

# SPECIAL NOTICE TO ALL WHO DENY TWO SEEDLINE, #16

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

Once more, I will reiterate We are at WAR, and I am not referring to the war between the "spirit and the flesh" as the anti-seedliners do. Yes, there is a war between the spirit and the flesh, and I wouldn't discredit it in the least, but the WAR I am speaking of is an entirely different conflict. The WAR I'm addressing is the WAR between the "seed of the serpent" and the "seed of the woman." How can anyone deny there are two seeds mentioned in Genesis 3:15? But deny it they do! They use some of the most fantastic arguments in an attempt to disprove that fact. Most anti-seedliners trace the bad fig "Jews" back to Esau, with which I do not disagree. But, if one will notice the various wives whom Esau married, one will discover they were mainly from the ten Canaanite nations of which the Kenites were a part (Genesis 15:19). If one will check the *Strong's* number for Kenite, one will see that it is #7017 and 7014. Then checking those numbers, they will be found to mean Cain, the one who murdered Abel. Now whether you believe that Satan or Adam was Cain's father, Scripture definitely proves that Esau's children had Cain's blood flowing in their veins. This fact is confirmed by Messiah Himself, (Matthew 23:35). The very nature of Cain displayed itself in Doeg the Edomite killing 85 of Yahweh's priests of the "linen ephod" at king Saul's command, 1 Samuel 22:17-18. This leaves the whole matter dependent on Genesis 4:1 for which both the *Massoretic* and *Septuagint* texts are ambiguously obscure. Thankfully, we have a witness which is much clearer than the usual, accepted rendering of that verse, and which is contextually in agreement with the rest of Scripture. Let's take a look at it:

*Targum of Jonathan* on Genesis 4:1: "And Adam knew his wife Eve, who was pregnant by the Angel Sammael, and she conceived and bare Cain; and he was like the heavenly beings, and not like earthly beings, and she said, I have acquired a man, the Angel of the Lord."

Whether or not we agree with this rendering depends on how badly we want to correlate this passage to correspond with, and measure up to the rest of THE WORD. If the anti-seedliners don't accept this rendering, one would think they would at least recognize that the "Jews" are the descendants of Cain! They simply don't believe their Bible. They, therefore, demand that the Almighty accept their personally contrived dogmas and opinions on Scripture. One such passage of Scripture the anti-seedliners take vehement exception to as proving Two Seedline doctrine is Matthew 13:24-30, 37-

43 about the “wheat and the tares.” While Stephen E. Jones and Jeffrey A. Weakley avoid comment on this topic, Lt. Col. Jack Mohr and Ted R. Weiland jump right in where angels fear to tread.

Before examining Matthew 13:24-30, 37-43, it would be advisable to read it: **“ 24 Another parable put he forth unto them saying, The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man which sowed good seed in his field: 25 But while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way. 26 But when the blade was sprung up, and brought forth fruit, then appeared the tares also. 27 So the servants of the householder came and said unto him, Sir, didst not thou sow good seed in thy field? from whence then hath it tares? 28 He said unto them, An enemy hath done this. The servants said unto him, Wilt thou then that we go and gather them up? 29 But he said, Nay; lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them. 30 Let both grow together until the harvest: and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them: but gather the wheat into my barn ... 37 He answered and said unto them, He that soweth the good seed is the Son of Man; 38 The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one; 39 The enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels. 40 As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this world. 41 The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; 42 And shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. 43 Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear.”**

It's simply fantastic the various interpretations the antiseedliners put on this passage, most of which they have brought with them out of Jew-deo-unchristian churches and seminaries. Lt. Col. Jack Mohr, a vehement anti-seedliner, comments thus in his *Seed of Satan, Literal or Figurative?*, page 15, concerning the words “tares” and “children” on this segment of Scripture in Matthew 13: “Apparently the disciples were intrigued by this parable, but could not understand its meaning. So Jesus explained it to them and told them that the ‘tares’ (#2215 — ‘zizanon’, a false grain called ‘darnel’, which looks like wheat), were the ‘children of the wicked one.’ The word ‘children’ in Greek is (#5207 — ‘huios’ and means ‘immediate, remote or figurative kinship.’ So if the word can refer to ‘figurative kinship’, why are the SEEDLINERS so adamant in stating it means ‘literal kinship?’”

