

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ALL WHO DENY TWO SEEDLINE, #18

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

It is of the utmost importance that it once more be loudly proclaimed that WE ARE AT WAR. We have been since the account in Genesis 3; with verse 15 identifying the conflicting parties as the "children of the serpent" and the "children of the woman." While we are at the very zenith of that battle, the anti-seedliners are actually aiding and abetting the enemy on the opposing side, and use some of the most outlandishly unrealistic arguments for their treasonous conduct. With this *Special Notice*, we will scrutinize their hypothesis concerning "telegony", which is a superstitious belief that goes back hundreds of years. Before we get involved in this discussion, it would be helpful to see how the 1996 *Webster's New Unabridged Dictionary* defines it. While sometimes it is advisable to refer to an older dictionary, in this case, with the many advances in the knowledge of anatomy, a newer one would be more advantageous.

"telegony ... n. a former belief that a sire can influence the characteristics of the progeny of the female parent and subsequent mates. [1890-95; TELE- + GONY] ..."

The Reader's Digest Great Encyclopedic Dictionary (1986): **"telegony ... n. Biol. The alleged influence of a previous sire on the progeny of the same mother from subsequent impregnation by other males. [<TELE- + GONY] ..."**

In his 1978 book *The Babylonian Connection*, Stephen E. Jones used "telegony", along with many other spurious arguments, in an ambiguous attempt to discredit Two Seedline doctrine; thus, exercising his skills as a master of deception. At the time he was able to get by with that false premise, as it was just prior to the general awareness of startling, new technology coming on the scene. On December 3, 1967 Dr. Christiaan Neethling Barnard of South Africa pioneered the first heart replacement. By 1968, nearly 100 heart transplants had been performed throughout the world. Some years later, the general public became aware of the need for anti-rejection drugs when a recipient receives an organ transplant. This factor of "immunity" alone will destroy the "telegony" hypothesis, but there is much more evidence to show Stephen E. Jones' conclusions on this to be flawed. Let's take a look at his primary conclusion on page 85:

"The reason for including telegony in this discussion has been to relate it to the sexual interpretation of Genesis 3. Those who teach that Eve's act was to have had sexual relations with, and to have been impregnated by, a negro, Satan, or anyone other than Adam, cast doubt on the purity of Abel, or Seth, and indeed

upon Eve herself. And thus we may even doubt the racial purity of the entire white race, including Jesus Christ Himself ...”

Had one followed Jones’ scheming line of reasoning up to this point, one would have fallen disastrously headlong into his mental entrapment. Once he concocted his false premise he was able to “establish” a perilous, erroneous, misleading conclusion. Like pretzels and Swiss cheese, Jones’ thesis is twisted and full of holes. In order to impress his readers and make himself appear an expert on the subject of “telegony”, Jones quoted from various publications predating the modern discovery of DNA and the intricate world of chromosomes. Nowhere did Jones address the modern-day study of genetics relating to DNA and chromosomes. Anyone having a basic understanding of today’s developments in genetics can quickly detect Jones’ unmitigated lies.

In his book, pages 77-85, Jones cites Trofim D. Lysenko, Conway Zirkle, Scheinfeld and Herbert L. Cooper, C. L. Redfield, V. A. Zhelnin, and Dr. Austin Flint. In citing these men and their opinions, Jones uses some very biased quotations. I have before me the 11th edition of *The Encyclopedia Britannica* (1910), which has an unbiased account of “telegony”, vol. 26, pages 509-510 and vol. 13, page 354. This encyclopedia cites nearly the same men, incidences and observations on cattle breeding as Jones does but with many conclusions to the contrary. While cattle breeding wasn’t the exact science in the 1800s as it is today, with the knowledge of DNA and chromosomes, nevertheless, they carried on experimental breeding under controlled conditions, proving the theory of “telegony” to be false. Interestingly, many of the ideas about “telegony”, during that period were coming from Charles Darwin, the inventor of the theory of evolution. In this same encyclopedia, vol. 26, page 509, it says this:

“Darwin says, ‘It is worth notice that farmers in south Brazil ... are convinced that mares which have once borne mules when subsequently put to horses are extremely liable to produce colts striped like a mule’ (*Animals and Plants*, vol. i. p. 436). Baron de Parana, on the other hand says, ‘I have many relatives and friends who have large establishments for the rearing of mules, where they obtain from 400 to 1000 mules in a year. In all these establishments, after two or three crossings of the mare and ass, the breeders cause the mare to be put to a horse; yet a pure-bred foal has never been produced resembling either an ass or a mule.’

