

LIES MASQUERADING AS “THE TRUTH”, A Critical Review Of The Book, *THE TWO CREATIONS*, Part #2

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

This is the second part of a critical review. As I explained in part #1, since the author didn't use his own name but instead used the pseudonym of "Gabriel", I will continue to refer to the author as "alias-gabriel". And since this book has been distributed to a number of people, even if I discover who the actual author is, I will continue to use this pseudonym so the reader can recognize the book to which I refer. To foster one's own agenda by using the name of "Gabriel" is nothing new, for Mohammed did likewise to promote his false doctrine, and should wave a red flag! In part #1, I showed where the author made many serious errors using flawed reasoning, rather than discovering the true context of the various Biblical passages. In this issue, I will continue to show more of these tragic miscalculations. The reader should be informed that alias-gabriel is an insidious no-Satan, no-devil advocate. I would also remind the reader that I have addressed this same no-Satan subject with a series of six brochures entitled *Mark Downey's Phony No-Satan Dogma*.

To get started with this second paper on this critical review of alias-gabriel, and his tirade, I will cite a passage on pages 115-116 in Appendix E, "Job And Satan":

"The word 'Satan' is a Hebrew word, signifying 'to oppose, to be an adversary.' The word 'Satan' is translated by our English translators 'adversary,' 'withstand,' 'resist,' and also transliterated as 'Satan,' in many places in the Bible.

"If the translators had used the words adversary or opponent, instead of the term Satan, we wouldn't have all the Satan worshippers today! But, as usual, God moved them to use this term to lead the unregenerate man into error.

"I've discussed this with many people. They all deny that they worship Satan. What they claim is that they just recognize his power, and what he is able to do! Well, my friend, if you think for a moment that you can admit that 'Satan' has power to do his own will, you have, in effect, given him the power of a deity. My dictionary tells me that worship means: TO VENERATE AS A DEITY.

“So any way you want to cut it – the ‘fallen angel’ dogma is the veneration of ‘Satan,’ in violation of the first commandment: ‘Thou shalt have no other gods before me’ ...

“Now the ‘fallen angel’ proponents claim that this event took place in ‘heaven’ and that the sons of God mentioned here are the angels. And, of course, the ‘Satan’ here has ascended for the meeting! Now this is a nice theory, but it just doesn’t wash when we know Bible terms. I’ve pointed out before that the Bible term, ‘sons of God,’ was exclusive property of the sons of Adam through Seth and Shem, with other divisions coming at Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob-Israel (Luke 3:38). This truth is also confirmed in Ex. 4:22-23:

‘And thou shalt say unto Pharaoh, Thus saith the Lord, Israel is my *son*, even my firstborn: And I say unto thee, Let my *son go*.’

“Now, as far as the angels being called the sons of God, Paul gives us clarification on this in Heb. 1: [5, 13] ‘For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee?’ “And again”, ‘I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son? ... But to which of the angels said he at any time, Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool?’

“Are they not all *ministering spirits*, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation? vs: 13-14

“We can now see that the angels of God were never called sons. And that their job is to be ministering spirits to the heirs of salvation! So now you know what the Holy Spirit is! For more on this revelation read: Luke 12:8-10, Ex. 23:20-23, Rev. 22:16.”

Previously, on page 21, alias-gabriel spoke in the same manner at combined chapters 6 & 7 “The Reason For and the Results of the Flood” thusly:

“... As we begin chapter 6, God confirms that many daughters were born unto men. Then we read in verse [sic verses] 2 and 3: ‘That the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they *were* fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose. And the Lord said, My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also *is* flesh: yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years.’

“As we’ve seen before in Luke 3:38, the sons of God were the descendants of Adam. They began to marry the mixed-blooded descendants of Cain, and no doubt some of the pre-Adamite people.” [So says alias-gabriel.]

Now **it simply is not true** that Genesis 6:2-3 is speaking of the descendants of Adam mixing with the descendants of Cain!!! The Hebrew numbers in Strong’s for Adam are 120 & 121, so let’s read in its proper context, and I will put the number 120 behind the word “man” where it belongs:

“¹ **And it came to pass, when men[120] began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them,** ² **That the sons of God saw the daughters of men[120] that they *were* fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose.** ³ **And Yahweh said, My spirit shall not always strive with man[120], for that he also *is* flesh: yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years.”**

