

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ALL WHO DENY TWO SEEDLINE, #13

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

We need to understand again that we are at the very zenith of a 7,000 plus year-old WAR. Because of a misinterpretation of Genesis 3:15, many wrongly apply this passage to a war between the "spirit" against the "flesh." While it is true there is a personal struggle between the spirit (carnal mind) and the flesh, this Scripture does not refer to that type of conflict. The WAR in Genesis 3:15 is a "hate" WAR. It is totally preposterous, therefore, to try to apply Genesis 3:15 to Ephesians 2:15 or Romans 8. The "enmity" in Ephesians refers to something quite different! Actually, Genesis 3:15 speaks about two "hate groups" (a good "hate" group and a bad "hate" group). You probably have been told that only bad people "hate", and that simply is not true. These two "hate groups" are at WAR with each other, and this WAR is not going to be over until one or the other is totally crushed, and you can mark that one down for posterity; our posterity.

"ONE SEEDLINE" AN ANTICHRIST DOCTRINE

This is a very serious charge, yet it is true, as you will shortly see. Maybe it would be well if the term "one seedline" were defined. It also might be called "non-seedline" or "anti-seedline" depending to what extreme it might be taken. If it is taken to the extreme of reducing the "two seeds" of Genesis 3:15 to be the "flesh" and "spirit", as Ted R. Weiland did, then it would have to be defined as "anti-seedline." When this extreme position is taken, then even the "seed" of the Messiah is denied! Truthfully, this stance would have to be defined as "anti-seedline", making their position not only "anti-seedline", but also "antichrist." I will now demonstrate why this is so.

When I first started researching Two Seedline, and realizing how serious were the ramifications — also observing those who rejected this teaching — it did not occur to me that such a teaching might be "antichrist." By delving into the position of the "one seedliners", the thought that it could be "antichrist" gradually dawned on me, along with the realization that the subject of the two "seeds" of Genesis 3:15 is even more serious than I formerly considered. Let me put it this way: There are certain basic, fundamental tenets to our "Christian" faith. These beliefs are as follows: We believe that YHWH created all things, visible and invisible; that He became flesh and dwelt among us, and that He was of one substance being both man and YHWH when He took on that flesh; that He suffered and died in the flesh at the hands of unholy men;

that He rose again in the flesh (John 2:19-21); that He ascended into Heaven in the flesh; that from thence He will return in the flesh to judge both the living and the dead. Every one of these tenets is essential and indispensable to the Christian Faith. Consequently, anyone denying these fleshly manifestations of YHWH is “antichrist”, 1 John 4:3:

“ And every spirit that confesseth not that Christ (Yahshua) is come in the flesh is not of Yahweh: and this is that *spirit* of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world.”

The denial of the **TWO** “seeds” mentioned in Genesis 3:15 is just as wicked, for if there were no “seed” of the serpent to bruise the heel of Messiah (betrayal and Crucifixion), we would have no Redemption. If He was not bruised for our iniquities, we have nothing to look forward to except the grave. It is blasphemous to even infer He was not bruised, and yet that is what the one seedliners, *i.e.* anti-seedliners, insist on doing. It is every bit as blasphemous to say that the Word was not made flesh as it is to imply that He was not bruised, yet the anti-seedliners position boils down to just that. To spurn “Two Seedline” is to reject Isaiah 53:5:

“ But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was *upon* him; and with his stripes we are healed.”

To deny “Two Seedline” is to reject the “bruising” of our Redeemer, for it was the “seed” of the serpent that was to bruise Him. Judas Iscariot was of that “seedline.” If there was no “seed of the serpent” to bruise Him, we have no Redemption! In short, it’s an **antichrist** religion! And they should be ashamed! Again: If there’s no “seed” of the serpent, there was no bruising. If there was no bruising, there’s no Redemption. Therefore, I will repeat again, the one seedliners and anti-seedliners (or whatever you wish to call them) are teaching an “antichrist” (anti-Messiah) doctrine by denying “Two Seedline.” There are those who advocate that we Two Seedliners declare a truce with the one seedliners, *i.e.* anti-seedliners, for the good of the Identity Message. To that I reply: Should we also make a truce with those who declare YHWH did not come in the flesh?