“The prevalence of the belief in telegony at the present day [before 1910] is largely due to a case of supposed infection reported to the Royal Society in 1820 by Lord Morton. A chestnut mare, after having a hybrid by a quagga, produced to a black Arabian horse three foals showing a number of stripes — in one more stripes were present than the quagga hybrid. The more, however, the case so intimately associated with the name of Lord Morton is considered, the less convincing is the evidence it affords in favor of ‘infection.’ Stripes are frequently seen in high-cast Arab horses, and cross-bred colts out of Arab mares sometimes present far more distinct bars across the legs and other zebra-like markings than characterized the subsequent offspring of Lord Morton’s seven-eighths Arabian mare. In the absence of control experiments there is therefore no reason for

assuming Lord Morton's chestnut mare would have produced less striped offspring had she been mated with the black Arabian before giving birth to a quagga hybrid. To account for the stripes on the subsequent foals, it is only necessary (now that the principles of cross-breeding are understood [before 1910]) to assume that in the cross-bred chestnut mare there lay latent the characteristics of the Kattiawar or other Indian breeds, in which stripes commonly occur."

This evidence is entirely opposite to what Jones tried to make it appear about Lord Morton's horses. It is glaringly obvious from this last quotation that Stephen E. Jones has taken the same position as the infamous Charles Darwin. In turn, all of the other anti-seedliners, in reading and believing Jones' book, (like Weiland and company) have followed suit.

Returning to *The Encyclopedia Britannica* of 1910, 11th edition, on page 510, we read the following under the heading *Telegony in Dogs*: **"Breeder of dogs are, if possible, more thoroughly convinced of the fact of telegony than breeders of horses. Nevertheless, Sir Everett Millais, a recognized authority [before 1910], has boldly asserted that after nearly thirty years' experience, during which he made all sorts of experiments, he had never seen a case of telegony. Recent experiments support Millais's conclusion. Two of the purest breeds at the present day are the Scottish deerhound and the Dalmatian (spotted carriage-dog). A deerhound after having seven pups to a Dalmatian was put to a dog of her own breed. The result was five pups, which have grown into handsome hounds without the remotest suggestion of a previous Dalmatian mate of their dam."** [*with more incidences cited*]

Continuing on page 510: **"Experiments with cats, rabbits, mice, with sheep and cattle, with fowls and pigeons, like the experiments with horses and dogs, fail to afford any evidence that offspring inherit any of their characters from previous mates of the dam; i.e. they entirely fail to prove that a female animal is liable to be so influenced by her first mate that, however subsequently mated, the offspring will either in structure or disposition give some hint of the previous mate."**

Now that we have substantial testimony offsetting and overriding Stephen E. Jones' fraudulent claims, let's examine the process by which this hypothetical "telegony", according to his book, is supposed to take place. Jones claims the following quotation is taken from "Applied Trophology." This, in turn, was supposedly translated into English from Russian by a Bennett McCutcheon from Arizona State University. During the period leading up to 1978, when Jones was writing this book, exchange of information with the Soviet Union was rather scarce because of the imposed "Iron Curtain." Thus, Jones was quite safe in presenting alleged documentation from that area, for who could check on its authenticity. After all, how many people are going to try to find a document on the topic of telegony in an inaccessible land written in a foreign language, and then have it translated into English? According to Jones, page 80, this article was marked "Circulation Restricted to Professional Use." Generally, when a document is translated from one language to another, the flow of words are irregular and a bit difficult to read. Strangely, this alleged translation is very smooth and very

easy to read. From his description, it is evident this article was never in any book or circulated by any recognized authority. Anyway, this is what that reputed article allegedly said, page 82:

“In pregnancy the rapid cell division promotes the release of greater than normal quantities of protomorphogens into the blood from the embryo, and the maternal gonad becomes loaded up with embryo blueprints, as it were, which causes subsequent germ cells of the female to be contaminated with the blueprints of the father, for all embryo protomorphogens are one-half duplicates of the genes of each parent.

