. 30:20)

Then on pages 8-9 alias-gabriel asks an absurd question thusly: “Could it be that Eve’s flesh and thoughts of her mind were the voice she thought came from the serpent?” It sounds like alias-gabriel is suggesting that Eve’s sin was a thought-crime! Well, if what alias-gabriel is claiming is true, maybe Eve was suffering from paranoia and needed to see a psychiatrist! After all, hearing voices from her flesh, and all of that! Also, it appears that alias-gabriel can’t make up his mind whether it was a talking snake or a hearing of voices. Maybe it’s alias-gabriel who is suffering from paranoia, and he needs to see a psychiatrist! Instead of Adam and Eve sowing fig leaves together, maybe what they needed were straight jackets, that is, if we listen to alias-gabriel, who is, after all, pretending that he is the archangel, Gabriel! Give alias-gabriel a little more slack, and he will be claiming to be Yahweh Almighty! This book written by alias-gabriel already gives one that impression!

Then on page 9, alias-gabriel goes on to say in part: “If Eve had the memory to remember what the Lord had commanded concerning the Tree of Knowledge ... she also would have reasoning ability ... Eve then, seeing the serpent, perhaps slithering on the tree of knowledge, with its tongue flickering – as snakes are known to do – was *beguiled* in her mind that the serpent actually spoke to her ... we read that she never told the Lord the serpent spoke to her.” What we have here is alias-gabriel turning this whole thing into a child’s fairy tale. Now alias-gabriel is not sure whether it was a talking snake (which he claimed that he could prove), or Eve’s flesh speaking to her, and is now theorizing that it was a mental illusion on Eve’s part that the serpent spoke to her.

Make up your mind, alias-gabriel! For alias-gabriel, it all boils down to: maybe this, or maybe that, or maybe something else! Anything to avoid Two Seedline!

There is much, much more to be covered concerning alias-gabriel's errors in this book, and it will require more papers to cover it. With this paper we haven't even gotten to some of the more important issues. What must be realized by the reader is that some of the major doctrines of the Bible are at stake, and if not addressed, one is not doing his Christian duty. Upon a lady's death in Indiana who understood the message of Israel Identity, I was blessed enough to be given this book by her daughter, which I would otherwise refuse to purchase and help support the author and his lies.