THREE DOCTRINES STAND OR FALL TOGETHER

While there are several doctrines taught in Genesis 3:15, three of these stand or fall together. These three fundamental doctrines are the Incarnation, the Crucifixion and the Resurrection of our Messiah. They are mutually interdependent. Each one is equal in importance and cannot be separated from the other two. Since both the “bruising” (betrayal and Crucifixion) and the “birth” of Yahshua (His coming in the flesh) are prophesied in Genesis 3:15, they stand or fall together! We can see from this that the “bruising” and Incarnation are of equal importance, and to deny one is to deny the other. Therefore, I repeat, these three tenets in Genesis 3:15 stand or fall together. Without the Incarnation there could be no “bruising” —without the “bruising” there could be no significance to the Crucifixion or the Resurrection. Remove one element and we have nothing, zip, zero. Therefore, Genesis 3:15 incorporates the Incarnation, Death and Resurrection all in one verse. Why else would YHWH be so careful about

preserving Cain and his posterity (Gen. 4:15, 23, 24) if it wasn't to prevent the Serpent's seed from being exterminated before the fulfillment of Gen. 3:15? In order for YHWH to keep his promise, the **serpent's seedline** had to be preserved as well as **the woman's**.

Genesis 3:15 is also somewhat unique inasmuch as it speaks both generally and specifically. It speaks generally of a "hate" WAR between two genetic groups of people—it speaks specifically of an individual "bruiser" (betrayor) from the one group and an individual Redeemer from the other. Among other things, Genesis 3:15 predicts the outcome of this seemingly unending war. While there are many conflicts in this war between the two "seeds", there are two specific significant events; the "bruising of the heel" and the "bruising of the head." The blow to the heel of our sinless Messiah was only temporary as He rose again. The blow to the head of the serpent and his seed will be fatal and final to all belonging to that genetic line. Resurrection is implied in Genesis 3:15 because the blow to the "heel" was not fatal to the Messiah. Again, I repeat, the Incarnation, Crucifixion and the Resurrection cannot be taught separately. We either have **ALL THREE** or we have **NONE**. To teach just one or two of these three elements alone is nonsense and heresy. This is, in essence, what the one seedliners, *i.e.* anti-seedliners, are doing. What it all boils down to is: if one cannot understand the full implications of Genesis 3:15, one cannot comprehend the rest of the Bible. It is obvious, then, that the one seedliners with some of their irrational statements on that verse, do not fathom the implications of that crucial and pivotal passage. With the prophecy that the serpent's seed (power) would be totally crushed, no wonder they are sensitive to the word "genocide"—and create so-called "hate" laws. No wonder they cry "never again." It would seem that deep within their satanic spirit they are already aware of their final fate.

DEFINITION OF "ANTICHRIST"

You can search in almost any Bible commentary and dictionary and the definition for the term "antichrist" is pretty much universally given as one who denies that YHWH came in the flesh. If this is a proper definition, then it follows that according to the "anti-seedliner's" position, He also was not "bruised by the seed of the serpent" (betrayal and Crucifixion), nor did He rise from the dead after three days. This denial of a literal "seed" of the serpent, propounded by the one seedliners, forces the same conclusion as that defined as "**antichrist**", putting them in the same category (that claim being: there never existed a literal "seed" to bruise His heel). In other words, by denying a literal "seed of the serpent" the one seedliners also become guilty of claiming that YHWH did not come in the flesh. While some commentaries point to the Gnostics of that day as being the "antichrists", other commentaries point to the "Jews." Actually, there were "Jewish" Gnostic groups, so both are probably true. Over the last approximately 2000 years the "Jews" have pretty much fulfilled this definition as being "antichrists." If, then, the one seedliners want to take the same position as the "Jews", let them be "marked" for what they really are! Since John Wilson and Edward Hine first brought us the Israel Identity message, we must pass through a refining process to clear away some false presuppositions: claiming today's "Jews" as a part of true Israel

being one of them. With the teachings of men like Bertrand L. Comparet, Wesley A. Swift and San Jacinto Capt, the “Jews” instead have been more properly identified as Israel’s formidable enemy. I admit that before knowing anything about the Israel Identity Message and the two seedlines of Genesis 3:15, I too, was ignorantly holding this same “**antichrist**” view herein described as “**one seedline**”, and didn’t know any better, as that’s all they ever taught in the churches that I attended until that time!

