

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ALL WHO DENY TWO SEEDLINE, #20

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

With this *Special Notice*, we will again focus on the subject of Two Seedline as proclaimed in Genesis 3:15. Many of you may wonder why it is so necessary to relentlessly pursue this subject and to point out those who ridicule this Bible Truth. The reason for this is, if one knows for a fact someone is lying about a certain topic and he keeps quiet about the matter, he becomes part and parcel of that lie. Though keeping quiet, may for the moment, sustain an unsettled peace, in the end it will eat away one's soul like acid. Therefore, the Truth cannot be compromised come hell or high water! Two Seedline is too important an issue and cannot be avoided in Scripture. Other false doctrines besides the anti-seedline teachings are universalism and the no-devil doctrine. Universalism is usually called "the restitution of all things" (Acts 3:21 taken out of context).

With this paper, we are going to scrutinize a situation where a proclaimed teacher in Israel Identity finally discovered there was a real devil. Unfortunately, he is still unaware of who the devil's children are. All this can be found on an audiocassette tape dated 10-2-2002 entitled *What We Don't Know*, by Pete Peters. At certain places I will explain or paraphrase him, or quote him word for word. Early on he said: "*The truth of the matter is, though we've found out who we are, we have still been suffering defeat after defeat because we don't know where we are; we don't know who we are fighting; we don't know what we are fighting; and we don't know with what we have to fight with, or use the weapons of warfare. Now I know I introduced a concept to some of you, who previous to that have been introduced to a lie, or partial lie, or associated on the outskirts of a lie; and sometimes when we only have a partial truth, and take it as total truth, that in itself can act as a lie; and then along with that, we have hooked up to it our pride, we're going to hold on to that lie.*" Then Peters goes on to proclaim we must repent of that lie. All that sounds quite good, but we must examine the rest of what is being said.

Then he brings up how the Israelites crossed the Jordan and moved into Canaan to fight giants. It should be noted, at this point, he made no mention of the origin of those giants. This was a serious omission! Moving along a little further on the tape, he makes a somewhat sarcastic remark: "*Let me tell you something, man, woman, scholar, when you're forty, on the Bible, you don't know it all, and neither do I.*" Does he mean that just because he doesn't understand something concerning the Bible, no

one else does either? From the tone of his voice, that seems to be the thrust of his statement.

Then, several minutes into the tape, he makes this confession: *“Now this might kill some people to do this, but I have to tell you something; I was wrong. When I picked up the teaching of the devil — that he’s just the flesh — I’ll tell you a little bit about where that came from — but before I do, I want you to read what the Bible tells you about the devil, and you best take it to heart.”*

The “lie” to which Peter’s alludes seems to have been introduced shortly after Sheldon Emry died, which would have been somewhere in the mid 80s, according to his story. Now if it took him about 15 years to find out that the “no devil” doctrine was false, how long will it take him to discover that Satan actually has physical children? If I remember correctly, the Sheldon Emry camp, with Stephen E. Jones and others, were pushing the *single* seedline doctrine in addition to the “no devil” doctrine some time before Emry died.

After quoting 1 Peter 5:8, which says: *“Be of sober spirit, be on the alert, your adversary the devil prowls about like a roaring lion seeking someone to devour.”* Then Peters continues to comment thus: *“Now the devil has been winning — he has been winning this world, and the head of the conspiracy is not the Pope — not the Illuminati — not the Masons — not the bankers — not the Jews; it’s the devil. Jesus Christ referred to him as the ruler of this world ... And so we have been taken down time after time after time. We’ve lost ground in this battle — we’ve lost our borders — we’ve lost our families — we’ve lost our health — we’ve lost our morality — we’ve lost our decency — we’ve lost our freedoms ... but I want to tell you this, if you never quit fighting, you don’t win the war ... So I humble myself — I apologize to you because I’ve been a part of this to a certain extent ... And will you forgive me for teaching you error? ... Now let me tell you something a little bit about this no devil doctrine, O.K.”* This apology is very admirable on the part of Pete Peters, if meant in all sincerity. But if this is a desperate move on his part to save his following, that is a different matter. Time will tell. For those who read my materials they know that, I too, have apologized when I found I was wrong in certain areas.