Had Lt. Col. Jack Mohr checked with the *Thayer Greek-English Lexicon; The Complete Word Study Dictionary NT* by Spiros Zodhiates; or *An Expository Dictionary of NT Words* by W. E. Vine, instead of the limited definition found in *Strong's*, he would have found the primary meaning for the word “children” #5207, means: “(A) A male offspring ... (B) In a wider sense a descendant, pl. descendants, posterity.” (This definition is from Zodhiates, and the others agree.) There is a secondary figurative sense which can apply and I will give you an example: The disciples were called “sons of thunder.” Had Mohr read *Strong's* more carefully, he would have noticed that it

mentioned “immediate kinship” first. One’s immediate kinship would be one’s own son. *Strong’s* gave Mohr three choices, and he rejected the first two and implied that “figurative kinship” was the only one mentioned. Such a maneuver is hardly honest! It is apparent, Mohr already had his mind made up what he thought it should be.

Secondly, Mohr forgets that Messiah Himself said “seed are ... children.” Therefore, “seed” and “children” cannot be separated. Consequently, it is highly essential to find out what the word “seed” means. The Greek word for “seed” is #4690, and is *sperma*. This is where we get the English word “sperm.” According to Zodhiates, page 1304, “***sperma* ... Also figuratively used of living beings as the seed of man; i.e., of posterity or descendants.**” In this case “figuratively” means comparing man’s seed to agricultural seed, and that is exactly what this parable is doing in comparing Satan’s offspring to tares (darnel).

Thirdly, we must check out the one responsible for planting the darnel-like genetic people. In the parable of the wheat and tares the word “wicked” is #4190, and is used with the **definite article** “*ho*” in Matt. 13:19; Eph. 6:16; 1 John 1:13, 14; 3:12; 5:18, and means “Satan.” Thus in 1 John 3:12 where it says: “Not as Cain, *who* was of that wicked one ...”, it means exactly what it says, “Satan”. Further, the word “wicked”, #4190, in that same verse, according to Zodhiates, page 1198, is used with the definite article “*ho*”, and means: “... the evil one, Satan ...” The book *Synonyms of the New Testament* by Richard Trench confirms what Zodhiates says about the word “wicked” (Greek #4190) on page 330: “Satan is emphatically *ho poneros* as the first author of all the mischief in the world.” In his *Greek-English NT Lexicon*, George Ricker Berry, page 82 describes *ho poneros* as “... the wicked one. i.e., Satan ...” W. E. Vine in his *An Expository Dictionary of NT Words* under “wicked” on Matthew 13:38 states: “... and in the following [verse just cited], where Satan is mentioned as ‘the (or that) evil one’ ...” (Don’t waste your time with *Strong’s* on this one.) Another way to verify the “wicked” of Matthew 13:38 is speaking of Satan is to go to Matthew 13:19 where the same Greek word #4190 is used saying: “... then cometh the wicked *one* ...” Then compare the parallel passage in Luke 8:12 which says: “... then cometh the devil ...” Conclusion: the “seed” or “children” in Matthew 13:38 planted by the “wicked” one are the genetic offspring of Satan!

In his attempt to spiritualize and take a figurative view of the “tares” in Matthew 13, Ted R. Weiland in his *Eve, Did She Or Didn't She?* in a rebuff of a quotation by James E Wise, makes this statement: “Furthermore, if the seedliners’ interpretation of the wheat and tares parable is accurate, and if the tares in Matthew 13 represent *all the seed line of Satan through Cain*, then there is no alternative but to accept that the wheat represents *all the physical seed line of Eve through Seth*. The wheat in this parable depicts the sons of the kingdom, and by this interpretation, the wheat would automatically be sons of the kingdom by their heritage, that is, they would be saved by their race or lineage. If this is true, then Yahshua’s death, burial and resurrection were wholly unnecessary. Of course, this hypothesis flies in the face of the entire Bible ...”

