

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ALL WHO DENY TWO SEEDLINE, #11

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

Again, I cannot emphasize enough how important it is to understand the formidable enemy with whom we have to contend! In order to fathom our present **world problems**, it is imperative we grasp two things: (1) That the White Europeans and their kin worldwide are the true racial Israelites of the Bible, and (2) Who Israel's real enemies are. To know one without the other is insufficient. To improperly identify Biblical Israel's enemy is a criminal offense, for it can mean the difference between life and death to our people. Death is not always so obvious to the eye. When a white marries a member of another race, it brings on death of the Spirit which was breathed into our forefather Adam. If you are ever invited to attend a wedding of a White and a nonwhite, you are not attending a wedding, but a funeral. When the 23 chromosomes of the male sperm of a nonwhite unites with the 23 chromosomes of the egg of a White, it brings death to the 23 chromosomes of the egg of the White (and the other way around)! This process is now happening in White countries every few minutes. In the Bible it is called a "plague", Numbers 25:1-9 (especially verse 9). In that chapter, having intercourse with non-Israelites was considered the same as "death." If you think the bombing of the Twin Trade Towers in New York was terrible, consider the death being brought about by miscegenation. This should give you some idea of what kind of WAR we are in, and who the players are. Now the key to understanding this WAR is found in Genesis 3:15. The anti-seedliners, by denying the truth of that passage, are aiding and abetting Israel's worst enemy. Actually, the anti-seedliners are doing more damage than the "Jews" themselves. They call us Two Seedliners "seedliners", so the only thing we can dub them is "anti-seedliners."

"MY FATHER" vs. "your father"

John 8:38 is one of the main supporting passages for Genesis 3:15:

"I speak that which I have seen with my Father: and ye do that which ye have seen with your father."

You will first notice, as properly applied by the translators, the one "father" is capitalized and the other one isn't. From this, it should be quite evident that the Father of the Messiah was not the same father as that of those so-called "Jews." Therefore, Scripture is talking about two separate genetic family trees! You might argue, "this is speaking in a 'spiritual' sense." Yet, take a look at the next verse where it says:

“*Abraham is our father.*” That hardly sounds “spiritual”, does it? It is not “spiritual” here, nor is it “spiritual” in John 8:44 where Messiah tells certain Judeans, later called “Jews”, who their father really was and is.

Further, it is stated “my Father” and “your father” indicating that our Savior had a different genetic Father than did the so-called “Jews.” The Greek word for “my” is #3450, while the word for “your” is #5216. Surely, this language should be clear enough to understand the “Pharisee” and “Sadducee” alleged “Jews” were, for the most part, definitely not of the same lineage as our Messiah. Yet, in spite of that evidence, this is what the anti-seedliners falsely maintain. Weiland and Weisman both made this assertion as I have already shown you in other *Special Notices*. What is it that we don’t understand about the difference in the meanings of “my” and “your”? Jeffrey A. Weakley also says it’s all “spiritual.”

“IF”

In John 8 verse 39 it says: “**IF** ye were Abraham’s children, ye would do the works of Abraham.” In verse 42 it says: “**IF** God were your Father, ye would love me.” Questions: (1) Did the so-called “Jews” ever do the works of Abraham? (2) Did these same “Jews” ever love Him? In order to understand what these passages mean, it will be necessary to qualify the Greek word “**IF**.” Actually, there are two Greek words translated “**IF**” in our English versions, and they are quite different! As a matter of fact, unless we investigate the true meanings of these words in the Greek, we cannot comprehend what is being said in the entire 8th chapter of John.

The one word “**IF**” is #1487, and the other word “**IF**” is #1437 in the *Strong’s Concordance*. We are particularly interested in #1487 in this case. W. E. Vine does not deal with either of these. *Strong’s* explanations do little to make these understandable either. After searching through several Greek reference books, I found Dr. Spiros Zodhiates in his *The Complete New Testament Word Study Dictionary* had the best general definitions for these two meanings. On pages 504 & 493 he says this of these two Bible words rendered “**IF**”:

“1487 ... *ei*: conditional conjunctive. If. As such it expresses a condition which is merely hypothetical and separate from all experience in indicating a mere subjective possibility and differing from *ean* (1437), if, which implies a condition which experience must determine, i.e., an objective possibility referring always to something future ...”

