

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ALL WHO DENY TWO SEEDLINE, #6

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 sixth in a series of *Special Notices* to all anti-seedliners who are opposed to the proposition that there is a literal walking, talking, genetic Satanic seedline people in this world. Some have condemned me for coming out and naming names concerning the controversy over this issue. They advise me that I should go personally to them and work out our differences in private. I would point out to anyone who is of that opinion that the anti-seedliners were the first to make an issue of this teaching. Stephen E. Jones, in his 1978 book *The Babylonian Connection*, was the first, to my knowledge, to take issue with the Two Seedliners. (Jeffrey A. Weakley wrote his *The Satanic Seedline, Its Doctrine and History* in 1994.) It wasn't until Ted R. Weiland came out with a ten-tape audiocassette series *Eve, Did She Or Didn't She?* that I began to counter what they were promoting. I had written an article in 1995, entitled *The Problem With Genesis 4:1* which I did not distribute very widely. I had put that short article together because I had heard of a young man who was hung-up on Genesis 4:1. At that time, I had no idea the anti-seedliners had a campaign going to discredit the Two Seedline doctrine. Jeffrey A. Weakley, a year before I wrote my small article, was the first one to really start naming names and pointing his finger at some of the leading Two Seedline teachers like Swift, Comparet and Gale. As these three great pillars of men are now dead, I have taken it upon myself to defend them.

You may well ask, then, what is the purpose for my writing these *Special Notices* anyway? The answer to this question is: I am duty bound by Yahweh's Law to witness to the truth to the best of my ability as I understand it. In other words, if I know a crime has been committed, in the process of being committed or there is a danger of a crime about to be committed, if I do not witness to what I know, I am as guilty as the person committing the crime. In this case, we are not talking about a single individual crime, we are talking about tens of thousands of crimes. The news of these crimes has been withheld from the public by the usual news media and writers of the past. The law concerning the witness of a crime is found in Leviticus 5:1 which reads: “**And if a soul sin, and hear the voice of swearing, and is a witness, whether he hath seen or known of it; if he do not utter it, then he shall bear his iniquity.**”

A second Scripture which commands us to expose the truth is found in Ephesians 5:11, which says: “**And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them.**”

The New Treasury of Scripture Knowledge, edited by Jerome H. Smith says this on page 132: "... such an one shall bear his iniquity — shall be considered as guilty in the sight of God of the transgression which he has endeavored to conceal, and must expect to be punished for hiding the iniquity with which he was acquainted." Both Jones and Weakley quote from the *Zohar*, the 'sacred' book of the Cabala, which is separate from *Talmud*. Neither Jones nor Weakley seem to be quoting directly from the *Zohar*, but indirectly from *The Talmud Unmasked* by Rev. I. B. Pranaitis, page 52. If this is the case, neither one quotes this passage faithfully; such as using the proper italics where it shows. I will now quote this passage exactly as Pranaitis presents it:

"In *Zohar* (I, 28b) we read: '*Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field, etc. (Genes. III, I.)* 'More subtle' that is towards evil; 'than all the beasts' that is, the idolatrous people of the earth. For they are the children of the ancient serpent which seduced Eve.' The best argument used by the Jews to prove Christians are of a race of the devil is the fact that they are uncircumcised. The foreskin of the non-Jews prevents them from being called the children of the Most High God. For by circumcision the name of God — *Schaddai* — is completed in the flesh of a circumcised Jew. The form of the letter *Isch* is in his nostrils, the letter *Daleth* in his (bent) arm, and *ain* appears in his sexual organ by circumcision. In non-circumcised gentiles, therefore, such as Christians, there are only the two letters *Isch* and *Daleth*, which make the word *Sched*, which means devil. They are, therefore, children of the *Sched*, the Devil."

A "Jew" could be circumcised a hundred times and it would not bring him under the Covenant. If anything, this passage proves Two Seedline, as the "enmity" of Genesis 3:15 is clearly evident, and is at work here; but the "Jews" have everything backward as they are the ones who are the children of the devil. Ted R. Weiland in his booklet *Eve, Did She Or Didn't She?* quotes one other passage from the *Talmud*, Shabbath 146a: "For when the serpent came upon Eve he injected lust into her."

If the purpose of the anti-seedliners is to use the old worn-out accusation of guilt by association, they could have used more references from the *Talmud*. Here are some passages they could have used for their ambiguous claim:

Shabbath 146a: "The idea is that the serpent infected Eve (i.e., the human race) with lust, from which, however, those who accept the moral teachings of the Torah are freed."

Berachoth 61a: "In cursing we commence with the least; first the serpent was cursed then Eve and then Adam!"