Well, what do you know, except for the last two sentences, Weiland got something right! After all, Hebrews 12:8 says we are either “sons” or “bastards”, and there isn’t anything in-between. And all this bull manure about being “born again”,

(John 3:3), is totally an incorrect translation and interpretation. That verse is not saying “born again” but “born from above.” Actually if one will check that verse out, it is saying one must be “born of the correct race.” To show you this, we will investigate the meaning of the word “born” as used in John 3:3 which has the *Strong’s* number 1080 in the Greek. For this we will go to *The Complete Word Study Dictionary NT* by Spiros Zodhiates, page 364. Zodhiates tells us this word means “generation, kind, offspring” ... and the primary definition is: “Spoken of men, to beget” ... “Spoken of women, to bear, bring forth” ... “To be begotten” ... “To be born as used generally ...” In other words, when an Adamic White person is born in the flesh, he is also born of the Spirit. Other races are not “born” of that Spirit, nor can they ever be. Zodhiates points out that “born” as used here (#1080) *gennao*, is from #1085, *genos*, which in turn means “offspring, posterity ... family, lineage, stock ...” You can also check this with *Strong’s*, but you must follow-through to #1085 to get the entire meaning. If you should check only the word #1080, *gennao*, you will not understand the full implications, for it is speaking of race. John 3:31 makes it clear there are “heavenly” people from above and people “that are of the earth ... earthly ...” Our Redeemer told the Jews, John 8:23: “Ye are from beneath; I am from above: ye are of this world, I am not of this world.” Thus, like us, He was also born from above; i.e., of the White race.

I don’t want to leave the impression that we should not be converted though. It’s not a matter, as the Babylonian prostitute preachers imply, that one should “accept the Lord Jesus Christ as our personal Savior.” It’s not a question of whether we accept Yahshua, but whether or not He accepts us. Inasmuch as He died two thousand years ago for our Redemption, He has already accepted us. To be truly converted, we must accept His Redemption, which brings about communion! Conversion does not consist of being “regenerated by the Spirit”, but of being “turned around” (an about-face). Where in the past we were “sinners” (breakers of Yahweh’s Law), we do a 180 and start, to the best of our ability, to keep His Laws.

I know that many who are reading this have experienced conversion. Whatever kind of prayer we made at that time, it was necessary for the Spirit to intercede on our behalf, (Romans 8:26). It’s only conjecture what kind of “groanings” the Spirit might have “uttered”, but perhaps it might have gone something like this: *“Here is an Israelite under the Covenant of Abraham who has come to the realization that he/she is a Lawbreaker and wishes to plead the blood of Redemption on his/her behalf. He/she promises hereafter, based upon the light of the written Word, do his/her best to reject the leaven of the Pharisees, and to return to the faith of the Patriarchs.”* Don’t worry about the exact words you might have prayed at your conversion, for the Spirit interceded and presented them before the Throne in an appropriate manner! Also, don’t distress yourself about all the members of your family kin who were never converted. If they were not converted in this life, they will be in the next, for it is written: “... every [Adamic] knee shall bow to me, and every [Adamic] tongue shall confess to God”, (Romans 14:11). Some of us Adamite-Israelites send our sins ahead to the Judgment, while for other Adamite-Israelites, their sins will follow them to the Judgment, (1 Timothy 5:24). And that is no sign the latter are going to be assigned to a burning

hell. They will be in the kingdom too. But aren't you glad you settled the account ahead of time?

To show you Ted. R. Weiland is still holding the position on the parable of the wheat and the tares which he learned at his Christian Leadership College in Denver, Colorado, I will quote a ludicrous statement he made in his *Eve, Did She Or Didn't She?*, page 72: "Instead, this parable [of the wheat and the tares] is simply contrasting righteous Israelites with wicked Israelites ..."

To believe such a thing, Weiland is implying that agriculturally wheat has the same genetics as darnel. If, as he contends, the only difference between wheat and darnel are "righteous" and "wicked" Israelites, in essence he is claiming wheat and darnel are genetically identical. It would seem, with this conclusion, that Messiah is somewhat incompetent in presenting His teachings by way of parables. Or rather, could it be that Weiland is the one who is incompetent in understanding them?!?! The truth is, the wheat and tares are **NOT** genetically identical, and neither are the seed of the serpent and the seed of the woman whom the wheat and tares represent. They may have had the same mother, but they surely had different fathers! By such spurious teachings as this, Weiland is doing more damage to Israel Identity than he is doing good! [which might be intentional]

