

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ALL WHO DENY TWO SEEDLINE, #12

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

As I have stated previously, "We are at WAR", and I am not referring to our present so-called war on "terrorism." While the current war concerning "terrorism" is taking on large proportions, it's only a mere skirmish in comparison to the great 7,000 year WAR of the "children of darkness" against the "children of light" foretold in Genesis 3:15. Every night White women are going to bed and waking up in the morning pregnant by a member of another race. In this greater war, we are taking tens of thousands of casualties nightly. While this large-scale War is going on, the Church sits idly by claiming its Christian in nature, and they assert everything is all right as long as the other person has been "saved." And, in the face of this great peril, the anti-seedliners refuse to point out the true enemy. They insist it's all a problem with the "flesh" or something "spiritual"! Oh, they will recognize that Genesis 3:15 speaks of One "seed" in the form of the Messiah, but stubbornly deny the "serpent" has "seed" also. I will repeat again: If there was no "seed" of the serpent to bruise the heel of Messiah, then we have no Redemption! Now, I would say that's a very dangerous and irresponsible position! One person wrote me a letter and said: "it's 99.9% religion, not race." That also is a most risky position. I wrote him back and told him he could point his sword at religion, but I would point mine at a walking, talking breathing, genetic enemy. I don't know how he gets religion out of "seed", (*zera*). Furthermore, he also had much training at a seminary. Well, the subject of "seminary" is what we are going to deal with in this paper. One thing I have noticed in the Anglo-Israel message is that many who have been trained in seminaries are the very ones who take a position against Two Seedline.

I believe the reason for this is because in the various church seminaries the students are taught a religious system called "hermeneutics." We'll take a look at that system in this article. I think you will find it doesn't have a very commendable background. The greatest problem with people coming into Identity is that they tend to bring with them their former church's dogmas. With the Identity message, one must wipe the slate entirely clean and reconsider all things from a new perspective. It seems like everything is just 180° from what we were always taught. Our Savior instructed us that we must become as a "little child" or we are not fit for the Kingdom, Matthew 18:3. A child has a clean mind without any preconceived ideas. Even Paul had to go to Arabia for three years to get rid of his Phariseism, Galatians 1:17-18. The problem in

Identity is: a lot of people haven't been to the desert yet, especially former seminary students who keep patching over Scripture attempting to put new wine (teachings) in old bottles, Luke 5:36-39. In getting into this topic about "hermeneutics", I will start first by quoting the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Ninth Edition, 1894, volume 11, page 671, the topic being "Hermes":

"... The name of Hermes seems during the third and following centuries to have been regarded as a convenient pseudonym to place at the head of the numerous syncretistic writings in which it was sought to combine Neo-Platonic philosophy, Philonic Judaism and cabbalistic theosophy, and so provide the world with some acceptable substitute for the Christianity which had at that time begun to give indications of the ascendancy it was afterwards to attain ...

"... The connection of the name of Hermes with alchemy will explain what is meant by hermetic sealing, and will account for the use of the phrase 'hermetic medicine' by Paracelsus, as also for so-called 'hermetic freemasonry' of the Middle Ages ..."

The anti-seedliners accuse us Two Seedliners of using Talmudic teaching when many of them have been trained in seminaries using "cabbalistic theosophical" thought. For further information concerning this type of teaching I will now quote from *The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church*, J. D. Douglas General Editor, page 466, the topic being "Hermetic Books": "This collection of writings deal with religious and philosophical subjects and reflects a degree of syncretism with reference to Platonic, Stoic, Neo-Pythagorean, and Eastern religious thought. The collection dates from the second or third century and is ascribed to Hermes Trismegistus which represents a later designation for the Egyptian god Thoth, who was said to be the source and protector of all knowledge. The literary form of the Hermetic Books is basically that of the Platonic dialog. The single most significant of the several writings is 'Poimandres', which tells of the soul's ascent to God through the various spheres of the planets."