Sotah 9b: "I will kill Adam and marry Eve; but now, I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed. Similarly do we find it with Cain, Korah, Balaam, Doeg, Ahitophel, Gehazi, Absalom, Adonijah, Uzziah and Haman, who set their eyes upon that which was not proper for them; what they sought was not granted to them and what they possessed was taken from them."

Avodah Zarah 22b: "When the serpent came unto Eve he infused filthy lust into her."

IS THERE ANY TRUTH IN THE TALMUD?

The anti-seedliners base their whole argument on the premise that anything found in the *Talmud* has to be entirely false. As a matter of fact, this is their ace in the hole, so they think. All they have to do is point out that the Two Seedline doctrine is found in the *Talmud*, and magically, the teaching is condemned in many people's minds. It is not my goal here to defend and uphold the majority of the contents found in these books. It is well recognized they are the most evil books ever written. But we must even give the devil his just dues. If the Two Seedline doctrine is condemned for being part of the writings of the *Talmud*, then all of their contents are condemned. Let's take a look at a few passages found in them:

Sotah 11b: "... Judah [is called] a lion's whelp; of Dan [it is said] Dan shall be a serpent, Naphtali [is called] a hind let loose; Issachar a strong ass; Joseph a firstling bullock; Benjamin a wolf that ravineth. [Of those sons of Jacob where a comparison with an animal] is written in connection with them, it is written: but [in the instances where such a comparison] is not written, there is the text: What was thy mother? A lioness; she couched among lions etc."

Well, what do you know; who would have ever thought there was anything like that in the *Talmud*? It would appear the anti-seedliners are going to have to reject the main tenets of Israel Identity because they can be found in the *Talmud*. Maybe they will have to go back to Judeo-churchianity. They are going to have to take a black permanent marker and blot out the entire chapter of Genesis 49 along with all the cross-references, all because it can be found in the *Talmud*. If they blot out Judah, there goes the Redeemer! Are you beginning to see how ridiculous an argument the anti-seedliners advocate? Can you see now how dangerous the ploy of guilt by association can be? Actually, its a "Jewish" kind of trick. Well, let's see what else we might find in the *Talmud*:

Talmud, Baba Kama 17a: "' He is worthy of the inheritance of two tribes': He is worthy of an inheritance like Joseph, as it is written: Joseph is a fruitful bough ... whose branches run over the wall; he is also worthy of the inheritance of Issachar, as it is written: Issachar is a strong ass. There are some who say, His enemies will fall before him, as it is written: With them he shall push the people together, to the ends of the earth. He is worthy of understanding like Issachar, as it is written: And the children of Issachar which were men that had understanding of the times to know what Israel ought to do."

Isn't it simply amazing what can be found in the *Talmud*? If we use the argument of the anti-seedliners, we are going to get in all kinds of trouble! If we apply their hypothesis, we will have to destroy most of Yahweh's written Word. One very adamant unyielding anti-seedliner is Lt. Col. Jack Mohr, AUS Ret. who wrote a pamphlet entitled *Seed of Satan, Literal or Figurative?* He used this same worn-out tactic of guilt by association when he said on page 8:

"Now this is pretty far fetched, I think, for it is the same teaching you find in the BABYLONIAN TALMUD, and in most heathen 'phallic religions' of the Far East. Wise [James E. Wise] implies that the FRUIT of the trees [sic.] of knowledge of good and evil, was sexual union, even though the Hebrew word for 'fruit', as it is used here

(6529), means ‘ Bough; fruitful; reward.’ There is hardly any room here for any sexual interpretation of the word, unless your mind is sexually oriented. Then I guess you can see sex in anything. Certainly the SEEDLINERS SEE SEX IN THIS PASSAGE. Shows you where their mind is, doesn’t it?” [Note: Gesenius’ includes “ offspring ” for #6529]

By the way, judging from his article, Jack Mohr believes that the tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil were wooden trees; that the serpent was an ordinary snake and the fruit was simply some kind of fruit from some fruit tree. Thus, Jack Mohr, in implying this, makes the tree of life (the Messiah) a wooden tree. I have to question anything Jack Mohr might write for he does not appear to be of pure Israelite stock. You will also notice that Jack Mohr points a finger at James E. Wise. It seems it is quite all right for the anti-seedliners to name names, but it is anathema for the Two Seedliners. More on Jack Mohr later, but for now, back to the *Talmud*:

Sanhedrin 44b: “ And the sons of Zerah: Zimri, Ethan and Herman and Calcole and Darda, five in all. Why the phrase: five of them in all? —Because all five were equally destined for the world to come ...”

Are we now supposed to throw out the entire Zerah branch of Judah because it can be found in the *Talmud*? If you listen to the anti-seedliners, this is their premise. In other words, the very mention of anything found in the *Talmud* automatically labels it as an evil teaching.