Had Peters checked Job 1:7 & 2:2, he would have found that it is similar to 1 Peter 5:8 but doesn’t mention the “roaring lion”, yet the center reference of 1 Peter 5:8 sends us to Job 1:7. Also, the center reference at Job 1:7 takes us back to 1 Peter 5:8. It should be apparent that *the* “devil” of 1 Peter 5:8 is identical to *the* Satan of Job 1:7 & 2:2. I became curious when I realized that Peter described the devil as a roaring lion and the passages in Job didn’t. Job, in 4:10 does speak of the lion, but not in that context. I found, by checking my many commentaries, that Peters’ reference to the “devil” being as a “roaring lion” was a euphemism for Nero’s feeding the Christians to the lions. If that is true, then we can understand why the “roaring lion” was not mentioned in Job. In order to comprehend what Peter was warning about in 1 Peter 5:8, we have to place ourselves in the political climate of the Roman Empire at that time. Pete Peters didn’t take the Roman Empire and the feeding of the Christians to the lions into consideration when commenting of 1 Peter 5:8. Likely, Peter never made it to the city of Rome, but he understood the danger to the Christians. The next question we

must consider is: how was Nero's Rome analogous to "the devil?" I believe the answer to that is the influence of Nero's second wife, the Jewess, Poppaea Sabina. The significance of this is the fact that Poppaea was a descendant of the satanic seedline of Cain. If you don't think that Poppaea had all that much influence on Nero, then you need to read a history book like Edward Gibbon's *The Decline And Fall Of The Roman Empire*. People form many absurd ideas and arrive at numerous foolish conclusions about what they think the Bible is saying because they don't take the time element and circumstances into account.

Because the Roman emperors considered themselves gods in those days, it was dangerous to speak out against Rome. Peter was simply instructing his followers to be careful of what they said in this regard. In 1 Peter 5:13, "The *church that is* at Babylon" is mentioned. The term "Babylon" was a code-word for Rome. By interjecting "Babylon" for "Rome" it was safe to speak of Rome without any repercussions. We do that sort of thing today. So then, Peter was simply instructing his followers to be as good citizens of Rome as possible, while at the same time being "sober and vigilant." In other words, don't unnecessarily wave a red flag at the enemy! That is also good advice for us today! That doesn't mean we have to renege on our Christian principles in the process.

Another reason for using the code-word Babylon, in place of Rome, may have been because the Roman emperors considered themselves the representative of the Babylonian Pontifex Maximus. All that came about when the Medo-Persian kings expelled the Chaldean priesthood after the death of Belshazzar and they settled at Pergamos. In the course of time, Pergamos became part of the Roman Empire. Upon the death of Attalus III in 133 B.C., having no heir, he bequeathed the title of Pontifex Maximus to Rome. After that, each Roman Emperor automatically became a Pontifex Maximus. This continued until Gratian, who refused it for Christian reasons. It was then transferred to the Roman Catholic Church where it remains today. This account can be found in *The Two Babylons* by Alexander Hislop, pages 240-242. You might remember the account of Achan and his family being destroyed for hiding a Babylonish garment under their tent; Joshua 7:21.