Jack Mohr gets his two cents worth in by saying in his *Seed of Satan, Literal or Figurative?*, page 15: "In no way does this Parable [of the wheat and the tares] point to specific people by race, who are literal descendants of Satan, coming from his union with Mother Eve." Moreover, on pages 15-16, Mohr has his own convoluted idea of what he thinks the parable of the wheat and tares is all about: "The 'tares', those who disobey God's law and refuse to be reconciled to Him, will be gathered at this time by the reapers, who will be 'angels', not 'white Israelites, bent on vengeance' ... This is one of the biggest problems with the SEEDLINE people. They are more concerned with 'pulling up the tares', whom they say are the Jewish people, then [sic. probably than] in getting their own house in order and their own Israelite people in a right relationship with God, so that He can do the 'rooting out work.' As a result, we find the SEEDLINERS doing exactly what Jesus warned them not to do, 'rooting up the wheat along with the tares' ... I can assure you from the Word of God, that when the 'rooting up' process takes place, there are going to be 'white Israelites' among the 'tares' who will be rooted up along with God's other enemies'."

I have two questions: Where in the Bible does Mohr get his evidence to substantiate these claims? Where is his verification this parable of the wheat and the tares is not racial in nature? As already documented in this *Special Notice* both the words #4690, "seed" and #5207, "children", mean "kinship" and "posterity." How much more racial can it be?!?! Furthermore, if one will read some of Jack Mohr's other publications, one will find that he has a very **peculiar** position on race and talks out of both sides of his mouth on that subject. Remember, Scripture says: "A double minded man *is* unstable in all his ways", (James 1:8).

Further evidence concerning the meaning of the term "seed" is found in *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, volume Q-Z, pages 328-329: "**SEED** ... is used to indicate both agricultural and human seed, the latter both in a narrow

physical sense and as a description of the descendants of a common ancestor ... the Israelite was commanded not to mix his seed in any field or vineyard, but to plant only one crop (Lev. 19:19; Deut. 22:9), a stricture [critical remark] parallel to that regarding the mixture of human seed by intermarriage with other nations.” In the parable of the wheat and the tares, the common ancestor to the “wheat” is Seth, the son of Adam. The common ancestor of the tares is Cain, the son of Satan through Eve.

While many commentaries address the topic of “tares”, a very good description for the term is given by *The Westminster Dictionary Of The Bible* by Henry Gehman, page 591: “**Tares.** The rendering of Gr. *zizanion* in Matt. 13:25-27, 29, 30; R.V. marg. darnel. The tare (*Vicia sativa*), a vetch, with pinnate and purple-blue or red papillionaceous flowers, would be easily distinguished from the wheat. The Gr. word *zizanion*, which is probably of Semitic origin, corresponds to Arab. *zuwan.*, which denotes *Lolium*, and to Talmudic *zonin*. The bearded darnel (*Lolium temulentum*) is a poisonous grass almost indistinguishable from wheat while the 2 are only in blade, but which can be separated without difficulty when they come into ear (cf. vs. 29, 30).”

The poison from the “tares” is caused by a fungus. “The darnel is host to an ergot-like smut fungus which infects the seeds. The fungus is a serious poison if eaten by animals or man.” (*Pictorial Bible Dictionary* by Merrill C. Tinney, page 668.).

From this description, we can easily apply the term “tares” to the “Jews.” You will notice that when the darnel comes into flower the colors are “purple-blue or red.” Because the “Jews” represent a few members of the Tribe of Judah who didn’t keep their bloodline pure, they would naturally appear as a counterfeit royal-blue, which in turn, serves to identify them with the tares. But the color red is even more significant, as it can represent Communism, for which the “Jews” are the inventors. Not only that, but it is the color of Esau from whom they also descend. It is also the color of the “red dragon” of Revelation 12:3 which represents Herod, the “Jewish” Edomite-racial proselyte who attempted to murder the Emmanuel-child shortly after His birth. (For Herod’s father’s and mother’s lineage, check *Josephus’ Wars* 1:6:2; 1:12:3; Antiq. 14:1:3; 14:8:1; 14:7:3; 14:12:1.) Furthermore, the poison from the darnel seed would be representative of the poison; “leaven of the Pharisees” which churchianity today is so infected with. Who says the “tares” don’t represent the “Jewish” people?!?!)