Mas. Megilah 17a: “ Why are the years of Ishmael mentioned? So as to reckon by them the years of Jacob, as it is written, And these are the years of the life of Ishmael, a hundred and thirty and seven years. How much older was Ishmael than Isaac? Fourteen years, as it is written, And Abram was fourscore and six years old when Hagar bore Ishmael to Abram, and it is also written, And Abraham was a hundred years old when his son Isaac was born to him, and it is written, And Isaac was threescore years old when she bore them. How old then was Ishmael when Jacob was born? Seventy-four. How many years were left of his life? Sixty-three; and it has been taught: Jacob our father at the time when he was blessed by his father was sixty-three years old. It was just at that time that Ishmael died, as it is written, Now Esau saw that Isaac had blessed Jacob ... so Esau went unto Ishmael and took Mahlath the daughter of Ishmael Abraham’s son the sister of Nebaioth. Now once it has been said, ‘ Ishmael’s daughter ’ do I not know she was the sister of Nebaioth? This tells us that Ishmael affianced [engaged] her and then died, and Nebaioth her brother gave her in marriage. Sixty-three and fourteen till Joseph was born make seventy-seven, and it is written, And Joseph was thirty-three years old when he stood before Pharaoh. This makes a hundred and seven. Add seven years of plenty and two of famine, and we have a hundred and sixteen, and it is written, And Pharaoh said unto Jacob, How many are the days of the years of thy life? And Jacob said unto Pharaoh, The days of the years of my sojournings are a hundred and thirty years. But [we have just seen that] they were only a hundred and sixteen? We must conclude therefore that he spent fourteen years in the house of Eber, as it has been taught: ‘ After Jacob our father had left for Aram Naharaim two years. Eber died.’ He then went forth from where he was and came to Aram Naharaim. From this it follows that when he stood by the well he was seventy-seven years old. And how do we know that he was not punished [for these

fourteen years]? As it has been taught: ‘ We find that Joseph was away from his father twenty-two years, just as Jacob out father was absent from his father.’ But Jacob’s absence was thirty-six years? It must be then that the fourteen years which he was in the house of Eber are not reckoned.”

While I have not checked this entire passage for error, it appears this part of the *Talmud* could be used as a valuable tool for figuring badly needed chronology. While I know the “Jews” cannot call Jacob their father through the Covenant, the evidence presented here could be used to confirm much of what is not recorded in our present Bibles. Therefore, I believe some passages from the *Talmud* would be creditable to our research, if we are careful how we use them; the Two Seedline doctrine without exception. I have several other passages of the *Talmud* which I could quote to enforce my position, but I think, by this time, you can see my point. In fact, if I were to use key words in the Old Testament and run them in the search mode of my copy of the *Talmud* on CD-R in my computer, no doubt, I could come up with at least 500 examples of truth contained within these writings. While I do not recommend the *Talmud* as a good source of inspiration, nevertheless, it is not 100% totally false information as the anti-seedliners imply. I only wish I had a copy of the *Zohar* on CD-R. Some might condemn me for studying the *Talmud*, but how else can we be as “wise as serpents” unless we know what the enemy has written? After all, I don’t hear anyone condemning Rev. I. B. Pranaitis, Henry Ford or Elizabeth Dilling!

LT. COL. JACK MOHR SHOTS HIMSELF IN THE FOOT SEVERAL TIMES

Lt. Col. Jack Mohr plays the con-game a little differently than some. In his 26 page booklet *Seed of Satan, Literal or Figurative?* he uses the first six paragraphs to brag on his military service. He gives a review of how he served in Korea as advisor to the southern Korean forces; about being captured, tried and condemned to die by the People’s Court; how he escaped and was the first to be decorated by General William Dean; how he repatriated American prisoners returning from North Korean prison camps and how he was a speaker for the American Opinion Speaker’s Bureau. By trying to influence you with such an impressive military record, he tries to lead you to believe that this qualifies him to be an authority on the Scriptures. If he didn’t do any better in the military than he did in this booklet, I thank the Almighty I never served under his command. You will see what I mean in a moment.

After acknowledging there is an argument in Identity circles concerning the Two Seedline interpretation of Genesis 3:15, he begins by attacking James E. Wise on his thesis *The Seed Of The Serpent*. On pages 4 and 5 he attempts to define the Hebrew words “enmity”, “seed” and “tree” as found in Genesis 3. On the word “enmity”, he shoots himself in the foot the first time. Here is what he says: “Let’s look at a few more ‘key’ words in this verse [Genesis 3:15]: ENMITY —#966 — Heb. ‘biyn’ meaning ‘between’; ‘among’; ‘within.’ In actuality it has seven meanings, only the three mentioned above can fit this setting.”