It should be pointed out that Pete Peters didn't mention any of these things concerning 1 Peter 5:8. Now back to Pete Peters on his audiocassette tape presentation: "*Now I want you to know something: the second most important thing to understand about the devil is this — he is. The second most important thing to understand about the devil's servants (his children) is — they are. Now we don't need to fight and divide and argue with our pride holding us here and there, if nothing else, except the fact that the devil is; and that he does scheme according to the Bible; and that he is a roaring lion seeking someone to devour. And accept the truth of God's Word that says his servants lie in wait to deceive.*"

Inasmuch as Pete Peters will repeat the phrase "lie in wait" several times in the remainder of his lecture, let's see what kind of implications it might have. He is correct when he points out this is the nature of the devil. The first place that it is mentioned is in Genesis 4:7 where the Almighty speaks to Cain saying: "**If thou doest well, shall thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door.**" The connection

here are the words “sin, lieth and door.” What does this mean, “**and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door?**” A lot of people try to read this as if Cain had a choice in the matter. That is not at all what it is saying! What is it saying then? Yahweh through Moses is speaking of Cain’s conception and birth here — his natural tendency toward sin as a result of the character of his father. Cain’s conception was therefore his “door.” Yahweh knew that he wouldn’t “do well” and wasn’t fit for the birthright and He told him as much! Let’s see what the words “sin”, “lieth” and “door” mean in the Hebrew:

Sin — #2403 **chattâ’âh**, *khat-taw-aw’*; or **chattâ’th**, *khat-tawth’*; from 2398; an *offence* (sometimes habitual *sinfulness*), and its penalty, occasion, sacrifice, or expiation; also (concretely) an *offender*: — punishment (of sin), purifying (-fication for sin), sin (-ner, offering).

Lieth — #7257 **râbats**, *raw-bats’*: a primitive root; to *crouch* (on all four legs folded, like a recumbent animal); by implication to *recline*, *repose*, *brood*, *lurk*, *imbed*:— crouch (down), fall down, make a fold, lay, (cause to, make to) lie (down), make to rest, sit.

Door — #6607 **pethach**, *peh’-thakh*; from 6605; an *opening* (literally), i.e. *door* (gate) or *entrance* way:— door, entering (in), entrance (-ry), gate, opening, place.

Notice how well the word #7257, “lieth”, fits an animal that lies in wait for its prey. Peters doesn’t grasp this connection either. In other words, the Almighty was telling Cain it was in his genetics to think and act the way he did. Cain’s sin lieth at his conception and birth door! All of Cain’s (Satan’s) descendants are congenital liars and murderers (John 8:44). If one will notice that verse, they will observe that it says “from the beginning.” Therefore there is not a single generation where that was and is not true. Now back to Peters’ presentation:

“ And the other day it just came to me like that —how it all happened. And then I called up George Southwick who’s been involved in this movement many years, and he confirmed how it worked. Now what happened is: a very fine man who’s reached more people with the Anglo-Israel Message than any man I know of —a man that ordained me that I highly respect —wh o’s a far better man than I am, for he was a far better man, and certainly a better scholar —but nevertheless he was like me, he was a man. And he, pastor Emry, came out with the ‘no devil’ doctrine. And the way it came about, though, he was given a book by (it was revealed to me just as clear as could be) a Jewess. Now some of you are not going to like this — I don’t really care — I’m even going to tell you her name. Her name was Gerda Koch ... You’re going to have to accept the fact that when you become mature in Christ, and you begin to have these revelations, you begin to recognize snakes. Gerda Koch showed some of the finest fruits — fought against the Jews — put out some of the finest material imaginable — been to my camp.

“But it occurred to me this Jewess we were having trouble with at Branson, Missouri the last few years —she was standing out there with —we have evidence she works for Morris Dees — standing out with a protest sign — some of you saw her, didn’t you? She was the spitting image of Gerda Koch. And old Gerda laid in wait, and this is what they do. They will lay in wait a lifetime if necessary ... You don’t understand

because you're sheep — the nature of a wolf disguises themselves as sheep. And you don't have to understand their nature — just understand what the Scripture says — have enough humility to accept it, and believe it." [Note: these are Pete Peter's words about Gerda Koch, **not mine.**]

Ironically enough, the Scriptures say that the "Jews" are "**of**" their father the devil, but Peters neither "accepts" it nor "believes" it! When speaking of **people**, the Greek word for "**of**" means a son of a father. Peters has one standard for others and another for himself. It appears that it all depends on what Peters believes, and only he has a right to change his mind. Let's continue with his oration:

"When you begin to go through Scripture there is a devil. He does put thoughts in people's minds. Jesus referred to him as the ruler of this world. Jesus did a sword fight with him in the temptation in the wilderness. He is like a roaring lion seeking someone to devour. He does deceive the nations. He has at his disposal the evil forces of darkness that Ephesians speaks about. They are Jews — they are unclean spirits — they are unclean birds — the Bible talks about all these things ... We had one leader who espouses what is known as the seedline. And if I got seedline people here, I want to tell you something. When you got a whole hoard of these coming at you, and you're in the foxhole, and you have to take the enemy down, there's no sense in getting in an argument with your foxhole partner as to the origin of these people. Let's take care of that later, O.K.? But we turn around and shoot each other."

You can see here, Peters wants to violate the first principle of warfare. That being, under no circumstance, go to war without knowing the character of the enemy. In metaphoric analogy, it is known as "going off halfcocked." Peters couldn't be more wrong on that statement, for it is quite the opposite from his claim. He's adopting the position, "shoot first and ask questions later." That's a real good way to shoot the wrong people. Now back to Peters:

"Now I want to tell you what I think the origin of these people are, all right — the origin of the devil. I think my God is the creator of all things — that He creates good and evil. You have to accept that. And I accept the pure teaching — if you go over to ... Genesis chapter 4, verse 1. 'Now the man had relations with his wife Eve, and she conceived, and gave birth to Cain, and she said, I have gotten a manchild with the help of the Lord. And she again gave birth to his brother Abel, and Abel was the keeper of the flock, but Cain was a tiller of the ground.' Now that's the way I see it."

This last statement by Peters should set off alarms and red lights in our minds, for it demonstrates, with little doubt, that he has never fully researched the matter. Had he ever checked *The Interpreter's Bible*, both the twelve and one volume editions, he would have discovered there are difficult problems with the Hebrew in Genesis 4:1. For instance, the words "with the help of" were never in the Hebrew. Evidently, Peters is using one of the Bible translations that erroneously spawn that rendering. To refresh your memory, I will repeat what I have cited before. Many of the best Hebrew scholars confirm there is a problem with Genesis 4:1! *The Interpreter's Bible*, a twelve volume collaborative work of 36 "consulting editors" plus 124 other "contributors", makes the following observation on this verse, vol. 1, page 517:

“Cain seems originally to have been the ancestor of the Kenites ... The meaning of the name is ‘metalworker’ or ‘smith’; here, however, it is represented as a derivation of a word meaning ‘acquire’, ‘get’ — one of the popular etymologies frequent in Genesis — hence the mother’s words **I have gotten a man. From the Lord** (KJV) is a rendering, following the LXX and Vulg., of *’eth Yahweh*, which is literally, ‘with Yahweh’, and so unintelligible here (the help of [RSV] is not in the Hebrew). It seems probable that *’eth* should be *’oth* — so, ‘the mark of Yahweh’ — and that the words are a gloss ...” While *The Interpreter’s Bible* does quite well on the Hebrew in this verse, they are wanting in many other areas.

I don’t mean to suggest that a gloss is the actual problem, but only to show there is an anomaly with this verse. *The Interpreter’s One-Volume Commentary On The Bible*, edited by Charles M. Laymon, makes the following comment on this passage, on page 6: “... **under circumstances which are obscure (vs. 1b can scarcely be translated, still less understood).**”

Evidently, Pete Peters has some extraordinary insight on Genesis 4:1 that no one else knows about (or does he only think he has)! It is commendable that he has finally conceded to the fact there is a devil, but we can’t wait another 15 years for him to finally admit there is a Two Seedline devil of Genesis 3:15 and 4:1. For anyone who is interested, Pete Peters, by his own admission as presented here, does not teach Two Seedline, no matter how much he raves about the devil. I suggest that his latest revelation; now that there really is a devil, may be a ploy to satisfy both the anti-seedliners and Two Seedliners in his congregation. If you’re really not sure, why don’t you put him to the acid test. With this evidence, I believe we already have.