We find more concerning this type of teaching in the *Nelson's New Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, page 558: "Hermeneutics ... — the principles and methods used to interpret Scripture. Bible scholars believe a biblical text must be interpreted according to the language in which it was written, its historical context, the identity and purpose of the author, its literary nature, and the situation to which it was originally addressed."

This all sounds good, but let's investigate this thing a little deeper from *The Illustrated Hand-Book To All Religions*, © 1877, excerpts from the "Preface":

"... The Primitive Church, for instance, would appear to be a congeries [a collection or heap] of discordant opinions, whose very names and titles are almost innumerable. Yet in fact there were but two great parties — the orthodox Christian on the one hand, and the heretical on the other; and these latter, amidst their infinite varieties, are all reduced to two — the Gnostics, who corrupted the Gospel by an admixture of Greek philosophy or Persian magianism, or both; and the Arians, who lost themselves in speculations upon the Divine nature, and especially the two natures of Christ. All the controversies of the Reformation hinge again upon the one question of Sacramental Grace. And in our own times, apart from individual quarrels, eccentricities

and errors, there are but three important differences in matters of doctrine through the whole of Christendom, namely, the Sacramental System of the Greek and Roman Churches, the Evangelical doctrines of Protestants, and the Rationalist of Neologian Creed ...”

We really need to look into this matter about the “Gnostics.” We find this in the same book on pages 210-216: “SIMON MAGUS is the generally reputed founder of the Gnostics; but Gnosticism was nothing else than the philosophical system of the times, leavened with a slight infusion of Judaism, and a still slighter portion of Christianity. It exhibited itself in its early days at Alexandria, whence it spread through Eastern Christendom. Alexandria was at that time the great seat of philosophy. It contained a vast number of Jews; and, being the great emporium of trade, it was of course much frequented by the early Christians ... Amongst the intellectual idlers of a thriving city, the Platonic philosophy had superseded the coarse and vulgar forms of the old Egyptian superstition. The Alexandrian Jews were infected with it; for their language was Greek, and many of them had an extensive acquaintance with heathen literature. On the other hand, the Platonists studied the Jewish Scripture, and saw in them traces of pure and sublime theology ... They even asserted that Plato had borrowed from the writings of Moses. Thus a compromise was attempted between the creeds of Moses and of Plato. There was a third element of error in the Persian or Magian doctrines; for Alexandria, open to the teachings of Greece on one side, was equally exposed to the fantastic theories of Orientalism on the other. And thus from these three sources —the philosophy of Plato, the religion of Moses, and the Magian superstition —a new system was created; this was Gnosticism ... it did not arise within the Christian Church, but it very soon infected the pure stream of Gospel truth ... It was unquestionably the most formidable opponent with which the early Church had to contend ... The Gnostics practiced magic, which they learned from the East ... Christianity no sooner appeared than the Gnostics incorporated it into their system, but so as not merely to corrupt, but to subvert it ... but they [the Gnostics] taught also that the body of Jesus was a phantom, and that Christ was neither born, nor suffered upon the cross ... Thus the doctrine of the atonement and of faith in the death of Christ found no place whatever in their system ... From St. Paul’s first Epistle to the Corinthians, it is evident that Gnosticism had already shown itself in Greece. He repeatedly used the term, *gnosis*, in a peculiar sense, as arrogated by a certain party, e.g., 1 Cor. 8:1 ... The Gnostics denied that there was, in any sense, a resurrection of the body ... Whatever the Christians said of a resurrection, they interpreted figuratively; according to them, the Gnostic rose from death to life when he was initiated in their mysteries and made perfect in their knowledge ... Simon Magus was probably the first of the Gnostics who engrafted the name of Christ into their system; he and his followers maintained that the body of Jesus was a phantom ... but they utterly denied the doctrine of his atonement. In fact, when a Christian adopted the Gnostic views, he ceased to be a Christian, for he renounced his faith in a Redeemer and his hope of a resurrection. In the first century the Church of Christ, with one voice, agreed in this view of the Gnostic system: namely, that Gnostics were not Christians ... The Greek philosophy, and particularly the writings of Plato, were the fashionable study, and therefore, we may venture to say, were