As I was reading his booklet over very carefully, it didn’t seem plausible that the word “enmity” could mean “between”, “among” or “within.” I then decided to check with my *The Complete Word Study Old Testament* by Dr. Spiros Zodhiates which has

the *Strong's* Hebrew numbers above each word. I discovered the word was not #966 at all, but #342! I found further the word had only one meaning, not seven! In the *Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament*, which sometimes uses several pages to define a word, says only this as the meaning: "... *enmity; hostile mind...*" The *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance Of The Bible*, the "Hebrew And Chaldee Dictionary" defines the meaning of the Hebrew word "enmity" as: "*ay-baw*; from 340; *hostility*: —enmity, hatred ." Because the Hebrew word #340 is referred to, we must take that one in consideration also: "*ay-yab*; a primitive root; to *hate* (as one of an opposite tribe or party); hence to be *hostile*: —be an enemy ."

For further confirmation that the word "enmity" means "hostility", let's consider some passages where #342 is found. According to the *Wigram Englishman's Hebrew-Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament*, #342 is used only five times. Once in Genesis 3:15 along with Numbers 35:21, 22; & Ezekiel 25:15; 35:5. Now, let's read these and compare them to Genesis 3:15:

Genesis 3:15: "**And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; and it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.**"

35:21-22: "**Or in enmity smite him with his hand, that he die: he that smote *him* shall surely be put to death; for he *is* a murderer: the revenger of blood shall slay the murderer, when he meeteth him. But if he thrust him suddenly without enmity, or have cast upon him any thing without laying of wait ..."**

Ezekiel 25:15: "**Thus saith Yahweh; Because the Philistines have dealt by revenge, and have taken vengeance with a despiteful heart, to destroy *it* for the old hatred.**"

Ezekiel 35:5: "**Because thou hast had a perpetual hatred, and hast shed the blood of the children of Israel by the force of the sword in the time of their calamity, in the time *that their iniquity had an end*.**"

You can see very clearly here, this is a very vicious and murderous type of enmity, and Lt. Col. Jack Mohr says the word "enmity" means "between", "among" or "within." This blunder alone should discredit his entire thesis on the subject of Two Seedline doctrine. Lt. Col. Jack Mohr then shoots himself in the foot again in his *Seed of Satan, Literal or Figurative?* on page 10, commenting on 2 Corinthians 11:3, when he says: "When the Apostle Paul admonished the church at Corinth not to be a partaker of Eve's sin, he said: 'For I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent (if it was Satan, why didn't Paul say so, he was usually outspoken when it came to naming the adversary), beguiled (#1185 — 'deleazo': meaning to entrap; allure; beguile; entice', (nothing of a sexual nature here) Eve through his subtlety (3834 — 'ponourgos' [sic. panourgos] meaning: 'shrewdness; craftiness;') should be corrupted from the simplicity that was in Christ."

Again, Lt. Col. Jack Mohr uses the wrong *Strong's* number. This time it is the word "beguiled" in 2 Corinthians 11:3. The *Strong's* number for "beguiled" in this case is #1818, not #1185. Mohr is correct that the word beguile #1185 *deleazo* means: entrap; allure or entice, but I repeat, it is not the word used in 2 Corinthians 11:3. You can see from this, if the meaning is that which Mohr implies, the word most likely would

have been #3884, to deceive by false reasoning. Again, I repeat, the correct word in 2 Corinthians 11:3 is #1818, to beguile thoroughly.

The *Thayer Greek-English Lexicon* takes us to an unusual scripture on the Greek word 1818 in the *Apocrypha*, History of Susanna, v. 56 which reads: “So he put him aside and commanded to bring the other, and said unto him, O thou seed of Chanaan [Canaan], and not of Juda, beauty hath deceived [#1818 beguiled] thee, and lust hath perverted thine heart.” [Note #1818: Same as for Eve.]

This is the story of a woman of great beauty who lived with her wealthy husband Joakin in Babylon where he held court in his house. About Joakin’s house was a large garden where Susanna strolled and bathed herself during the heat of the day. One day, after the litigants had left, two Canaanite-Jew elders inflamed with desire for Susanna plotted among themselves to force her affections. Preparing to bathe, after her maids had departed, they confronted her with the alternative of either submitting to them, or being exposed as having an affair with a young man. Upon this, Susanna chose to be unjustly accused rather than submit. Upon this these Canaanite-Jews gave their false testimony at the court the following day, and she was found guilty. But there was a judge by the name of Daniel who was not swayed by their false testimony and requested a new examination of the witnesses. After parting the witnesses, Daniel examined them separately, demanding them to identify the tree in the garden where Susanna and her alleged lover were seen. Their contradictory answers betrayed their treachery, and Daniel said to them as quoted in verse 56 above. I will continue with Lt. Col. Jack Mohr in the next *Special Notice*.