Now that we have established an ambiguity with Genesis 4:1, let’s once again review the evidence found in the *Aramaic Targums*. I will now cite again the following evidence:

Targum of Jonathan to 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.**”

Palestinian Targum to Genesis 4:1: “**And Adam knew his wife Eve, who had desired the Angel; and she conceived, and bare Cain; and she said, I have acquired a man, the angel of the Lord ...**”

Again, it would appear from those references that the problem with Genesis 4:1 is an omission of some of the words of the Hebrew text. I will now quote Genesis 4:1 from the *King James Version* and I will add the potentially needed words in italics from the *Targum of Jonathan* so it will make some sense:

“**And Adam knew his wife Eve, *who was pregnant by Sammael, and she conceived and bare Cain, and he was like the heavenly beings, and not like earthly beings, and she said, I have gotten a man from the angel of the Lord.***”

Let’s now return to Peters’ presentation proving there really is a devil: “*Now I have handed you a handout, and I rapidly want to look at that handout called Scriptures On The Devil And Satan. The Strong’s definition on the Greek word translated Satan is the accuser, that is, the devil. The word devil is transducer, a slanderer, a false*

accuser. The devil and Satan is one and the same entity, and is also called the tempter, see Matthew 4:1-3, 10. The evil one, Matthew 13:38. The great dragon and old serpent of Revelation 12. The devil knows and uses and quotes Scripture to promote false doctrine and deception, see Matthew 4:1-11. He plants his people in the Kingdom, see Matthew 13:38-39. He takes away the Word of God from the heart of his people, Luke 8:10-13. He puts into the heart of men to do evil, even to the extent of betraying the Son of God, John 13:2. He can oppress some to the point they need healing, Acts 10:38-39. If you let the sun go down on your anger, you give the devil an opportunity, Ephesians 4:25-28. He schemes against us ... Ephesians 6:11-12. He is able to ensnare and hold people captive to his will, 2 Timothy 2:25-26. He's a roaring lion seeking someone to devour 1 Peter 5:8-9. He has works, 1 John 3:8-9. He deceives, that is he is capable of deceiving the whole world, Revelation 12:8-9. He can enter into certain people, Luke 22:3-4. He can sift people like sifting wheat, Luke 22:31-33. He can fill your heart to lie to the Holy Spirit, Acts 5:3. He has dominion known as the dominion of darkness, Acts 26: 16-18. To combat him is a sword fight. Jesus used Scripture to fight him, and told him to be gone. Matthew 4:1-11. He has angels, Revelation 12:8-9. Satan falls when we use the authority and power given to us, Luke 10:17-20. He can disguise himself as an angel of light, 2 Corinthians 11: 12-15. Satan hinders us at times, 1 Thessalonians 2:17-19. Power, signs and false wonders can be performed by Satan, 2 Thessalonians 2:9-10. Some Christians turn and follow Satan, 1 Timothy 5:14-16. Satan has a synagogue and a throne, Revelation 2:8-10 and Revelation 2:12-14 ..."

While Peters did a good job on his handouts describing Satan, he forgot his most important Scripture. That being that Satan, by seducing Eve, had the power to procreate children, John 8:44. Because Peters assigns Satan to the spiritual realm only, he recommends exorcism as a method, similar to the Pentecostals, for fighting against the devil. He completely overlooks the fact that the fallen angels had the ability to change themselves into the form of men and mate with women. The antichrist, anti-seedliners usually point to Matthew 22:30; Mark 12:25 and Luke 20:34-35 to refute that idea, but that is not what these passages are inferring. There's a lot of difference between unlawful sexual intercourse and the institution of marriage. True marriage takes into account the parental responsibility for the offspring of those unions. True marriage is kind after kind. Angel-Adamwomen unions are not in that category!