“1437 ... *ean* ... It differs from *ei* in that *ei* expresses a condition which is merely hypothetical, a subjective possibility; *ean* implies a condition which experience must determine, an objective possibility, and thus refers always to something future ...”

From this we can see in the Greek, for these two words, it is either a “hypothetical” **IF** or a “future” **IF**. For an example of a “future” **IF**, one might say: **IF** one will turn on the ignition, one might be able to start the engine. But the **IF** in our passages above is #1487, a “hypothetical” **IF** in nature. Thus, these verses might read something like this:

Verse 39 saying: “**IF** [hypothetically] ye were Abraham’s children, ye would do the works of Abraham.” And verse 42 saying: “**IF** [hypothetically] God [Yahweh] were your Father, ye would love me.”

Surely, this very strongly suggests that the greater part of the Pharisees and Sadducees were NOT true children of Abraham of **pure genetic seed**! When faced with these statements of our Redeemer, the so-called “Jews” said, verse 41: “**We be not born of fornication; we have one Father, even God.**”

Those so-called “Jews” wouldn’t have made such a statement if it hadn’t been implied in the discourse by our Savior in John chapter 8, for “fornication” means to race-mix. Yes, they understood His words very well, and they knew what the word “*ei*” (IF) meant, even though the anti-seedliners don’t seem to comprehend it today. Not only did the “Jews” understand the impetus of Messiah’s words, but they understood well the sarcasm in which they were said. There used to be a bumper sticker that read: “*If you’re so smart, why aren’t you rich!*” Messiah said: “**If ye were Abraham’s children, ye would do the works of Abraham.**”

In other words: “put up or shut up!” How much more evidence is needed to convince the anti-seedliners that those so-called “Jews” were not true pureblooded descendants of Abraham? I recognize that verse 37 says: “*I know that ye are Abraham’s seed*”, but it doesn’t say “*pure seed*”, and “*never in bondage*” confirms it in John 8:33! The Hebrew word “arab”, #6154, means “a *mixture or mongrel race*” The Esau-Edomite-“Jews”, and the Arabs all have one thing in common; they are all “mamzers” (bastards). All mixed people are “Arabs.”

“OF”

In John 8:47, Messiah tells the so-called “Jews”: “**He that is [genetically] OF God heareth God’s words: ye therefore hear them not; because you are not [genetically] OF God.**” In *Special Notice #1*, we considered the word “OF” such as used in this verse. It is *Strong’s #1537* in the Greek. To refresh our memory, I will repeat it here:

“The *Complete Word Study Dictionary, New Testament* by Dr. Spiros Zodhiates devotes five pages to define and expound the word “**OF**” as used in the Greek, pages 529-534. Obviously, I cannot quote this entire document here, but cite only that which is relevant to John 8:44:

“1537. ... Preposition governing the genitive, primarily meaning out of, from, of, as spoken of such objects which were before another ... Of the origin or source of anything, i.e., the primary, direct, immediate source ... Of persons, of the place, stock, family, condition, meaning out of which one is derived or to which he belongs ... Of the source, i.e., the person or thing, out of or from which anything proceeds, is derived, or to which it pertains ...”

“The *New Testament Greek Study Aids*, by Walter Jerry Clark, says, on page 230, about the Greek word ἐκ: ‘out of ... with the genitive: by means of, out of.’ The *Intermediate New Testament Greek* by Richard A. Young, page 95 says the following about the Greek word ἐκ: ‘ἐκ often conveys special extensions ‘out of’ or ‘from.’ For example, the prophet said that God would call His Son out of Egypt (Matthew 2:15)” From the *Greek to English Interlinear* by George Ricker Berry, page 31 of his “Greek-English New Testament Lexicon”, we have this on ἐκ: “ἐκ, or before a vowel, ἐξ, a preposition governing genitive, from, out of.” The *Thayer Greek-English Lexicon of the*

New Testament, page 189 expresses ἐκ this way: "... out of, as separation from, something with which there has been close connection ..." John 8:47 has the same connotation as John 8:44. It means a chip off the old block. When it says the so-called "Jews" are not "**OF**" God [Yah], it means it in a genetic way. But only those of us who are genetically "**OF**" God (Yahweh) can hear and comprehend His Word.