embraced by great numbers by whom they were imperfectly understood. And yet something more certain, more religious, was wanted. This the Jew supplied, and Gnosticism was formed ... Gnosticism was an attempt (so far as it assumed the Christian garb) to effect a compromise between the gospel and heathenism as refined by philosophy and leavened with Judaism ... From its expiring ashes Mohammed kindled a new and fiercer flame. Gnosticism, with its magic, its angelic powers, its mystical dogmas, its affected contempt of the body and of death, and its real licentiousness, was absorbed into the system of the impostor, or fanatic, of Mecca.”

Jeffrey A. Weakley, along with several other anti-seedliners, accused us Two Seedliners of practicing Talmudic Judaism. Now, I ask, who’s really practicing the religion of “Judaism”? Again, on page 488 of the same book we read this: “Anti-Trinitarians ... Cerinthus was doubtless contemporary with St. John, although he may have been alive after the death of that apostle. He was a Jew, who had studied philosophy at Alexandria, but he spent the greater part of his life in Asia Minor. His system was probably a mixture of Judaism, Gnosticism and Christianity. Irenæus makes him a complete Gnostic, saying of him. ‘He taught that the world was not made by the supreme God, but a certain power (the demi-urgos) separate from him, and below him, and ignorant of him. Jesus he supposed not to be born of a virgin, but to be the son of Joseph and Mary —born altogether as other men are ...’”

Next from this same book we read this on page 500: “New Platonics or Ammonians. — So called from Ammonius Saccas, who taught with the highest applause in the Alexandrian school, about the conclusion of the second century. This learned man attempted a general reconciliation of all sects, whether philosophical or religious. He maintained that the great principals of all philosophical and religious truth were to be found equally in all sects, and that they differed from each other only in their method of expressing them ... Ammonius supposed that true philosophy derived its origin and its consistence from the Eastern nations, that it was taught to the Egyptians by Hermes, that it was brought from them to the Greeks, and preserved in its original purity by Plato, who was the best interpreter of Hermes and the other Oriental sages. He maintained that all the different religions which prevailed in the world were, in their original integrity, conformable to this ancient philosophy; but it unfortunately happened, that the symbols and fictions under which, according to the ancient manner, the ancients delivered their precepts and doctrines, were in process of the time erroneously understood, both by priests and people ... Taking these principles for granted, Ammonius associated the sentiments of the Egyptians with the doctrines of Plato; and to finish this conciliatory scheme, he so interpreted the doctrines of the other philosophical and religious sects, by art, invention, and allegory, that they seemed to bare some semblance to the Egyptian and Platonic systems ...”

We get more on this topic from the *Collier’s Encyclopedia*, © 1981, volume 2, pages 373-375. This time we see a Catholic priest bringing into that church the very same thing which the Protestants continue to this very day. This quotation will be excerpts from their article about “St. Thomas Aquinas”:

“From the earliest days of his teaching it became apparent to his contemporaries that he was laying the foundations of a veritable revolution in theology and philosophy

... His meeting at Orvieto with his fellow Dominican, William of Moerbeke, led to William's translation of the writings of Aristotle from Greek originals and to Thomas' series of commentaries, in which there is a careful effort to arrive at Aristotle's essential teachings ...

"Summary. Thomas broke sharply from the so-called Augustinian tradition, which was essentially a form of Neo-platonism, albeit a Platonism in which many Aristotelian notions had found a place. His work represents the renewal of Christian thought in the light of a metaphysic and theology whose conceptual systematization was expressed in terms of the principles of Aristotle ... Perhaps the most fundamental change made by him was his extension of Aristotle's doctrine of potency and act to the relation between an essence and the act of existing which actualized it ..His philosophical indebtedness to Aristotle should not be minimized. One has only to read his theological works to realize the esteem in which he held the philosopher ..."