“It is obvious, these protomorphogens circulating in the maternal blood influence repair and reconstruction to a tremendous extent.

“It will be obvious that this presence of paternal ‘blueprints’ in the blood of a female who has had a child by one husband and subsequently remarries, the children of the latter marriage will be carrying characteristics of both male mates.”

Then, Jones comments on that quotation by stating: *“When this newly-fertilized cell begins to divide itself and grow, they say, there is a subsequent release of some protomorphogens into the blood of the mother ... and thus the paternal genes could have a definite effect upon the mother herself and all subsequent offspring.” [emphasis mine]*

It’s at this point that Jones really blows his argument and exposes his ignorance. It’s common knowledge that there is no connection between the mother’s blood and the embryo or fetus. The fetus makes its own blood. The only use of the umbilical cord between the mother and fetus is for nourishment and oxygen in one direction and the elimination of waste products in the other. As the mother has an entirely different immune system than the fetus, the mother’s immune system would reject and destroy any part of the fetus, or the other way around. All this bull manure on the part of Jones is nothing more than conjecture, yet he finds those who agree and support his finagling! *The Collier’s Encyclopedia*, published in 1980, vol. 2, page 174, under “Anatomy, Human; The Reproductive System” says:

“... There usually is no continuity between the mother’s blood and that of the embryo or fetus.” This is common knowledge and is found in many medical related publications. The definition of “continuity” is: (1) *state or quality of being continuous*, (2) *a continuous or connected whole*. The definition of “trophology” (trophoblast) from the 1995 *Webster’s New Universal Unabridged Dictionary* is:

“... n. Embryol. the layer of extraembryonic ectoderm that chiefly nourishes the embryo or develops into fetal membranes with nutritive functions.” Notice: it’s “fetal membranes” and not tissue of the mother. Jones and all those anti-seedliners use some of the most distorted arguments I ever heard!!! Well, let’s continue.

Again, Jones uses Darwinian logic on pages 83-84 where he quotes Dr. Austin Flint’s *Textbook of Human Physiology*, when Jones comments: **“Dr. Flint then commented on the belief that when a man and a woman have been married to each other for a long period of years, they begin to resemble each other. This phenomenon is called *saturation*. Dr. Flint asked of telegony: ‘May we not have**

here the explanation of the fact, which has frequently been pointed out, that husband and wife show a tendency to grow like each other, both physically and mentally, the resemblance after a long married life being sometimes very striking?’”

Do you comprehend the inference of what is being said here? Both Flint and Jones are implying that **gradually** the genetics of the couple are changing until they are alike. Can you understand the implications here? Well, if we understand the mechanics of intercourse, surely, with this hypothesis, only the wife’s genetics could change to that of the husband’s. Or could it be that the husband is affected genetically by kissing?!?! Surely, Judah, being married to the Canaanite woman Shuah for several years didn’t take on her Canaanite features! This convoluted hypothesis suggests that the wife loses the genetics of both her father and mother and **gradually** changes to that of her husband. Now if that isn’t Darwinism, I don’t know what is!!! For a moment, let’s take a look at what happens at conception. Science knows today that each single cell of the human body has two sets of 23 chromosomes, or a total of 46. I will now quote *The World Book Encyclopedia*, volume 9, page 192d: “**Every human body cell contains two sets of 23 chromosomes. These two sets look very much alike. Each chromosome in one set can be matched with a particular chromosome in the other set. Egg cells and sperm cells have only one set of 23 chromosomes. These cells are formed in a special way, and end up with only half the number of chromosomes found in body cells. As a result, when an egg and a sperm come together, the fertilized egg cell will contain the 46 chromosomes of a normal body cell. Half of the chromosomes come from the mother, and half from the father.**”