John chapter 10 warns us of this very thing! In John 10:26-27 Messiah says the same thing to the "Jews", but puts it a little differently: "26 But ye believe not, because ye are not my sheep, as I said unto you. 27 My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me."

You may be wondering why I am so adamant concerning the Two Seedline doctrine. The reason I am so insistent is because, without properly identifying the enemy, the Identity message is neutralized. It also tends to open the door for the enemy to worm his way into our midst. Once the enemy has established a beachhead among us, he can spread all kinds of misleading information and false doctrine ("leaven"). The "Jews" who are in the Herbert Armstrong camp are a good example of this. It should be obvious that the "Jews" would have the most to gain from an anti-seedline message. If the enemy can directly or indirectly influence those in Israel Identity to the fraud that there is no "seed of the serpent", he has them right where he wants them. Once the enemy has convinced Identity minded people there is no "seed (children) of the serpent", the "no-devil doctrine" invariably follows. Once this erroneous premise is established, the next step is usually to identify the "devil" as the "flesh." While it is true we do have a war with the flesh, this is not the same WAR as that which is being waged against "the seed (children) of the serpent!" To identify the flesh as the Satanic enemy is to grossly misdirect our energy. While the anti-seedline people are trying to analyze their own individual, personal, fleshly problems, the real enemy is bulldozing along their agenda to destroy the White Race! You can't get any more neutralized than that!!! Paul speaks of it as: "*one that beateth the air.*" David said the following about the enemy, Psalm 139:21-22, of which I am sure he wasn't talking about his "flesh":

"21 Do not I hate them, O YAHWEH, that hate thee? and am not I grieved with those that rise up against thee? 22 I hate them with perfect hatred: I count them mine enemies."

Surely, the "devil" and the "flesh" can't be the same thing! Yet this is what Ted R. Weiland maintained on one of his ten audiocassette tape series entitled *Eve, Did She Or Didn't She?* He tried to claim that the two seeds of Genesis 3:15 were the "seeds of the spirit against the seeds of the flesh." Ted R. Weiland was saying, in effect, that the "tree of knowledge" was the law, and when Eve ate of it, it brought on death! — that the "enmity" between "thy seed and her seed" of Genesis 3:15 is the enmity between the "flesh and the spirit." In other words, the flesh represents a seed line. In doing this, Ted R. Weiland was separating verse 15 from 14 as if it didn't exist. Yahweh was directing His dialogue to the "serpent", not the "flesh." Let's read the whole passage, Mr. Weiland:

"14 And Yahweh said to the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt

thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life: 15 And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.”

Now if it is a war between the “spirit” and the “flesh”, it would have to read as follows. (So let’s now read it as Ted R. Weiland would have us to read it):

“ And the LORD God said to Eve’s flesh, Because thou hast done this, thy flesh is cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; and thy flesh shall go upon its belly, and dust shalt thy belly eat all the days of thy life: And I will put enmity between the flesh of the woman and the spirit of the woman, and between the offspring of her flesh and the offspring of her spirit, and the offspring of her spirit shall bruise the head of the offspring of her flesh, and the offspring of her flesh will bruise the heel of the offspring of her spirit.” (The Gospel according to Ted R. Weiland.)