It should be perfectly clear that if the “sons of God” are also Adamites, as alias-gabriel falsely claims, it would be Adamites mixing with Adamites (“kind after kind”; and “bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh”)!!! And, Adamites cohabiting with Adamites

doesn't produce giants! Of course, as I showed you in part #1, alias-gabriel put Cain in the same category with Adam, Noah, and Abraham. To demonstrate how inconsistent alias-gabriel is, in one breath he infers that Cain is an Adamite, and in the next breath he says: "They began to marry the mixed-blooded descendants of Cain ..." So, alias-gabriel, was Cain a pureblooded Adamite, or of "mixed-blood"? Make up your mind! As we observed, alias-gabriel tried to prove his point that the "sons of God" at verse 2 were Adamites by quoting Exodus 4:22:

"And thou shalt say unto Pharaoh, Thus saith Yahweh, Israel is my son, even my firstborn." The proper context for this verse is (and remember that Israel was the same person as Jacob) that even though Esau was born first, Yahweh considered Jacob as firstborn! Therefore it has nothing to do with the "sons of God" at Genesis 6:2!

At Gen. 6:4 we are told that from these unions, of the "sons of God" with Adamic women, "giants" were born (Strong's H#5303): "גִּבּוֹרִים (*něpîlîm*) **giants, the Nephilim** (Gen 6:4; Num 13:33, only)." Since that Hebrew word is used only twice according to *The Theological Wordbook Of The Old Testament*, by R. Laird Harris, let's check Num. 13:33:

"And there we saw the giants, the sons of Anak, which come of the giants: and we were in our own sight as grasshoppers, and so we were in their sight." Now why didn't alias-gabriel cite this passage?

In my *Watchman's Teaching Letter* #114 for October, 2007, William Finck in his *The Problem With Genesis 6:1-4* wrote in part: "In the Enochic literature, in what is called *The Book of Giants*, the race of fallen angels is said to have perpetrated the corruption of species. From another edition of the Qumran scrolls, *The Dead Sea Scrolls, A New Translation* by Michael Wise, Martin Abegg Jr. and Edward Cook, on page 247, a translation of 1Q23, fragments 1 and 6 ...

"The word translated 'giant' at Gen. 6:4, which also appears at Num. 13:33, is *nephilim*, a word derived from the verb *naphal*, 'to fall' (Strong's #5307), and is interpreted by many to mean in the plural *fallen ones* (although this is not Strong's definition, for which see #5303). This word appears as a label for certain of the 'sons of heaven' in the *Genesis Apocryphon* ..." In a recent note Bill said: "The problem with Genesis 6:1-4, that the Masoretic Text, where it reads 'sons of God' in those verses should be amended to 'sons of heaven'."

You may have noticed that alias-gabriel places everyone who believes there is indeed an entity known to Yahshua Christ as "Satan" into the category of unregenerate man where he said: "But, as usual, God moved them to use this term to lead the unregenerate man into error." Well if this is true, then Yahshua Christ Himself is an "unregenerate man", for He stated at Luke 10:18:

"And he said unto them (the seventy) , I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven."

Note here, the Greek word Σαταναν = Satan. Breaking each character down in Greek letter by letter it appears thus:

Σ = S, α = a, τ = t, α = a, ν = n, α = a, ν = n.

Luke is recognized by most all authorities in the Greek language for his excellence in Greek. Therefore, if that is what Luke wrote, that is what Christ said! Who is alias-gabriel to contend that Yahshua said otherwise?

Paul used the same Greek word at Romans 16:20 where he said: “**And the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly.**” And that happened shortly after, as Paul had predicted it, when the Roman army under Titus besieged and destroyed Jerusalem and the Temple after all of the Christians had fled to Pella, and by-and-large all that was left in Judaea were the Canaanite-Edomite-bad-fig-jews, the seed of the serpent of Genesis 3:15.

Josephus recorded the occupation and appalling profaning of the Temple by Jewish Zealots in A.D. 67-68, who had also installed a usurper, Phanni, as high priest (Josephus’ *Wars* 4.3.7-10; 4.6.3). Judaeans Christians fled to Pella, a town located in the Transjordanian mountains (Eusebius *Ecclesiastical History* 3.5.3). [*The Bible Knowledge Commentary* on Mark 13:14]

Repeating alias-gabriel where he stated: “If the translators had used the words adversary or opponent, instead of the term Satan, we wouldn’t have all the Satan worshippers today! ...” Evidently alias-gabriel is not aware that “the devil disputing about the body of Moses” at Jude 9 is the same Satan at Zechariah 3:1-2. The body of Moses represents the body of the law, not Moses’ physical body. The Greek for “the devil” at Jude 9 is τῷ διαβόλῳ with τῷ being the Greek Article, and διαβόλῳ being a noun, masculine, singular dative. Zechariah 3:1-2 is a portrayal of Joshua the high priest before the angel of Yahweh, with Satan standing at his right hand ready to resist him. Here Satan is accompanied with the Hebrew Article (ה), as it also appears with Satan in the book of Job.