We find even more in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Ninth Edition, 1894, volume 11, pages 664-665, concerning "Hermeneutics":

"... He (Hillel) was also the first to formulate definite rules by which the rabbinical development of the law should proceed. These canons of interpretation were seven in number, afterwards increased by Rabbi Ismael to thirteen by the addition of seven new rules and the omission of the sixth, and looked to the construction of Biblical warrant for precepts which it was wished to prove implicit in the law ... This regard for it, which was never wholly disowned, ultimately took shape in the improved rabbinical hermeneutics of the Middle Ages. In the writings of such rabbis as Saadiah Gaon, Jarchi, Rashi, Kimchi, Maimonides, Abarbanel (a line of expositors extending from the 10th to the 16th century, we find, alongside the traditional rules and explanations, a scientific recognition of the interpreter's duty to give the literal sense as well as a practical application of the principles of grammatical and historical exegesis to the Old Testament ... The hermeneutics developed among the Hellenistic Jews had marked characteristics of its own. These interpreters, departing from the exclusiveness of rabbinical devotion to the Old Testament revelation, and from the pure Hebraism of native Jews, brought to the study of the sacred books a range of ideas derived from Hellenic culture. They had to devise a hermeneutical procedure which would harmonize their new ethnic learning with the traditional estimate of the Jewish Scriptures. To the theosophic Hellenist, and specially to the Alexandrian Jew, acceptance of the plain sense was often an impossibility. A reconciliation was sought by the use of allegorical interpretation. This method was also pursued by the Rabbinical exegetes. It is embraced in the Halachic hermeneutics, and is seen in the distinctions drawn by Palestinian Jews between the body and the soul of text ... The coryphæus in this hermeneutical practice was Philo (born perhaps about 20 B.C.), although he had predecessors in Aristobulus (180 B.C.), Josephus, and others. He devoted himself mainly to the exposition of the Pentateuch with the view of explaining the realism and anthropomorphism of the Old Testament in a way to suit the philosophy of the time. Wishful to retain the Alexandrian Jew's regard for Moses as the supremely inspired prophet of God and the oracle of all mysteries along with adherence to the current Platonism and theosophy, he supposed that the Mosaic writings contained a twofold mode of teaching, a popular representation of God

and divine things and a spiritual ... On the other hand as extraordinary development was given in the rabbinical hermeneutics by the Kabbalists of the Middle Ages, who used the devices of artificial interpretation in order to find an Old Testament basis for their mixed Neo-Platonist, Gnostic and Sabæan culture. The Kabbala (' what has been received', ' tradition' ...) had its roots in the ancient doctrine of numbers, for which the Jews were probably indebted to the Chaldæans ... By the combinations and permutations of letters, the interchange of words of equal numerical value and similar artifices, new meanings were extracted where the proper sense seemed poor, and acceptable meanings found where offence was felt ...”

We will now see more on how the “Jewish” Kabbalah fits into this thing from *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Ninth Edition, 1894, volume 13, page 822:

“To obtain these heavenly mysteries, which alone make the Torah superior to profane codes, definite hermeneutical rules are employed, of which the following are the most important. (1) The words of several verses in the Hebrew Scriptures which are regarded as containing a recondite [hard to understand] sense are placed over each other, and the letters are formed into new words by reading them vertically. (2) The words of the text are ranged in squares in such a manner as to be read either vertically or boustrophedon [alternately from right to left and from left to right]. (3) The words are joined together and redivided. (4) The initial and final letters of several words are formed into separate words. (5) Every letter of a word is reduced to its numerical value, and the word is explained by another of the same quantity. (6) Every letter of a word is taken to be the initial or abbreviation of a word. (7) The twenty-two letters of the alphabet are divided into two halves; one half placed above the other; and the two letters which thus become associated are interchanged. By this permutation [modification], *Aleph*, the first letter of the alphabet becomes *Lamed*, the twelfth letter; *Beth* becomes *Mem*, and so on. This cipher alphabet is called *Albam*, from the first interchangeable pairs. (8) The commutation [back and forth] of the twenty-two letters is effected by the last letter of the alphabet taking the place of the first, the last but one [next to last] the place of the second, and so forth. This cipher is called *Atbash*. These hermeneutical canons are much older than the Kabbalah. They obtained in the synagogues from time immemorial, and were used by the Christian fathers in the interpretation of Scripture. Thus Canon V., according to which a word is reduced to its numerical value and interpreted by another word of the same value is recognized in the New Testament ...”