THE “LAW TREE” HYPOTHESIS

Although Weiland does not say it in terms of a “law tree”, he highly suggests that this is what the “tree of the knowledge of good and evil” was which Eve partook of in the garden. I will quote some excerpts from his book by the same title as his ten audiocassette series, pages 40-44, and I am sure you will have to agree with my analysis of what he, in essence, is saying:

“ There are no scriptures that categorically tell us what the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was ... Genesis 3:22 clearly reveals that the knowledge of good and evil resides not with some demon of darkness, but rather with our omniscient God, Yahweh ... God’s law itself is good because it reflects Yahweh’s nature. Consequently, Yahweh uses it as the vehicle through which the knowledge of good is commuted to man. The knowledge of evil is imparted by means of the law as well ... Furthermore, Genesis 3:6 describes the tree of the knowledge of good and evil as being able *to make one wise, being pleasant to the eyes and good for food*. These qualities also describe the law of God ... At this point someone is likely to inquire ‘If the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was the law of God, would not that have made God’s law evil because God did not want Adam and Eve to partake of it?’ ... There may be Christians, especially those who understand the vital goodness and importance of God’s law for us today, who may still have difficulty reconciling in their minds that Yahweh would ban His law from Adam and Eve. Such Christians should consider that when God prohibited Adam and Eve from partaking of the tree of life, that prohibition did not make the tree of life evil ... So why would Yahweh want to keep Adam and Eve from His law? ... Perhaps God initially forbade Adam and Eve the knowledge of good and evil by way of His law because He knew He would have to hold them accountable to it, and He knew the heartache and death that would ensue as a result ... On the other hand, if the eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil was an unlawful partaking of God’s law, then there is a connection between Adam and Eve’s sin and all other sin.”

Let’s now sort out all this gibberish. What are the consequences of what Weiland is saying? Weiland is inferring that Yahweh deliberately withheld His Law from Adam and Eve so they wouldn’t be condemned by their sin —that as long as they didn’t know the Law, they were innocent —that by partaking of the Law, it brought

about death. If Weiland is correct (Yahweh forbid), and Adam and Eve had never partaken of the “law-tree” (as Stephen E. Jones calls it), we could conceivably be living in innocence today, partaking of every kind of immorality, and it would not be considered by Yahweh as sin because we never ate of the so-called “law-tree.” Wouldn’t all the homosexuals of today love that situation?

THEORY OF EATING OF THE LAW TREE NOT ORIGINAL WITH WEILAND

This idea is not original with Weiland. Stephen E. Jones, in his book *The Babylonian Connection*, pages 60-61, says this in part:

“The tree of life (Grace) and the tree of knowledge (Law) both were planted in the same garden by God. They grew together. The Law-tree provided the righteous standard; the Grace-tree provided the means by which the standard could be met ... First they disobeyed God by eating from the Law-tree, and for that act they were made mortal. Then their eyes were opened to know both good and evil, and they *recognized* their mortality in contrast to God’s immortality ... Because they had broken His Law, they stood naked (mortal) and without excuse.” [*Bull manure!*]

All this is absolutely preposterous, for there is positively no Scriptural backing for such ideas as a “law tree”, or a “grace tree”, or that the two seeds of Genesis 3:15 are representative of the “seeds of the flesh” and “seeds of the spirit.” The term for seed in both the case of the woman and the serpent is #2233 *zera*, and is the same word used in Genesis 13:16 where Abram is promised by the Almighty that his “seed” would become “as the dust of the earth.” If in fact Abraham had literal “seed”, so also must the serpent of Genesis 3:15 have literal “seed!” So where are the serpent’s “seed” then? You talk about “taking away”, “adding to” or “twisting”; this is the ultimate zenith of absurdity. It is obvious then, that the “woman”, the “serpent” and “Abraham” were all to have literal “seed” (children). Thus, to state that the “woman” was to have only one “seed” is also outrageously irrational for it does not literally follow! She was to have a single variety (species; like kind) of “seed” via Seth, of which one “seed” was to bruise the head of the serpent! All this makes one wonder who will be next in line to parrot this same spurious argument! Stop and think: Without the “seed” of the serpent, Messiah’s heel could not be bruised; and without the bruising of His heel, we have no Redemption. Maybe we should be a tad more careful how we interpret Genesis 3:15! Repeating: If there was not a literal genetic offspring of the “serpent” to bruise the “heel” of our Savior, then, **WE HAVE NO REDEMPTION!!!** It would appear the anti-seedliners have talked themselves into a corner from which there is no escape!