The following definition is from the Strong’s *Enhanced Lexicon* from the Libronix Digital Library:

“**7854** שָׂטָן [satan /saw-tawn/] noun masculine. From 7853; 27 occurrences; AV translates as ‘Satan’ 19 times, ‘adversary’ seven times, and ‘withstand’ once. **1** adversary, one who withstands. **1A** adversary (in general – personal or national). **2** superhuman adversary. **2A** Satan ...”

In order to see how the Hebrew שָׂטָן transliterates into English, we have to reverse the order to left to right thusly:

ש = Syin, ט = Têyth, נ = Nûwn

One can check this out in the Strong’s *Dictionary of The Hebrew Bible* under “Hebrew Articulation”. So whether it is in the Hebrew or the Greek, **it is still** “Satan”.

The most important thing, though, is whether or not the term Satan is accompanied by the Greek or Hebrew Article. When Christ told Peter, “get behind me Satan” at Matt. 16:23; Mark 8:33 and Luke 4:8, the Greek Article isn’t there, thus not a proper noun in that case. But when we take into account Revelation 12:9, the Greek Article appears four times as follows:

“**And the [ὁ] great dragon was cast out, that [ὁ] old serpent, called the [ὁ] Devil, and [ὁ] Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his**

angels were cast out with him.” I have inserted the Greek Article “ὁ” into this verse, copied and pasted from the NA27 from the Libronix Digital Library for your appraisal. John, in his Revelation, here is showing the reader that the “great dragon”, the “old serpent”, the “Devil”, and “Satan” are all the same entity. In essence, alias-gabriel is calling John the Revelator **a liar!**

Christ identified the scribes and Pharisees as children of Satan at John 8:44. The *Smith & Goodspeed* translation renders like this:

“The devil is the father you are sprung from, and you want to carry out your father’s wishes. He was a murderer from the first, and he has nothing to do with truth, for there is no truth in him. When he tells a lie, he speaks in his true character, for he is a liar and the father of them.”

To comprehend this, one must realize that the priesthood had been usurped by Edomites of Hittite extraction, who in turn had mixed with the Kenites of Genesis 15:19-21 (descendants of Cain #'s 7014 & 7017), who in turn was the son of Satan. And don't quote Genesis 4:1, as that verse is known by Hebrew scholars to be a corrupted passage.

We will now return to alias-gabriel and his book *The Two Creations*, on pages 9 & 110. With a smart-aleck attitude he attempts to support his position at Appendix C on page 110 stating: “Then neither Adam nor Eve could have been tempted in the flesh”. That leaves only the mind. I would also like to remind the reader, as I pointed out in Part #1 of this series that alias-gabriel uses italics incorrectly, which you can observe in the following quotation from page 9. He changes the italics in the KJV where they are used to show words that were not in the original manuscripts. By doing so, he is adding and subtracting from the Word. Compare the following with your KJV:

“... NO! Only that it *beguiled* her. I'm going to explain this word *beguiled* a little later in this study, so bear with me. But right now I want to quote you a truth James wrote which has its application right here in Eden:

‘Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, *neither tempteth* he any man: But *every man* is tempted, when he is *drawn away* of his *own lust*, and *enticed*. Then when *lust* hath *conceived*, it bringeth forth sin: and sin, when it is finished. bringeth forth death.’ James 1:13-15 [*italics incorrect*]

“Mark this well, my friend. For here James said *every man* (including woman) is drawn away into *sin* by *his own lust*. If there was a ‘devil’ or ‘Satan’ that was responsible, don't you think James would have qualified his statement?

“If the witness of James isn't enough for you, how about this statement from Jesus:

‘... Hearken unto me every one of you, and understand: There is *nothing* from without a man, that entering into him can defile him: but the things which come out of him, those are they that defile the man. If any man have ears to hear, let him hear. And when he was entered into the house from the people, his disciples asked him concerning the parable. And he saith unto them, Are ye so without understanding also? Do ye not perceive, that whatsoever thing from without entereth into the man, it cannot defile him; Because it entereth *not* into his *heart*. but into the belly, and goeth out into

the draught, purging all meats? And he said, That which *cometh out* of the man, that *defileth* the man. For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thought [sic thoughts], adulteries, fornications, murders, Thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, and [sic an] evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness: *All these evil things come from within, and defile the man.*' Mark 7:14-23 [*Notice all of the italics that weren't there*]

“ If all these evil things proceed from the heart of man, that doesn't leave too much for the ' devil ' to do, does it?”