I don't know whether or not you fully fathom the significance of what you have just read, for if this is true about “Jewish” hermeneutics and the Kabbalah, they have wrongly interpreted, or even changed some of the meanings of the Hebrew Scriptures with their Chaldean hocus-pocus. Not only that, but some of the early Church fathers followed this system of interpretation to a some degree. Is it any wonder, then, that we have occasional difficult and questionable Bible passages to deal with? With some passages, we then have to wonder whether what we are reading is “Yahweh breathed” or is some “lying divination” by a “false scribe”, Ezekiel 13:6; Jeremiah 14:14; Zechariah 10:2. We are instructed in Scripture to verify everything with witnesses, so when we encounter a difficult passage, we need to consider the **CONTEXT** in which it is

written. When we consider what we know today as so-called “Christianity”, learning that it is an admixture of Aristotelian logic, “Jewish” hermeneutics, Greek philosophy, Persian magianism, Judaism, Platoism, Gnosticism, Eastern Mysticism, Spinozism, Maimonides-ism and Kabbalism, what should we make of all of this? Do you now comprehend why we must do as our Messiah taught, and start all over again from the beginning? The Scriptures truly describe our “righteousness as filthy rags”, Isaiah 64:6.

Matthew 6:22-23 says: “ **22 The light of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light. 23 But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great *is* that darkness.**”

This is comparable to a person who, learning the true Identity Message, keeps one eye looking back to the Aristotelian philosophized, Gnosticized, Judaized, Kabbalahized, and Eastern mysticized corrupted form of “Christianity.” We cannot live in both of these worlds at the same time, for a mind that is divided (afflicted with double vision) is in total darkness. The Bible tells us further, James 1:8: “*A double minded man is unstable in all his ways.*” It is not speaking of the physical eye, but the eye of the mind. Just because your preacher may be blinded by his seminary training, that is no reason you need to be blinded also! Not only is our eye to be single, but if we have two eyes (eyes of the mind; one seeing true light and one seeing evil wisdom), we are to pluck out the one seeing evil, Matthew 5:29:

“ **And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast *it* from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not *that* thy whole body should be cast into Gehenna.**” [*Heb. Gehenna, as opposed to Abyss, “pit.” Also, see Matt. 18:8-9; Mark 9:43-47; Zech. 11:17.*]

The result of having two eyes is to have two masters, and being a slave to both. In that way, a man will not amount to much for either. Men might work for two employers, but no slave can be the property of two owners; one is either in Yahweh’s employ or in Satan’s. If the mind’s eye be full of Greek philosophy, Persian magianism, Judaism, Platonism, Gnosticism, Eastern Mysticism, Spinozism, Maimonides-ism and Kabbalism like those who are taught in seminaries, what good are they to the Almighty? I am fully persuaded that this “one seed” only teaching is coming from students trained in seminaries or by people under their influence. Manly P. Hall in his *An Encyclopedic Masonic, Hermetic, Qabbalistic and Rosicrucian Symbolical Philosophy* page CXIV, shows that Hermeticism is considered synonymous with Qabbalism and that the tenets of Hermeticism are interwoven with Qabbalism:

“The theories of Qabbalism are inextricably interwoven with the tenets of alchemy, Hermeticism, Rosicrucianism and Freemasonry. The words *Qabbalism* and *Hermeticism* are now considered as synonymous terms covering all the arcana and esotericism of antiquity. The simple Qabbalism of the first centuries of the Christian Era gradually evolved into an elaborate theological system, which became so involved that it was next to impossible to comprehend its dogma.” (With all this, one can now better understand 1 Corinthians 1:19-31 and Romans 1:21.)