Della Stanley in her book *Adam’s Tree*, (1975) pages 170-173, puts it very nicely about the parable of the wheat and the tares at the end of chapter 34 and the beginning of chapter 35, entitled “Pharisees and Scribes —a Generation of Vipers .” I will quote excerpts from these few pages as a critical review in order to counter the anti-seedliners’ arguments:

“... Jesus gave the people another parable concerning wheat and tares. He compared the kingdom of heaven to a man that sowed productive seed in his field. But while his men or servants slept, an enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat. When the plants came up and brought forth fruit, the tares came up also. The servants wanted to go and gather out the tares, but the man said wait until harvest time. Then he instructed the reapers to gather the tares first, and bind them in bundles to burn them; and gather the wheat into his barn. (Matthew 13:24-30) ...

“... When Cain killed Able he was cursed and banished from the presence of God, and the curse was never lifted. And at this time the seed of man was divided into two groups: the descendants of Seth that replaced Abel which were the children of God; and the descendants of Cain which became the children of the devil.

“Generations later, Canaan, the son of Ham, was cursed. And the curse was never lifted, therefore his descendants became the children of the devil [by admixture with Kenites, Gen. 15:19].

“Nimrod was another descendant of Ham; and he built cities, among them Babylon. When the Israelites under Joshua pushed a portion of the Canaanites out of the land of Canaan, they dispersed and some went to Babylon. Later still, there were the Shelanites, descendants of Shelah the son of Judah of the house of Jacob, whose mother was a Canaanite ... neither were they allowed to rule through the house of Judah.

“The people that returned to Jerusalem from the sixth century B.C. captivity were not of the house of Israel, but were a remnant of the house of Judah. But it was the royal house of Zedekiah and his followers that God said, ‘I will deliver them to be removed into all kingdoms of the earth for their hurt, to be a proverb, a reproach, a taunt, and a curse ...’ it was mostly the members of Zedekiah’s house and his followers that intermarried with the cursed descendants of Canaan [which had also mixed with the Kenites, the descendants of Cain].

“After the return of the Jews to Jerusalem, there emerged a number of sects called the Pharisees, the Sadducees, the Herodians, and the Scribes ... John the Baptist called these people a generation [race] of vipers. Jesus called them hypocrites and children of the devil; and cautioned His disciples to beware of their doctrine. He speaks of Satan and his kingdom in Luke 11:18 ... And everywhere He went the Scribes and Pharisees followed and opposed everything that He did.

“There was quite a division among the Jews for the sayings of Jesus. Some believed and some did not. They came to Him and said, ‘How long dost thou make us to doubt? It thou be the Christ, tell us plainly.’ Jesus replied, ‘I have told you, but you believe not ... because ye are not of my sheep. My sheep hear my voice ... and follow me. And I give them eternal life ... and I and my Father are one’ (John 10:24-30) And the Jews took up stones to stone him ... But Jesus said, ‘If God were your Father, then ye would love me: for I came from God ... ye are of your father the devil, and the lust of your father ye will do ...’” [*Comments in brackets mine.*]

What Della Stanley failed to explain was: Of the two factions (one favoring diplomacy with Babylon; the other with Egypt), the house of Zedekiah favored the latter. After Nebuchadnezzar captured Zedekiah, and killing his seventy sons and gouging out his eyes, the remainder of his surviving household forced Jeremiah to accompany them to Egypt for which he had forewarned them against. After Jeremiah sailed to Britain with Tea Tephi, the remainder fell under the judgment of a third dying by the sword, a third by pestilence, and a third being captured and taken to Babylon. Actually, one small group ended up in Elephantine in Egypt where they built a temple after the fashion of Solomon’s Temple (check Elephantine Papyri), and intermixing with African Cushite types (i.e., Sammy Davis Jr.) they became half-breed Falasha (black) “Jews.” You

can't find a more rotten "bad fig" than that! How foolish then is Ted R. Weiland's remark, already quoted from his *Eve Did She Or Didn't She?*, page 72, but this time I will finish it: "Instead, this parable [of the wheat and the tares] is simply contrasting righteous Israelites with wicked Israelites, much the same as the good and evil figs of Jeremiah 24." You can see from this, Weiland hasn't the slightest clue why the house of Zedekiah was considered "naughty figs." While Della Stanley did quite well, she should rather have linked the "bad figs" primarily with Elephantine in Egypt.