I should point out here that we owe a debt of deep gratitude to British Israel. While doing so, though, there are some areas in which we cannot agree: (1) We cannot take the position that the great German people are Assyrians as they are truly of the Tribe of Judah. (2) We cannot agree with British Israel that the Cainite “Jews” are under the Covenant of our fathers, and, (3) As British Israel is ignorant of Two Seedline, we cannot agree with that either.

The one thing that I learned when getting into this Israel Identity message is that it was necessary for me to unlearn many things that I thought I knew, and start all over from scratch. This is what a lot of people getting into this Message refuse to do. Paul, after his conversion, had to go to the desert for three years to be reeducated, Galatians 1:17-18. Three years would have been a reasonable amount of time for him to have reviewed all the Scriptures of the Old Testament in a new light. Why should we be any different than Paul? The problem in this Identity movement is there are a lot of people who haven’t been to the desert yet (Identity pastors not excepted).

Let us read some commentary to help grasp the implications concerning what is considered “antichrist.” There are a lot of opinions along this line, but we will concentrate on the definition of denying that YHWH came in the flesh to dwell among us, and read the other three passages on this as found in 1st John:

1 John 2:18: “**Little children, it is the last time: and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time.**”

1 John 2:22: “**Who is a liar but he that denieth that Yahshua is the Christ? He is antichrist that denieth the Father and the son.**”

2 John 7: “**For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Yahshua the Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist.**”

The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible, volume 1, page 179, says the following on the subject of Antichrist, under “References in Scripture”:

“... First John 2:22 defines antichrist as one who ‘denies that Jesus is the Christ.’ Such a one also ‘denies the Father and the Son.’ According to John’s definition, an antichrist is anyone who denies that Jesus is God and Christ. In 1 John 4:3, reference is made to ‘the spirit of antichrist’ which again is described as coming in the future and also ‘now it is in the world already.’ In this passage, also, an antichrist is defined as one who is a denier of the deity of Jesus Christ.

“In 2 John 7, a more specific reference is made to contemporary rejection of Christ by those who deny the reality of the Incarnation: ‘For many deceivers have gone out into the world, men who will not acknowledge the coming of Jesus Christ in the flesh; such a one is the deceiver and the antichrist.’ John is anticipating docetism, the view that Christ merely appeared to be in the flesh and was not actually incarnate. From

these four passages it is clear that antichrist, according to John's definition, is a theological concept primarily and relates to rejection of Christ or heretical views concerning His person ... [Ed. emphasis]

The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, volume A-D, page 142 says this concerning "antichrist": "... Polycarp, however, is in agreement with the Johannine letters that the Antichrist is the spirit of heresy, that everyone who denies the actual incarnation, is in fact, an antichrist, and that he who denies the resurrection and judgment is the first-born of Satan (Polyc. Phil. 7:1)." [Underlining mine]

From the *Dictionary of the New Testament* by Hastings, "The Apostolic Church", volume 3, under the topic "Antichrist" we find some interesting information. While Hastings uses the words "Jewish" for Israelite and Judaism for the beliefs of the Israelites, he has some interesting statements to contribute to our enlightenment on this subject. Interestingly, Hastings connects the subject of "antichrist" with the Temptation in Genesis 3. Thus, there seems to be a close affinity of Two Seedline doctrine with the subject of "antichrist." Reading excerpts now from pages 67-68:

"... Although the word 'Antichrist' does not occur till we come to the Johannine Epistles, we have many evidences in the pre-Christian Jewish [rather Israelite] literature, canonical and extra-canonical, that there was a widely spread idea of a supreme adversary who should rise up against God, His Kingdom and people, or His Messiah. The strands that went to the composition of the idea were various and strangely interwoven, and much obscurity still hangs over the subject ... Traces of this dragon-myth appear here and there in the Old Testament, e.g. in the story of the Temptation in Genesis 3, where, as in Revelation 12:9; 20:2, the serpent = the dragon; and in the later apocalyptic literature a dragon represents the hostile powers that rise up in opposition to God and His Kingdom (*Pss. Sol.* ii. 29). But it was characteristic of the forward look of Prophetism and Messianism [prophets and Messiah] that the idea of a conflict between God [YHWH] and the dragon was transferred from cosmogony to eschatology and represented as a culminating episode of the last days (Isaiah 27:1; Daniel 7) ... Side by side with the dragon-myth must be set the *Beliar* (Belial) *conception*, a contribution to Jewish [rather Israelite] thought from the side of Persian dualism, with its idea of an adversary in whom is embodied not merely, as in the Babylonian Creation-story, the natural forces of chaos and darkness, but all the hostile powers of moral evil ... And in the interval between the Old Testament and New Testament *Beliar* is frequently used as a synonym for Satan, and Devil or arch-demon (e.g. *Jubilees*, 15; cf. 2 Cor. 6:15). The *Beliar* idea was a much later influence than the dragon-myth, for Babylonian religion offers no real parallel to a belief in the Devil, and Cheyne's suggested derivation of the name from *Belili*, the goddess of the underworld ... has little to recommend it. But a subsequent fusion of *Beliar* with the dragon was very natural, and we have a striking illustration of it when in Wisdom 2:24 and elsewhere the serpent of the Temptation is identified with the Devil. Cf. Revelation 12:9; 20:2, where 'the dragon, the old serpent', is explained to be 'the Devil and Satan' ... But, so far as the New Testament is concerned, the earlier Antichrist tradition is taken over with important changes, due to the differences between Judaism [correct this time] and Christianity, and especially to the differences in their conception of the Messiah

Himself. At the same time it must be noted that nothing like a single consistent presentation of the Antichrist idea is given by the New Testament as a whole. Elements of the conception appear in the Gospels, the Pauline Epistles, the Apocalypse, the Johannine Epistles, but in each group of writings it is treated differently and with more or less divergence from the earlier Jewish [Israelite] forms ... In the Synoptic Gospels it is everywhere apparent that Jesus recognized the existence of the kingdom of evil under the control of a supreme personality, variously called the Devil (Mt 4:1; 13:29, etc.). Satan (Mt 4:10; 12:26; Lk 10:18 etc.), or Beelzebub (Mt 12:24), who sought to interfere with His own Messianic mission (Mt 4:1-11; 16:23), and whose works He had come to destroy (... He 2:14)”

With this quotation on the subject of “antichrist” we should be beginning to get a conception of what this whole thing is all about. In order to delve into this matter a little further, let’s consider the term “Belial.” For this I will quote again from the same volume in Hastings, page 146:

“BELIAL ... Taking the meaning ‘worthlessness’, we note that the ordinary use of ‘Belial’ in the OT suits it very well; ‘sons of Belial’ or ‘men of Belial’ means ‘worthless *or* wicked men’, according to the common Hebrew idiom which substitutes a genitive for an adjective. The word is, however, twice used in the OT as a quasi-proper name. In Ps 18:4 we read of ‘the cords of death’, ‘the floods of Belial’, ‘the cords of Sheol’, ‘the snares of death’; here Belial = the underworld. Again, in Nah 1:15 we read that Belial shall no more pass through Judah; he is utterly cut off. In this passage Belial almost exactly corresponds to the ‘man of lawlessness, the man of perdition’ of St. Paul (2 Th 2:3 ...) ... In the *Sibylline Oracles* ... where the reference to the ‘Augustans’ ... shows the passage to be a later interpolation, probably of 1st cent. A.D. ... Belial is Antichrist ... There are many forms of this name, chiefly due to the phonetic interchange of the liquids: Belial, Beliar, Beliam, Belian, Beliab, Belias, Berial.”