We can clearly see that every cell in our bodies contains these same 2 sets of 23 chromosomes. Further, one set is found only in the male sperm and the opposite set found only in the female egg. In essence, both Flint and Stephen E. Jones are intimating that somehow one or both parties of this marriage lose the 23 chromosomes each of their parents contributed to their genetic makeup. Such a thing would only create greater complications, as conception starts with one united cell containing 46 chromosomes (23 from each parent). As these cells divide and redivide they are directed to become various tissue such as muscle, heart, brain, bone etc. In doing this, every cell making up the body has this same genetic code built into it as was in the original cell (half from the father and half from the mother). Are Jones and Flint trying to suggest there is some kind of device that goes to all the millions of cells and **gradually changes** their DNA makeup from their original genetic code, and does it in synchronization? I find that idea fantastically unrealistic! Does this device somehow trade the wife’s chromosomes she got from her two parents in exchange for the chromosomes of her husband’s two parents?!?! Well, this seems to be the impetus of their intent. If what Flint and Jones are implying is true, at what point does a man’s wife become his sister?; and at what point in time does that married couple discontinue having normal lawful sexual relations and start to commit unlawful incest? Surely, if a wife takes on the genetic makeup of her husband, she would be genetically equivalent to his sister!

Moreover, eventually by that hypothesis, one or the other of that couple could receive an organ transplant from the other without requiring anti-rejection drugs, which brings us the subject of organ transplants. Before we consider that, let's first look into DNA. Here is what the 1980 *Collier's Encyclopedia* said 22 years ago in vol. 4, page 180: **“The gene theory states that the characteristics of each generation are transmitted to the next by the units of inheritance known as genes. The genes are composed of deoxyribonucleic acid, or DNA. The large complex molecules of DNA are made up of four kinds of subunits, called nucleotides, which are arranged in a double helix. The information in each gene resides in a particular order of these subunits. Since each gene is composed of 10,000 or so nucleotides arranged in some specific sequence, there is a very large number of possible combinations of nucleotides and therefore a large number of different sequences representing different bits of genetic information ...**

“The information in each gene is transmitted from one generation to the next by a code, called the genetic code, which involves the linear sequence of the four nucleotide units making up the gene. In each cell generation the gene undergoes replication, so that when the cell divides each of the two daughter cells gets an exact copy of the code. Also in each cell generation one or more transcriptions of the code may be made by which the genic [*genetic*] information is used to regulate the assembly of a specific enzyme or protein.” [*emphasis mine*]

It is overwhelmingly apparent, the Almighty created us with a well regulated genetic code which can only be violated through miscegenation, and once defiled can never be repaired. Our body cells are controlled by this “genetic code”, not telegony. Ladies, you'll always be the genetic daughter of your father and mother, not your husband. Genesis 1:11 says the “seed *is* in itself ... after his kind.” In other words, our Creator has placed safeguards within us to protect that genetic code. That is why, when one receives an organ transplant, one must forever continue to take anti-rejection drugs to suppress one's immunity. The subject of the “rejection process” is quite complex, but the following from the 1980 *Collier's Encyclopedia*, vol. 18, page 219, under the topic of “Organ Transplantation” will serve for this discussion:

“... When the donor and the recipient are identical twins or members of the same inbred line of animals, the procedure is known as isotransplantation ... Transplants performed between two individuals of different species or of the same species but not identical twins are subject to a process known as rejection. Identical twins, being derived from a single ovum, are exactly alike in all their tissues and therefore will accept tissue from each other without rejection ... According to present concepts, the immunological reaction is called forth by the exposure of the recipient to certain substances that are present in or on the living cells of the donor organ but are lacking in the recipient. These substances are called histocompatibility antigens. Histocompatibility antigens are determined by histocompatibility genes in much the same way as an individual's hair color or iris color is determined: Each individual inherits a set of genes, basic units of heredity, and thereby antigens from each of the parents. Upon exposure to the

donor's antigens, the recipient responds by recognizing the tissue as foreign."
[emphases mine]