Here alias-gabriel quoted Christ as saying, “ There is nothing from without a man, that entering into him can defile him ...” If that is true (and that is exactly what Christ said), it couldn't have been some kind of fruit off of a tree that Eve ate, could it? Had alias-gabriel read the entire chapter, he may have discovered that Yahshua, speaking to the scribes and Pharisees, was condemning them for giving greater attention to the cleanliness of their eating utensils rather than to the manner by which they obtained the food to fill those utensils! Evidently alias-gabriel is not aware that a woman has two mouths; the one on her face that she eats food with, and the other her vagina, and I will guarantee that what she eats with her vagina certainly could defile her if it isn't of her own race (cf. Prov. 30:20 & 9:17)! The transgression recorded in the garden could not have been due to mere food, and alias-gabriel serves to prove the very act which he denies!

Before this alias-gabriel had quoted James as saying, “ But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed.” Today that enticement is being perpetrated on a large scale by the television and other media, showing all kinds of murder, sexual deviation, the encouragement of race-mixing which is fornication, and many other sins all promoted by the same Cain-Canaanite-Edomite-bad-fig-jews, who were responsible for the crucifixion of Christ, and who own and control the television networks today. Just like Eve was drawn away of her own lust and enticed by Satan, Satan's children (seed) are doing the same thing to our young White women today! And alias-gabriel, with his false teachings, is helping Satan's children in their agenda by screaming that Satan doesn't exist!

Let's compare alias-gabriel's comments here to what Yahshua said at Matthew 7:15-20: “ ¹⁵ **Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep[-people]'s clothing, but inwardly they are ravening [Canaanite-jew] wolves.** ¹⁶ **Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of [Canaanite]-thorns, or figs of [Canaanite]-thistles?** ¹⁷ **Even so every good [sheep]-tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt [Canaanite]-tree bringeth forth evil fruit.** ¹⁸ **A good [sheep]-tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither *can* a corrupt [Canaanite]-tree bring forth good fruit.** ¹⁹ **Every tree that bringeth not forth good-[sheep] fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.** ²⁰ **Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know [the difference between] them.”**

Thus, alias-gabriel is really stuck in a rut with his talking-snake theology, and I'm sure most of the pastors in judeo-churchianity would agree with him where he rambles aimlessly along on page 6:

“ Four things are sure here:

“ 1. The serpent (*nachash*) was a snake. Not a man, or ‘ fallen angel.’

“ 2. It was subtil [sic subtle]. (From the primary root *aram*) meaning: smoothness.
[error, wrong Strong’s #]

“ 3. Yahovah [sic Yahweh] God created it.

“ 4. The snake (it appears) was given the power to speak!” [On page 8 alias-gabriel continues]:

“ To prove that this ‘ devil’ (*diabolos*) was nothing more that [sic than] Christ’s own flesh tempting him to do his own will, instead of the Fathers [sic] will, we must read on. But first let’s look up this word ‘ devil’ in the Greek Concordance, and see if our English translators had a choice of words to choose from. Devil (*diabolos*) meaning: false accuser, devil, or slanderer. ...

“ Two more attempts by the misnamed ‘ devil’ are recorded in Matthew 4. Each time Jesus rebuked the temptation with the written Word of God. Assuming this assessment is correct, we then can explain also what satan [sic] is. For in rebuking his temptation to exalt himself as ruler over the world in verses 8-10, Jesus calls his nemesis satan [sic]. After overcoming these temptations, and, in effect, rebuking the fleshly desire to do his own will, Jesus was ready to begin his mission of doing the will of the Father and preaching the gospel of the Kingdom.” [bull]

Poor old Yahweh in the flesh, can’t do anything right! Question: If “ Satan ” was Christ’s flesh, why would He quote Scripture to it? And why would his flesh quote Scripture back to Him? I never heard of anything more ridiculous in my life! Maybe Christ like Eve, hearing voices from her flesh – as alias-gabriel alleged – was also suffering from paranoia or a schizophrenic disorder and needed to see a psychiatrist! If there is anyone hearing voices from his flesh, it has to be alias-gabriel.