Conspicuously, “Belial” is #1100 in *Strong’s*, which is from the same root as #1098 meaning “mixed”, and therefore as we should know, “worthless” (Kenites, Canaanites, Edomites etc.). Check #1100 in Psalm 18:4 and Nahum 1:15. For another definition of “Belial” we will use *The Revell Bible Dictionary*, page 143:

“Belial ... As a proper noun, a name for Satan. In common use, a Hebrew word for ‘worthless.’ The phrase ‘sons of Belial’ appears several times in the OT (Deut. 13:13; 1 Sam. 2:12; 2 Chr. 13:7). Modern versions usually simply translate this ‘worthless persons’, since *belia’al* means ‘worthless’ or ‘lawless.’ However, the proper name is retained in 2 Cor. 6:15 where Paul asks rhetorically, ‘What harmony is there between Christ and Belial?’ In Jewish literature from the second century on Belial (or Beliar) was a name for Satan. In the 2 Corinthians passage Paul urges Christians not to compromise with the ways, the practices, or the people of Satan.”

Again, in *The Revell Bible Dictionary* there is a good definition for the word “antichrist” on page 73:

“antichrist An opponent of Christ, or a substitute Christ. The name, coined by John and found only in his letters, is rooted in ancient biblical prophecies concerning an evil person who will appear at history’s end to rally mankind against God.

“John also speaks of ‘many antichrists’, and of a spirit of antichrist which is active even before the end times (1 John 2:18; 4:3). These antichristian false teachers can be recognized by their denial of Jesus as God in the flesh. Such persons are ‘deceivers’ who may masquerade as Christians, but whose true character is revealed by their refusal to affirm the full deity of Jesus Christ.”

I would point out here that to refuse to rightly identify the two “seeds” of Genesis 3:15 is to deny the deity of the Messiah. In order to rightly identify our Redeemer, it is necessary to profess Him not only as YHWH in the flesh, but also to identify Him as the One who was “bruised” by the serpent’s seed of Genesis 3:15 for our iniquities. If He was not bruised as such, He is not YHWH in the flesh! Further, we must recognize His Resurrection. If He was not bruised (dying in our place), He could not be resurrected. If He didn’t die in our place and resurrect to life again, He is not YHWH in the flesh! The one seedliners deny His bruising. If He suffered and died a **literal** physical death, then the serpent is also a **literal** physical seedline. By teaching against Two Seedline, the one seedliners, *i.e.* anti-seedliners, have made themselves **ANTICHRISTS!** And that by their own choice!

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE INCARNATION

I do not believe that the average follower of the Nazarene has ever taken the time to contemplate the implications of the Almighty taking upon Himself a fleshly body. We could ponder why He did this, but that thought is not the before us. The question is, what happens when the Almighty El entwines Himself in a fleshly body that is condemned to die? Yes, when He decided to do that, He knew He was going to die the death of a man. It wasn’t a question, then, of whether or not He was going to die, but how and when. Once committed, it was a one-way street; there was no turning back. The difference between our Messiah and man is, YHWH had the power to lay down his life and take it back up again, but nevertheless, He was going to die a man’s (an Adamite’s) physical death. The next important question is, did He die according to Scripture? Scripture says (Genesis 3:15), He would die, or be bruised by the seed of the “serpent.” If this is true, the “serpent” had to have literal children! This is the very **CORNERSTONE** of **SCRIPTURE**, and if our Redeemer didn’t die in that prescribed manner, the whole foundation of our **FAITH** is for naught!

Conclusion: While it is paramount that we have faith that our Almighty came in the flesh, it is important to the same degree in what manner that flesh died and the fact that it rose to life again! The one seedliners (anti-seedliners) talk a lot about the “Sovereignty of God”, which is all well and good, but if Yahweh did not come in the flesh; be “bruised” and die in the flesh; resurrect to life again in the flesh; ascend to heaven in the flesh, He is not Sovereign. The one seedliners really don’t believe He is “Sovereign” for they deny His “bruising” inasmuch as they deny there was a literal seed of the serpent to bruise Him. How can anyone claim that the woman was to have a literal, fleshly seed (Yahshua), but then do a complete about-face and claim that the serpent’s seed is only figurative? Now, who’s not “consistent”?

Those anti-seedliners will probably try to disclaim any charge of teaching an “antichrist” doctrine! Any further effort on their part to explain away their position will

only result in digging themselves into their own quagmire. Without their realizing it, they have earmarked themselves in unequivocal terms as “**antichrist anti-seedliners.**”