“ A MURDERER FROM THE BEGINNING ”

This phrase is found in John 8:44, and the anti-seedliners make the claim that it has a “spiritual” connotation. For the life of me, I don’t know where they find a case of “spiritual murder” in the Bible. Then again, maybe they have a different Bible than mine. I wish they would quote book, chapter and verse showing a single occurrence where someone was “murdered spiritually.” The word “murderer” in John 8:44 is

#443, *anthropoktonos*, in the Greek and means “a manslayer.” It would seem if it had “spiritual” connotations, it would be defined as “spirit slayer.” But, try as I may, I can find no place where this word has any such meaning. Many of the commentaries attempt to point out that this doesn’t mean Cain, but the devil. Lt. Col. Jack Mohr makes this same claim on page 23 of his *Seed of Satan, Literal or Figurative?* But thankfully, all commentaries do not agree on this. The *Nelson’s Illustrated Bible Dictionary* says this on page 733:

“**MURDER** — the unlawful killing of one person by another, especially with premeditated malice. After the Fall in the Garden of Eden (Gen. 3:1-24), it was not long before the first murder occurred (Gen. 4:8), as Cain killed Abel his brother.”

It would appear from this that the killing of Abel by Cain is the first recorded murder in the Bible. While it is true that Satan’s beguiling brought on “death”, nowhere is it recorded as a “murder” as implied in the meaning of this Greek word. *The Complete New Testament Word Study* by Spiros Zodhiates makes this observation on the Greek word #443 on page 179: “*anthropoktonos* ... Homicidal, used substantively [not imaginary; real rather than apparent; actual] manslayer, one who commits homicide (John 8:44; 1 John 3:15) ... to kill, put to death.”

As you can see, Zodhiates includes both John 8:44 and 1 John 3:15 in this definition. And, if you will check 1 John 3:15, you will see that it is speaking of Cain as recorded in 1 John 3:12, just three verses before it! Where do these anti-seedliners come up with all of this hocus-pocus about some kind of “spiritual murder”?

Stephen E. Jones implied this in his *The Babylonian Connection* on pages 70-71 where he said this:

“Remembering John’s definition that ‘he that committeth sin is of the devil’, Jesus was simply saying that the Pharisees were doing the devil’s works. Since we have already seen that the devil could not have physically fathered Cain, nor any other human, the Pharisees were ‘of the devil’ idiomatically, not genealogically.”

Ted R. Weiland in his *Eve, Did She Or Didn’t She?* words it a little more cleverly, when on page 90 he says:

“However, any well-versed Bible student knows that the Word of God is not always intended to be taken literally.” Then, on page 84 he asks this question: “However, is it a foregone conclusion that the word ‘father’ used in John 8 has to be understood in a literal, physical sense? The seedliners declare: ‘Absolutely!’”

Well, if the word “murderer” is literal, as we have just seen, then the word “father” would have to be literal also, would it not? Matthew 23:29-35 cites the murdered victims.

Jeffrey A. Weakley, in his *The Satanic Seedline, Its Doctrine and History*, parrots the same contention in a “question and answer” discussion conducted solely by himself on page 24:

“**ARGUMENT** [of the Two Seedliners]: John 8:44 says: ‘Ye are of your father the devil ...’ This shows that the devil is their physical father.” **ANSWER** [by Weakley]: “Wrong. This once again shows that the devil is their spiritual father (the one that they serve).”

Lt. Col. Jack Mohr in his *Seed of Satan, Literal or Figurative?*, page 26, put it this way:

“Figuratively, I believe they are the special children of Satan and that as the Apostle Paul said: ‘They please not God, and are contrary to all men’ (Thess. 2:15). But let us use care when we call them the literal, physical children of Satan, for we cannot prove this from the Word.” *[ha!]*