This data is sufficient to demonstrate, if any sperm cells survived from a former sire, and somehow found their way into the blood of the mother, they would be recognized as "foreign" and would be rejected by her immune system's response to them. Secondly, if somehow the sperm cells of that sire survived in the blood and managed to find their way to her egg supply, they could in no way alter the genetics of those eggs. The 23 chromosomes of the male are paired to the 23 chromosomes of the female, and are directly opposite each other. Therefore, there is no way the male sperm could modify the 23 chromosomes of the female. Under such a hypothetical condition which Jones and Flint suggest, the chromosomes would be so mis-aligned and confused, if a next pregnancy were to occur, it would only result in a genetically deformed disorderly mass of twisted flesh. We only have to look at Down's syndrome for comparison. For this, we will again use *Collier's Encyclopedia*, vol. 16, pages 454-455:

"MONGOLISM, now usually called Down's syndrome, a development disorder characterized by mental retardation as well as by abnormalities of bone growth and other physical malformations ... The disorder is characterized by the presence of physical traits that are normal at an early stage of fetal development. Among these fetal traits are the narrow, slanting eyes which give such cases a superficial resemblance to Asiatic races ... Down's syndrome actually has no racial connotations, but is a pathological condition that may occur in any human race ...

"Causes. Although many factors have been proposed as causes of Down's syndrome, it has now been established that persons with this disorder typically have 47 chromosomes instead of the normal 46. The occurrence of the additional chromosome results from an abnormality in the process of reproductive cell formation. In the normal process of reproduction cell division, one member of each chromosome pair goes to each cell ... In Down's syndrome, the failure of one specific chromosome pair to separate (non-disjunction) results in the occurrence of that particular chromosome in triplicate in the offspring ..." If only one misplaced chromosome can cause that much havoc, consider the complications that would develop under Jones' imagined concept.

For further proof that Stephen E. Jones was using Darwinian theory in his *The Babylonian Connection*, pages 77-85, endorsing the hypothesis of "telegony", I will now quote a paragraph from *The Etiology of Racism in Europe* from website <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/grupe/eg/eg17/04.htm> saying: **"Later, when racist theories took hold of the 'scientific community', the racial inferiority of the Semites [Jews] was explained by the long-term adverse effects of their religion on the blood. This went so far as to revive telegony which implied that the fetus engendered by a mongrel male in a pure blood female modified the mother in its image in such a way that the latter descendants of the same mother were also condemned to impurity. It is noteworthy that this idea was forwarded by Spencer and found support in many writings of Darwin. Hence the source of Hitlerian laws prohibiting**

mixed marriages. Another consequence of Darwinian science was the reinforcement of heredity, promoting it to the rank of a universal law, and greatly contributing to racist theories and practice.”

While we can agree to a small degree with this last quotation, we must differ somewhat with the last sentence, for Darwin was interested to a greater degree on environment affecting future generations rather than heredity. The reason for including it here is to show the Darwinian connection and his unproved theory of telegony. On one occasion Darwin, because he couldn't account for the many various features of a particular breed of cattle, said it was due to “spontaneous variations.” Based on modern DNA genetic science, it would be ridiculous to account for any variations in man or animal somehow happening in such a haphazard way. Evidently, Darwin, like today's anti-seedliners, never read Genesis 1:12 “after his kind.” That's comparable to saying all the races came from Eve. Inasmuch as the anti-seedliners love Darwin's theories, wait 'till they start spreading that one. From all this you can see that when Stephen E. Jones spouts Darwinism loudly, the rest of the anti-seedliners, like an animal in heat in mating season sniffing at the air, couples with — believes it strongly — and purchases Jones' “Brooklyn Bridge.”

There are many in Israel Identity who point out that a woman must go through seven gestations after relations with another race in order to purify herself. I don't agree, as it insinuates that the first six children, although Adamic (or pure) parentage, are no good. This is not true, and neither is there any evidence of there being six children between Abel and Seth. I would rather believe a waiting period would be necessary to see if any venereal diseases developed as a result of such a union.